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## 1 List of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BESG</td>
<td>Built Environment Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>Breaking New Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORC</td>
<td>Community organisation resource centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DME</td>
<td>National Department of Minerals and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWAF</td>
<td>Department of Water Affairs and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDUP</td>
<td>Federation of Urban and Rural Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR strategy</td>
<td>Growth, Employment and Redistribution strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS</td>
<td>Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>Kwazulu Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIG</td>
<td>Municipal Infrastructure Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLS</td>
<td>People’s Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP</td>
<td>People’s Housing Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO</td>
<td>South African National Civic Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI</td>
<td>Shack/slum Dweller International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Sustainability Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>Utshani Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USN</td>
<td>Urban Sector Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Introduction

This report concerns the evaluation of the interventions of Cordaid’s partners in South Africa between 2003-2007 in the framework of the programmes ‘Quality of Urban life’ (2003-2006) and ‘Slum Dwellers’ (2007-2010). Similar evaluations have been executed in Mali and Peru; the three country reports will feed into a synthesis report. Cordaid commissioned the evaluations to ACE Europe in order to have a better understanding of the effects of the programme on the lives of slum dwellers and to take lessons from this with regard to the future implementation of the programme.

The field missions took place after a phase in which a desk study was carried out (by Cordaid, covering all partners and countries dealing with the topics ‘environment and waste’ and social sustainability between 2003-2007) and a methodological framework and approach was developed by ACE Europe. The mission was executed between February 8th and 24th 2009 by two consultants: Corina Dhaene and Muna Lakhani. The preparation for the mission and the collection of data started already in December 2008.

The main elements of the methodological framework are the following
- A questionnaire to the partners based on the methodological framework requesting the partners to fill out data and indicate respondents for the MSC method (see below) – example of the questionnaire is in annex;
- Workshops and reflection with the full group of NGO partners in South Africa;
- Analysis of a number of projects executed by the NGO partners;
- Interviews with beneficiaries aiming at the identification of the most significant change (Most Significant Change Method MSC) in their lives (as a result of their involvement in Cordaid funded projects);
- Organizing and processing all data around 5 basic evaluation questions, of which the first three focus on the effects and impact on the ground and the latter two concern an assessment of Cordaid’s strategy in the country.
- Study of most relevant documents (see overview in annex).

Evaluation questions

1. To what extent do slum dwellers have increased access (including use and affordability) to basic facilities such as refuse removal, water and energy through the interventions of partners
2. To what extent did slum dwellers develop a claim making power/capacity to ensure the sustainable and equitabe development of their community thanks to the interventions of the partners?
3. To what extent have slum dwellers been able to use their claim making power to change policies and local government planning/operations regarding access to basic facilities and thanks to the interventions of the partners?

4. To what extent was the mix of partners effective and relevant in order to achieve the objectives of the programme?

5. To what extent have the four core activities of Cordaid contributed to the effectiveness of the programme and the sustainability of its outcomes?

The workshops in the beginning and at the end of the field mission have allowed the NGO partners to be involved in the reflections and analysis. The evaluation team visited most of the NGO partners, their field officers and beneficiaries individually during two days. The focus was mainly on the following partners: DAG, Planact, Afesis Corplan (see further). The contextual analysis was prepared before hand by the local consultant and was further enriched through contacts with stakeholders at local and provincial government level and the reading of some key documents (see programme, overview of documents consulted and people interviewed in annex).

As defined by the Terms of Reference (drafted by Cordaid), the evaluation mission focused mainly on access to basic facilities, such as refuse removal, water and energy and the extent to which building civil society has contributed to a better access. The evaluation mission had to take a closer look at target group/society level and not at results at the level of the partner organizations (organizational development, strengthening society, relations with Cordaid and other stakeholders). Yet some of these aspects were touched upon when assessing some aspects of Cordaid’s strategy (see Evaluation Question 4 and 5).

Several meetings with the programme officers of Cordaid have allowed to involve their perspective in the evaluation and to confront the findings and analysis of the evaluators to their understanding and experience.

2.1. OVERVIEW OF NGO PARTNERS AND THEIR PROGRAMMES

At the start of the programme Quality of Urban Life in 2003, Cordaid worked with 44 partners in South Africa in three different fields (market access, quality of urban life and HIV/AIDS). At that time the decision was already taken to slim down the total number of partners. In the 2004 programme for South Africa, Cordaid specified that it would cooperate with 12 organisations on urban issues and develop a strategic relationship with Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI) and with COHRE (in the field of
international lobby, for e.g. on forced evictions).

**Selection of partners for this evaluation** - The desk study, executed by Cordaid proposed a sample of partners to fit the focus of the evaluation (environment/waste and social sustainability) and excluded the strategic partners COHRE and SDI from the sample. This focus was altered and further specified by the Terms of Reference for the field mission, namely: access to basic services (water, waste and energy) and strengthening capacity of slum dwellers (for claiming better services and lobby for change). Taking this into account, ACE Europe proposed a final sample in the methodological concept paper. The partners selected for South Africa were those NGOs that have developed projects specifically aimed at slum dwellers and/or the creation of sustainable settlements (including the development of models and pilots). As it is, none of the partners are focused on access to basic services as such but they address the issue through their goal of creating sustainable settlements. As such, NGOs and projects dealing with youth development, local economic development and HIV/AIDS were not included in this evaluation.

The table below gives an overview of the partner sample (more details about the partners can be found in annex, as well as an overview of the projects and funds).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO partners working in South Africa on urban issues (Cordaid, 2004 programme)</th>
<th>NGO partners identified by the Cordaid desk study for South Africa</th>
<th>NGO partners selected for the field mission for this particular evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDSL (in partnership with SAHPF and related to UF)</td>
<td>PDSL (although closed since 2005)</td>
<td>Not included because remaining partner (UF) was not able to provide the evaluators with information about the projects and beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF (in partnership with SAHPF)</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>UF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAG</td>
<td>Not selected because of its focus on housing</td>
<td>DAG because their activities are in line with the focus of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANACT</td>
<td>Planact</td>
<td>Planact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFESIS</td>
<td>Afesis-Corplan</td>
<td>Afesis-Corplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Leij Habitat Foundation (later Intervolve)</td>
<td>Intervolve</td>
<td>Not, because of Cordaid’s decision¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTO</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMEPE</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHC</td>
<td>JHC but only in a “light version”² because they are not working with slum dwellers or on the topic of basic services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-systems and SI</td>
<td>SI (who took over the projects of E-systems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Intervolve is an organisation from the Netherlands and was recently evaluated. There is a branch of Intervolve in East-London. This branch is going through a period of re-organisation: the decision has to be taken to move on independently from Intervolve or to stop activities.

² The “light version” means that both SI and JHC have been requested to provide us with some data/information about their strategy and their appreciation of the relations with Cordaid (in the framework of Evaluation Question 4 and 5).
but only in a light version because the projects only deal with study and developing plans without concrete output on the ground

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Share</td>
<td>Not, because this organisation is dealing with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyasa Fund</td>
<td>Kuyasa Fund because they work with slum dwellers and are the only ones to provide financial products to the poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven (7) NGO partners included in this evaluation are active in and around Johannesburg (Planact and the JHC), Cape Town (DAG, Kuyasa Fund and SI) - as two of the 6 largest urban areas in South Africa – and East Londen (Afesis-Corplan, Buffalo City is considered as one of the larger cities that find themselves the base of a municipality which include large rural areas).

**Volume of Cordaid support related to this sample** - In total, the volume of Cordaid’s support for the programme slum dwellers and related to access to basic facilities between 2003 and 2007 is 2.886.850 (excluding the new rounds of funding which started in 2007) divided over 9 organisations of which UF and PDLS, then followed by the SI, received the largest sums. Part of this sum was also allocated to organisations that were not in the sample for the field mission: PDLS (a community support organisation that was closed down in 2005 and that worked closely with UF – as a kind of CORC now) and E-systems, the organisation that managed a research project which was later on taken over by the SI. The evaluators were not able to analyse the results and effects of these programmes through the selected partner sample (no access to data).

**Description of the partners in the sample** - What follows is a short description of partners (all of them NGOs) and their programmes funded between 2003-2007.

**Kuyasa Fund** – the Kuyasa Fund has received one round of funding between 2005-2008 of 90.000 euro (35% of total budget). The Fund is a typical Micro-finance institution intervening in the Western Cape working with 27 loan officers. Its target group are mainly women living in townships and applying for loans to upgrade their house/assets. The evaluators visited several women in Kayelitsha (part of savings groups and applied for at least one loan) and observed a marketing event in one township. The activities of the fund are less relevant with regard of the focus of this evaluation. Kuyasa Fund was established by DAG in 1999.

**Development Action Group** – DAG has received one round of funding for three years in the period 2003-2007 of 300.000 euro (or 11% of the total budget). A new round started in 2007 (with 17% of co-financing). DAG mainly operates in the Western Cape and works with communities through already existing groups and on their request (or the request of government), underpinned by an agreement. The beneficiaries are households in urban areas with incomes ranging from 0ZAR/month to about 3.500

---

3 Other donors investing in the same partners/programmes are: Misereor, the Swedish Co-operative Centre (mainly for Afesis) and the Mott Foundation.
ZAR, living without adequate housing. DAG is also providing training to government officials. DAG was one of the members of the Urban Sector Network (USN, see further). DAG offers different types of support to communities and has relations with several other stakeholders and organisations. The evaluation team visited respondents in Hangberg, Wallacedene, Freedom Park and Netreg.

**Planact** – Planact has received one round of funding for three years in the period between 2003-2007 of 225.000 euro (13% of the total budget). A new round started in 2007 (29% of co-financing). Planact operates in the Gauteng province and around Johannesburg with communities in informal settlements. Poor, marginalised community members are the main beneficiaries next to government officials who receive training to enhance their role in public participation. Planact was also member of the USN and is currently member of the Good Governance Learning Network. The evaluation team visited respondents in Orlando, Zandspruit and Vosloorus.

**Afesis Corplan** – Afesis has received one round of funding for 3 years of 225.000 euro (13,5% of their total budget). In January 2007 a new round for two year started (with 15% of co-financing) Their main direct beneficiaries are communities residing with the Eastern Cape Province involved in the Human Settlements Programme of Afesis and CBO’s and government officials involved in the Local Governance Programme. Afesis was member of the USN and is current member of the Good Governance Learning Network. The evaluation team visited Amalinda, St-Lukes and Duncan Village.

**Utshani Fund**: the Fund has received one round of funding for 3 years between 2003-2007 of 53.000 euro (68% of the total budget). A new round of funding started in 2007 (15% of the total budget). The Fund operates in an alliance with the Federation of Rural and Urban Poor (FEDUP) and CORC. The members of FEDUP are the main beneficiaries, next to any other community that aligns itself to the principles of the SDI (the Shack Dwellers International). The Fund has not been active as an implementer of housing projects since 2003 because of serious financial difficulties: the UF tended to provide upfront financing for housing projects but funds were not paid back by the provincial authorities. In the meantime, the Fund has organised some training activities for the members of FEDUP and continues to negotiate with government.⁴

**Sustainability institute**: the SI has received one round of funding between 2003-2007 of 300.000 euro (100% of the total budget). A new round of financing started in 2008 (35% of total budget). The SI is a research and training institute. They have been involved with E-systems dealing with the development of alternative and innovative models for sustainable development. The programmes mainly dealt with design and research; one aspect dealt with the promotion of energy efficiency in buildings which was co-managed with the Cape Town Partnership. The SI did not develop concrete activities but remained in the phase of research and planning.

**Johannesburg Housing Company** (was not visited during the field mission, data were collected before hand and a skype interview was conducted after the mission): The JHC is a private housing company which is committed to urban regeneration through the provision of quality, value for money (rental) accommodation and service for all who choose to live in JHC projects and neighbourhoods. The JHC is

---

⁴ A chronicle of the hardships the UF went through can be read in the magazine SELAVIP (see overview of documents consulted in annex).
not dealing with access to basic services. Services are provided in the rental stock that is owned by the JHC. The JHC delivers supporting services to its tenants through its organisation ‘Makhulong A Matala’ which is cultivating the empowerment of tenants (not necessarily as members of a group/or aimed at groups). Their main target group consists of individuals from low to middle income groups.

2.2. DESCRIPTION OF LIMITATIONS

The main limitations were the following:

- Lack of coherence between the focus of the evaluation and the actual activities / fields of intervention of the NGO partners in South Africa: the Cordaid desk study focused on environment and waste plus social sustainability, whereas the focus of the programme in South Africa was on physical and secure tenure (see Cordaid programmes) and social sustainability. As such it was difficult to identify specific interventions centred around environment and waste.

- The evaluation took place against the background of a changed environment/policy in the Netherlands that has forced Cordaid to change its policies. Cordaid decided for another organisation structure: from country/region programme to thematic organised programmes and one of these programmes developed in the course of 2007 to the so-called ‘Slum dwellers programme’. The evaluation questions formulated by Cordaid in the Terms of Reference are inspired by that new programme. The idea to link results and impact of partners’ activities to Millennium Development Goals like indicators is something that gradually developed in the period 2003-2007 and became more clear from 2007 onwards. As such, many of the data requested at the level of partners about their interventions were not (readily) available and could not be traced post-activity.

- Figures and data about NGO partners and their projects were scattered over different Cordaid reports and documents (such as Projectkenschets, Considerations, etc) and reports from partners. There was little consolidation and systematisation of data at the level of Cordaid and the available data about outreach and number and nature of outputs did often not match the reality on the ground.

- Partners had time available to prepare for the mission (collection of data through the questionnaires and collection of MSC stories) but the period was less favourable: December to beginning of January is holiday period. Although the methodological concept paper announced that the NGO partners were requested to put in quite some time, most of them were surprised by the amount of work and were not organised to provide information prior to the evaluation mission which hindered the preparation by the evaluators (for e.g. the collection of additional MSC outside of the leadership of communities, good understanding of what actually happened on the ground, …). The example of one NGO partner however demonstrated that the MSC method as such can actually work very well (see MSC of DAG in annex).

- Meeting with the Utshani Fund: a UF representative took part in the kick-off and feedback workshop organised by the evaluators. It was however not possible to meet with UF during the mission or
afterwards (and to collect some information on FEDUP and COURC and their way of working through them). ACE Europe conducted a skype interview with the Manager of Operations after the mission. UF is currently facing a lot of constraints (shortage of personnel is one of them) and was not able to organise meetings with beneficiary groups. Cordaid has been aware of the difficult situation; all financial transfers were executed in the course of 2007 while it was understood by Cordaid that the programme would run until March 2009.
3 Context

In the following, the evaluators would like to highlight some elements that are necessary to understand the programmes of the partners. Because the ToR did not request the evaluators to execute a context study, the following is based on a limited number of sources (see overview of documents in annex) and the assessment of the local consultant when it comes to identifying some current issues.

3.1. URBANISATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

The main points to remember are that the ‘urban agenda’ is still quite young in South Africa and that the understanding of how big cities (can) function in partnership (with citizens a.o.) did not yet fully materialize.

Some figures - In 2003 there were 2.1 million shack dwellings in South Africa, up from 1.5 million in 1996 (the number of shacks increased in Johannesburg from 156,000 to 212,000, in Cape town from 24,000 in 1993 to 143,000 in 2001). This informal hypergrowth was projected to result in 2.4 million shack dwellings by 2008. While many urban households saw post-apartheid gains in electricity connections and (mobile) telephones, the supply of basic water, sanitation and waste removal services fell short of rapidly-rising need. From 1996 to 2001, the number of households lacking on-site water supply increased with 59% in greater Johannesburg and 79% in Cape Town.

Some figures on precarious habitat and inadequate services

In 2003 there were 2.1 million shack dwellings in South Africa, up from 1.5 million in 1996 (the number of shacks increased in Johannesburg from 156,000 to 212,000, in Cape town from 24,000 in 1993 to 143,000 in 2001). This informal hypergrowth was projected to result in 2.4 million shack dwellings by 2008. While many urban households saw post-apartheid gains in electricity connections and (mobile) telephones, the supply of basic water, sanitation and waste removal services fell short of rapidly-rising need. From 1996 to 2001, the number of households lacking on-site water supply increased with 59% in greater Johannesburg and 79% in Cape Town.
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Some figures on precarious habitat and inadequate services

While many urban households saw post-apartheid gains in electricity connections and (mobile) telephones, the supply of basic water, sanitation and waste removal services fell short of rapidly-rising need. From 1996 to 2001, the number of households lacking on-site water supply increased with 59% in greater Johannesburg and 79% in Cape Town.

Development of an urban agenda - A specific urban agenda took a long time to develop: “Until now, government departments have pursued their own developmental priorities with little concern about the ‘where’ of development focusing instead on the ‘what’ of their sectoral programmes.” Policies and

---

5 Main elements are taken from Mabin, A. (“Local government in South Africa’s larger cities.” In Udesh (2006), 135-156.
strategies remained rather vague about the issue of urbanisation, although there was specific attention for rural-urban migration. In 1996, the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), which advocated a people-driven development process and proposed a social democratic agenda was sidelined and replaced by the Growth, Employment and Redistribution strategy (GEAR). According to a number of mainstream economists, this strategy reduced economic growth and UNDP urged South Africa’s government in 2004 to review GEAR because of the rising unemployment, income inequality, low investment etc.

Relevant steps in the development of an urban agenda include the following:

- 1995/96: Urban development strategy coordinated by the RDP Office (closed shortly after)
- 1997: Urban Development Framework managed by the Department of Housing
- 2000 IDP: introduction of focus on integrated planning (through the Municipal Systems Act), ‘but many municipalities dispensed with spatial thinking altogether and concentrated primarily on issues of infrastructure, poverty and job creation’. (Udesh (2006), 28)

**Vision on ‘bigger city’ government** - It has taken South African government some time as well to develop a particular vision on the management and functioning of local authorities beyond the requirement of delivering services; and of metropolitan cities as very distinct (in their management requirements and development challenges) from smaller municipalities. The ANC did put in place measures that firmly control any deviant local development. Clearly, developing cities answering context-specific elements is still quite challenging to national government and the parties in power and this explains (partly) the slow development of specific urban policies.

The weakness (still) of larger city government has allowed the provinces gain power, more in particular because they have greater capital resources to contribute. Currently, the relationship between city governments and provincial institutions are under tension and negotiation. For both government levels it is sometimes hard to live with the understanding that city development strategies are essentially intergovernmental strategies.

To date, these large city governments find it difficult to deal with the very different perceptions of local government marginalised groups of poor urban residents hold. Councillors sometimes too easy assume false consensus on what the community wants. A city government that effectively enables collective action is far from realised. “Despite widespread requirements and mechanisms of participation and a vast calendar of meetings, ward committees and representative forums, many barriers still separate people from influence (transport, language, etc) and a lot of trust has been lost’, because of government not keeping its (ambitious) promises (Udesh (2006), 151). The groups that seem to have used the new structures of democracy the most are from the middle class. Presumably this limit is a consequence of the lack of civil society organisations which conceptualise themselves as urban actors engaging at the scale of the city as a whole. (Cited in Udesh (2006, 152))

---

9 Mabin (2006), 149, see also Sogge (2007), 19.
Next, following topics are treated:

- description of the services in the field of water and sanitation, waste collection and energy
- service delivery at the local level: municipal responsibilities;
- Access to and quality of services
- programmes and policies that are relevant for slum dwellers
- funders and other international players active in slums and sector of basic service delivery

3.2. THE SERVICES: WATER, SANITATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

It is important to understand that the legal framework for the provision of basic services is clear and in place. Policies for water, sanitation and waste management are developed by the Department for Water Affairs and Forestry\(^\text{10}\).

Water and sanitation - South Africa is one of the few countries in the world that enshrines the basic right to sufficient water in its Constitution, stating that everyone has the right to have access to (...) sufficient food and water. It is estimated that up to 90% of the total population will have access to basic water supply services by the end of 2008.

With respect to sanitation the picture is more sobering. According to official figures, an estimated 18 million South Africans did not have access to basic sanitation in 2002 and may be using the bucket system, pit toilets or the "veld" (open defecation). When sanitation systems are inadequate the health impacts can be extremely serious.\(^\text{11}\) In response to the fact that access to sanitation lagged significantly behind access to water, the government published its White Paper on Basic Household Sanitation in 2001. It called for universal access to basic sanitation by March 2010, with priority accorded to communities with the greatest needs. The policy outlines the roles of the various stakeholders - households, municipalities, provincial governments, various branches of national government - and establishes coordination and monitoring mechanisms. It also called for Infrastructure Grants (MIG) to municipalities to finance investments in sanitation. Yet, substantial challenges remain in addressing historical inequalities in access to both water supply and sanitation, and in sustaining service provision over the long term.

Most relevant legislation/policy for this evaluation is:

- The Water Services Act (nr. 108 1997) and the Water Services Amendment Act – 2004 (nr. 30 2004): this act calls for higher cost recovery, which proved a challenge due to widespread poverty

\(^\text{10}\) http://www.dwaf.gov.za/ . The prime responsibility of the department is the formulation and implementation of policy governing these two sectors. It also has override responsibility for water services provided by local government. See also the website of the Water Information Network: http://www.win-sa.org.za/ .

\(^\text{11}\) This is evidenced in the estimated 1.5 million cases of diarrhoea in children under five and the 2001 outbreak of cholera. According to estimates by the WHO/UNICEF Global Joint Monitoring Program for water and sanitation based on survey and census data, the share of South Africans with access to adequate sanitation actually decreased from 69% in 1990 to 65% in 2004.
and a culture of non-payment for water in many Townships, as a remnant of protests against Apartheid.

- The Strategic Framework for Water Services (2003): amongst others highlighting the free basic service issue in water and sanitation (FBS, see further).
- Free Basic Sanitation Strategy (2004): challenges indicated are the provision of the sanitation facility itself to poor households, the promotion of health and hygiene in a coordinated manner (which requires close collaboration between district municipalities with responsibility for environmental health, the Water Services Authority and the water services provider) and subsidising operating and maintenance costs.

**Household) waste collection and management** - This is governed by the National Environmental Management Act (Act NO 107 OF 1998), with the later Waste Bill (currently with the President for signature) specifying what local authorities must do (for e.g. “A municipality in terms of a by-law (a) must establish service standards and levels of service for the collection of waste; (b) may identify requirements in respect of the separation, compacting and storage of waste…” ).

The focus is mainly on collection, and such collection is almost always connected with formal housing, business and industry. Informal settlements are not well serviced, as this is seen as “formalising” the settlement, or recognizing it as legitimate, something government is hesitant to do. However, it must be said that wherever there is a formal waste collection system, these tend to work well. No far reaching steps have yet been taken to ensure that ‘the polluter pays’, with the responsibility for waste always being placed on the householder, not the manufacturer or other financial beneficiaries of waste production.

**Energy** - The National Department of Minerals and Energy is ultimately responsible for energy provision in the country, but with local authorities being ‘bulk’ purchasers of electricity (through state-owned power utility ESKOM), who then ‘retail’ it to business and households. Energy consumed by households represents about 17 percent of South Africa’s net use. Most household energy is obtained from fuel wood (50 percent of net household energy), primarily in rural areas, with the remainder from coal (18 percent), illuminating paraffin (7 percent) and a small amount from liquid petroleum gas.

The DME’s Energy Policy is based on key objectives of which: attaining universal access to energy by 2014; accessible, affordable and reliable energy, especially for the poor; diversifying primary energy sources and reducing dependency on coal; good governance, which must also facilitate and encourage private-sector investments in the energy sector; and environmentally responsible energy provision.

To date, little progress is made by the Department to promote and support any form of sustainable energy. Vested interests, particularly within the mining sector, lobby strong for a coal fired baseload approach: new power stations build (Medupi currently) are all planned to be coal fired.

3.3. SERVICE DELIVERY AT LOCAL LEVEL: MUNICIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES

South Africa has three spheres of government: National, Provincial (9 provinces) and local government, variously referred to as Local Authorities or Municipalities. The Constitution of South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996) envisages a robust local government system, which can provide democratic and accountable government for local communities; ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner; promote social and economic development; promote a safe and healthy living environment; and encourage the involvement of communities and community organizations in the matters of local government.

Municipalities thus provide most retail services and also own some of the bulk supply infrastructure – the practical implication of this is that local authorities are in principle responsible for all services: water, electricity and waste in almost every case.

In theory, the local level of government is responsible for overseeing standards, quality control and service maintenance. Standards are generated at national level, with any possible training and capacity building generally not seen as a direct government responsibility. The municipalities are provided with instruments/mechanisms for planning and financing service delivery:

- Each municipal council must adopt a single, inclusive and strategic plan for the development of the municipality. This plan is called the integrated development plan or IDP. The IDP concept, launched in 2000, introduced a new process of planning and was seen as a vehicle for state/civil society interaction. In 2007 alignment of the budget and the needs identified in the IDP were still a major challenge for most municipalities.
- A Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG) administered by the Department of Provincial and Local Government is aimed at providing all South Africans with at least a basic level of service by the year 2013 through the provision of grant finance to cover the capital cost of basic infrastructure for the poor.

Relevant laws – The following pieces of legislation provide a framework for a democratic, accountable and developmental local government system, as envisaged by the Constitution:

- 1998: the Municipal Demarcation Act, which enabled the re-demarcation of municipal boundaries; and the Municipal Structures Act, which defined the structures of local government.

---

13 Local authorities or Municipalities are what is commonly understood as “local government” – i.e. large towns and cities; there are areas within SA that are, technically, neither – villages, for example, or areas controlled by traditional authorities. In this case, as well as in areas with common challenges, there is a type of “in between” government, called District or Regional authorities. They sometimes serve the function of what local authorities would generally o, or alternatively, attend to areas of regional concern, often development issues.

14 The Municipal Structures Act (commonly known as the Municipal Structures Act or simply the Structures Act, 117, 1998) delimits the powers between district and local municipalities more in particular regarding land reform. A district municipality must seek to achieve the integrated, sustainable and equitable social and economic development of its area as a whole.
The Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 regulating key municipal organizational, planning, participatory and service delivery systems. The Act specifies that a municipal council may finance the affairs of the municipality by charging fees for services, imposing surcharges on fees or property rates, and (when allowed by national legislation) imposing surcharges on other taxes, levies and duties. The Municipal Systems Act also obliges municipal councils to consult the local community about municipal services. Communities should have a say in:

1. the way in which services are delivered (for example, by the municipal administration or through a service agreement);
2. the level of services (for example, VIP latrines or waterborne sanitation);
3. the quality of services (for example, how quickly the municipality processes planning applications);
4. and the range of services which are provided (for example, whether the municipal council should provide recycling facilities).

Municipalities must fulfil these duties as far as possible, taking account of the budget and capacity they have available.

3.4. ACCES AND QUALITY

In reality, South Africans have found that there is a fine line between “access” to a service, and the ability to use that service – so while there may be “access” to electricity and water, this does not automatically mean that the person can afford to use that service. While there is for e.g. a subsidized (free) 6 kl of water per household per month, this is based on 4 persons per household, generally an underestimate of the number of people living there, and still does not reach the 50 l per day recommended by the WHO and others.

3.4.1. FREE BASIC SERVICES

South Africa has introduced a policy of free basic services (FBS), including water, electricity and solid waste collection since the 1999 elections. This was a dramatic shift in policy; previously, the approach had been that government would pay for the capital cost of schemes, provided that beneficiaries would undertake to pay the recurrent costs.

When it comes to water (FBW, free basic water), every eligible household is to receive the first 6 cubic meters per month for free. In July 2001 a revised tariff structure was suggested that included 6 cubic meters of free water per month (40 litre/capita/day for a family of five or 25 litre/capita/day for a family of eight). Putting the policy of free basic water in practice proved a challenge. And the policy is only being implemented gradually and within the means of each municipality. In August 2007 36 million South
Africans (about 75% of the population) had access to free basic water according to DWAF’s water sector information system (less in East London and KwaZulu Natal).

The achievements of the free basic sanitation initiative have not been significant to date. Figures from 2005 suggest that 15% of the citizens were receiving free basic sanitation and that 11% of the poor population is served.

A free basic electricity policy is effective from July 2003 but progress is also limited. The policy states that grid connected households will be provided with 50kWh of free basic electricity funded mainly through relevant intergovernmental transfers.

Some issues related to basic services:

- The poorest of the poor (who often have pre-paid meters) pay a higher rate per kW/hr than the better off, or business and industry. Households can pay in excess of R0.50 per unit, with large industry paying well under R0.20 per unit. Hence, electricity is not very affordable for the poor. Hundreds of thousands of South Africans have been disconnected due to non-affordability, so while the number of new connections since democracy seems high, the total still having access to and use of, electricity, remains low.
- Pre-paid meters for water were introduced in Johannesburg, including in Soweto, and in other cities as part of management contracts with private operators. These meters, which cut off water supply above the 6 cubic meter monthly limit if no payment is made, sparked substantial protests in poor neighbourhoods. In April 2008 the South African High Court found this practice unconstitutional (Phiri case). Further, the judge stated that “25 liters per person per day is insufficient for the residents”. The Court apparently assumed a household size of eight.
- Further, service quality is highly variable and data is sketchy. Monitoring of service quality by the government’s Department of Water Affairs and Forestry is only starting, with the “blue drop green drop” Water Quality Regulation Strategy. Thus 63% of municipalities could not say if they met drinking water quality standards or not.
- The actual impact of service delivery by the government is perceived as questionable by a number of new social movements (such as Abahlali baseMjondolo and the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign) representing the poorest and most oppressed communities in South Africa (and having relations with Cordaid’s partner DAG). Supplying water to communities is one of the main issues that these movements address and there is a specific focus on preventing water cut-offs and campaigning for free basic water. Because of their criticism of the government, they have suffered severe repression by officials and police.
- Privatisation is an issue of long-standing in SA. Bodies such as the Anti-Privatisation Forum, Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee, and others, have embarked on sometimes radical campaigns to halt privatisation processes. This has also grown into an affordability campaign, with, for example, illegal re-connection of water and electricity supplies to poor households that have been cut off for non-payment. These organisations have also rallied around the cause of pre-paid meters.

---

15 The list of issues are based on the experience of the local consultant, Muna Lakhani, his work with CBO’s and grassroots organisations and articles from newspapers and non-official media (such as Wikipedia).
16 One could argue though that pre-paid meters allow consumers to better monitor their use of electricity.
Basic services and housing policies in South Africa are interrelated, this is known as the ‘site and service’ concept where government provides individual plots of land with basic services, on which beneficiaries or private developers would build their houses. The South African housing programme from 1994 onwards has thus provided beneficiaries with access to basic services. This programme was linked to the Reconstruction and Development programme (RDP) introduced in the same year; from here comes the name ‘RDP house’.

The original housing policy aimed at creating an ‘enabling environment’: the state supports and facilitates the delivery of housing by the private sector or by community-based organizations but prefers not to get engaged directly in shelter provision itself. The Housing White Paper (undated) envisaged that the subsidy scheme would do more than just build houses. The idea was to create viable integrated settlements where households would have easy access to opportunities, infrastructure and services. This dimension of the housing programme has largely failed to materialize; the housing ‘experiment’ was critiqued because of the lack of settlement integration and the poor connectivity between housing delivery and opportunities in urban areas. Yet, one has to admit, that besides all criticism, the government may not have delivered what it promised, but they delivered quite an amount of houses over the years.

Over the years, the state strengthened its role in low-cost housing delivery (Housing Act of 1997) with the idea to allow local authorities to be developers of low-income housing projects with effect from 2002. Housing however remains a National and Provincial competency (concurrent competency). In practice, this means that municipalities identify suitable land for development and then apply to the Provincial government for funding for development. The municipality is responsible for the delivery of bulk services to the land, and the subsidies are used to then take services to each house and construction of the house by private developers or the communities themselves as such promoting the co-production of housing.

Some issues to highlight:

− In practice, it has become clear that delivery of municipal services, including housing, are a means in which political parties gain support and favour. There are many instances of development projects being visited by local political structures to check if all the people working on the site have a membership card of the relevant political party. This limits benefits flowing to citizens who are not supporters of the particular party, and are thereby either excluded, or forced to join the political party.
− Further, little, if any, steps are taken to ensure sustainability — poor design, no energy or water efficiency, etc. is the norm, as can be ascertained from the minimum standards guidelines.

Social housing, defined officially as a housing option for low-to-medium income persons that is provided by housing institutions and that excludes immediate individual ownership, is not considered in this evaluation report.

Charlton S. and Kihato, C. "Reaching the poor? An analysis of the influences on the evolution of South-Africa’s housing programme". In: Udesh (2006), 252-282. The paragraph in the above is mainly based on this article.
3.5. PROGRAMMES AND POLICIES THAT ARE RELEVANT FOR SLUMS

South Africa does not have specific laws on slums (with one exception) or programmes directed to slums only. Yet slum dwellers can benefit from housing policies, programmes and subsidies which give them access to basic services (see the above for the connection between housing and basic service delivery). Clearly, South African NGOs have played a major role in the elaboration of these programmes and have succeeded in using them to facilitate access of slum dwellers to housing. South Africa also has a land policy but the effects on the lives of slum dwellers are less evident.

3.5.1. WHAT ARE SLUMS AND HOW ARE SLUM DWELLERS ORGANISED?

Slums are defined in South Africa under the United Nations agency UN-HABITAT understanding: a slum is a run-down area of a city characterized by substandard housing and squalor and lacking in tenure security. Shack dwellers oppose the description of their communities as ‘slums’ arguing that this results in them being pathologised and then, often, subject to threats of evictions. Although their characteristics vary between geographic regions, slums are usually inhabited by the very poor or socially disadvantaged. Slum buildings vary from simple shacks to permanent and well-maintained structures. Most slums lack clean water, electricity, sanitation and other basic services.

Given that there has been little in the way of legislation directly aimed at slums, efforts are being made by government to do just this. The specific programmes are still new, with only KZN province having drafted a particular bill, the KwaZulu-Natal Elimination and Prevention of Re-Emergence of Slums Bill, 2006 which will be replicated in other provinces (according to different media sources). There are other plans by the national government such as the Department of Housing’s Comprehensive Plan for the

What's in a word?

Different people use different names - Slum, informal settlement, squatter camp, transit camp, township, …. A key reason why people live informally, is for access to local and localized work opportunities. Yet, when housing is provided by government, the new houses are generally located far away from where they currently live, so that the access to work, schools, etc. is dramatically limited, given transport costs, for example.

Some people are offended by the term “squatter” as they believe that people cannot be squatters in their own country, merely homeless. So, informal settlement is a more acceptable term. A slum is generally seen in the context of quality of life issues – so an informal settlement may well be a slum, but this could also apply to formal housing which is run down and not functioning very well. A township is an appellation generally applied to areas that are mainly populated by Black people, and are a hangover from the Apartheid past. A transit camp has two very different meanings – there is a transit camp used prior to the deportation of “undesirable aliens”; and there are temporary housing facilities used to house South Africans (usually if they have been moved from informal settlements) until new housing is available. Unfortunately, some of these temporary camps have become permanent.

19 Many academics have criticized UN-Habitat and the World Bank arguing that their ‘Cities Without Slums’ Campaign has led directly to a massive increase in forced evictions.
Creation of Sustainable Human Settlements: ‘Breaking New Ground’ (BNG), see further.

In contrast to the common ideas about slums, these communities are not disorganized, on the contrary. The table below provides an overview of existing structures in slums. In this evaluation, the focus was mainly on the housing/upgrading committees and to a lesser extent on savings groups, CBOs and groups related to SANCO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing structures in slums/informal settlements</th>
<th>Main characteristics</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Strong points</th>
<th>Weak points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings groups FEDUP and others</td>
<td>Groups working collectively to improve their lives</td>
<td>Generally the poor and workers</td>
<td>Civil cohesion, potentially powerful voices</td>
<td>Lack of access to resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockvel and burial societies</td>
<td>Informal groupings within society</td>
<td>Varied characteristics</td>
<td>Good community support system</td>
<td>Unlikely to take on issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political structures</td>
<td>Formal party structures</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Have a voice</td>
<td>Cannot speak out openly against party policy or actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward committees</td>
<td>Formal municipality structures</td>
<td>Formally elected representatives</td>
<td>Potentially a mechanism for delivery</td>
<td>Often dominated by selected political structures, thereby limiting delivery to certain sectors only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/upgrading committees</td>
<td>Often formal committees</td>
<td>Generally formally nominated representatives</td>
<td>Generally better skills than most, could be a catalyst for change</td>
<td>Tend to collapse after housing is finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church groups</td>
<td>Informal groupings</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Passionate and motivated</td>
<td>Variable levels of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Informal groupings</td>
<td>varying</td>
<td>Passionate and motivated</td>
<td>Often lacking resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups related to SANCO, South African National Civic Organisation (SANCO), ° 1993 and divided into regional and local branches</td>
<td>Generally formal groups, aligned with the ANC.</td>
<td>Local residents</td>
<td>National body</td>
<td>Seen to be voting fodder for the ANC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2. HOUSING PROGRAMMES AND SUBSIDIES

**The People’s Housing Process or PHP (1998)**– The PHP aims to support households who wish to

---

²⁰ Information for this paragraph is taken mainly from Charlton, S. and Kihato, C. In: Udesh (2006).
enhance their housing conditions by building or organizing the building of their own homes themselves. This process is a method of accessing government subsidies for housing (such as the Projects Linked, Project Linked Consolidation, Institutional, or Rural Subsidies) as well as technical and other forms of assistance in the house building process. The subsidies are channeled through the provinces and in general, NGOs are involved to provide services to the community (mobilization of the community, training and capacity building for leadership etc.). The PHP was a clear result of the lobby efforts of the South African Homeless People’s Federation (SAHPF) in alliance with the service NGO, People’s Dialogue (PDLS). This grassroots movement, operating from townships in major municipalities, sought to promote deals with the authorities for housing and services for the poor, by avoiding the common approach of protest and claim-making toward government. Rather, “its strategy was first to build power by organizing residents around collective assets and knowledge of their communities, and thereafter negotiating with the authorities from positions of strength”. The SAHPH collapsed in 2001 (and later on re-emerge as Federation of the Urban and Rural Poor, FEDUP, with a splinter group operating in Western Cape). PDLS, supported by Cordaid, was closed down in 2005 (after a couple of years of reorganising and limited performance). The strategy was however applied by other NGO’s within the context of the PHP as can be witnessed from the experiences of some of Cordaid’s partners.

A Government Housing Subsidy is a once off grant by Government to qualifying beneficiaries for housing purposes. The grant is not paid in cash to beneficiaries. The grant is either paid to a seller of a house, or in new developments, the grant is used to construct a house that complies with the minimum technical and environmental norms and standards, which is then transferred to the qualifying beneficiary. Applicants for the Housing Subsidy must satisfy the following qualifying criteria (with exceptions here and there):

- Married or with financial dependants: An applicant must be married or constantly be living together with any other person. A single person with proven financial dependants (such as children or family members) may also apply.
- Residents: An applicant must be a citizen of the Republic of South Africa, or be in the possession of a permanent resident permit.
- Competent to Contract: An applicant must be legally competent to contract (i.e. over 21 years of age, or married or divorced) and of sound mind.
- Monthly Household Income: An applicant's gross monthly household income must not exceed R3 500. Adequate proof of income must be submitted.
- Not yet benefited from Government Funding: An applicant or anyone else in the household must not have received previous housing benefits from the Government.
- First time property owner: An applicant may not own or has owned a house previously.

When talking about government housing subsidy in this report, the evaluators mainly refer to:

- the Project Linked Subsidy: this housing subsidy mechanism enables a qualifying household to access a complete residential unit, which is developed within an approved project linked housing
subsidy project for ownership by the beneficiary);

- the Institutional Subsidy: The Institutional Subsidy is available to qualifying institutions (for e.g. housing cooperatives) to enable them to create affordable housing stock for persons who qualify for housing subsidies. This housing subsidy mechanism provides capital for the construction of housing units in respect of qualifying beneficiaries. The subsidy is paid to approved institutions to provide subsidised housing on deed of sale, rental or rent to buy options. Institutions must also invest capital from its own resources in the projects.

2004: Breaking New Ground – www.housing.gov.za - In September 2004, the National Department of Housing launched its Breaking New Ground Strategy. While not clearly introducing any new policy direction, the document outlines a comprehensive plan for the ‘development of sustainable human settlements in the next five years’. It was stated that this policy would reduce the housing backlog. The concept of ‘sustainable human settlement’ is new and proves the influence of international organisations in South Africa’s housing policy, supported by local NGOs. The documents and speeches at that time also addressed the issue of informal settlements and more in particular the eradication of existing informal settlements and those that are formed in the future. Eradication is said to refer to the integration of these settlements into the broader urban fabric. “While this suggests the upgrading of settlements through providing services and tenure, it is also acknowledged (…) that this may mean relocation of residents to other areas” (Udesh (2006), 258).

The suggested strategies entailed funding of well-located land for low-income housing, paying for certain community facilities in new housing projects and supporting in situ upgrading of informal settlements. The policy however did not offer a “clear direction with respect to the difficult political issues of land ownership (see below), the land market and rights around property values (…). Although the programme strived for broader outcomes, key indicators of performance appear to remain largely quantitative, focused around numbers of housed produced and budgets spent”. (Udesh (2006), 259)

Current issues:

- A new concept, proposed by the Department of housing is named the Housing Development Agency (established by the Housing Development Agency Bill (23 of 2008)). The agency’s main tasks would be to develop, manage and coordinate the development of housing nationally. The theory behind the agency is that it would aid with minimizing red tape in the approval of developments by both government and the private sector which have been known to take as long as three years, before developers can lay the first brick. The main purpose is to address: the shortage of well-located land; the facilitation of the rapid development of sustainable human settlements by proactively improving (the much needed) inter-governmental relations across all three spheres of government in respect of ensuring that needed inputs are delivered; and the supply of much

---

22 Many people and organisations active in the housing sector were involved through a process of research and consultation (2002-03) that was intended to inform policy direction. The Housing Department established a research chief directorate to develop in-house research capacity; yet Breaking New Ground appeared confusing and disappointing. The link between research and the policy framework was weak which raises serious questions about the best strategy to feed research results into policy processes. Yet, the research provided empirical evidence that showed that the housing programme needed to concern itself with creating socially and economically integrated habitats.
needed project management capacity for government projects.

− Since the 2000 Grootboom\textsuperscript{23} constitutional ruling, a mobilization has developed around informal settlements. A significant jurisprudence has also emerged on the right to housing. These combined into a confident challenge of the KwaZulu-Natal slums act. If the government is determined to push ahead with its eradication agenda it will encounter strong resistance in the streets and in the courts.

− The migration of people from rural to urban areas and to the economic powerhouses in Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and the Western Cape also presents challenges as the number of people looking for housing increases. There is increasing demand for affordable rental stock, as many would already have houses in their home cities and provinces.

− Another challenge is that people that get government houses are selling them off and the department has, therefore, implemented initiatives to conduct occupancy audits to establish if the original beneficiaries of the houses still live in them. The laws prohibit that subsidy beneficiaries sell their house right on, but the practice goes on. The intent of a new law is to enable beneficiaries to benefit from their houses and to cultivate a sense of ownership, and not to use them for a quick increase in disposable income, and then leaving them homeless as before.

− Another area of serious concern is building materials inflation, where government has already indicated that it plans to get tough through competition policy. But it could also seek to combat the inflation of construction materials by using its buying power in a more concerted way.\textsuperscript{24}

3.5.3. LAND POLICY AND THE POOR

South Africa’s political history has resulted in the development of urban landscapes that are enormously socially and spatially inequitable; a further significant urban feature is the existence of a number of unipurpose nodes and settlements. Townships were essentially considered large dormitories which intentionally lacked any business or recreational activities. New legislation, regulation and policy had to be put in place to ensure that Apartheid cities were transformed into spaces of equity, integration and sustainability. This meant a significant change to the way land was thought about, regulated and managed.

There is a wide variety of acts dealing with land issues (Constitution, Development Facilitation Act from 1995, the Housing Act (1997), the Housing Code (2004), the Municipal Systems Act (2000), Land Use Management Bill (2006), each of which purports the noblest of intentions. A recent study (Ovens 2007)\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} For more information see www.escr-net.org/caselaw.

\textsuperscript{24} The BNG housing programme alone is by far the largest supplier of residential property in South Africa and, therefore, there is a considerable demand base for material supply. The Department’s affordable housing programmes alone provide about 260 000 dwelling units a year. Home enrolments by the National Home Builders Registration Council show that the delivery by the private sector is about 78 000 houses a year. PPC’s, one of SA’s major cement producers, projections for cement demand indicate that the BNG housing programme demands more cement than the Gautrain, and 2010 FIFA soccer World Cup, Airports Company South Africa and Department of Water Affairs and Forestry infrastructure projects combined. This is making affordable housing more expensive, and delivering potentially smaller and less human housing.

reports that the current land management systems are obstructive in providing the poor with access to land or supporting activities that effectively maintain or better the quality of life. Moreover, there is a lack of capacity within municipalities to actually cope with land management systems.

The broad approach by government on land is as follows (White Paper on South African Land Policy – 1997):

− Redistribution aims to provide the disadvantaged and the poor with access to land for residential and productive purposes. Its scope includes the urban and rural very poor, labour tenants, farm workers as well as new entrants to agriculture.
− Land Restitution covers cases of forced removals which took place after 1913. They are being dealt with by a Land Claims Court and Commission, established under the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994.
− Land tenure reform is being addressed through a review of present land policy, administration and legislation to improve the tenure security of all South Africans and to accommodate diverse forms of land tenure, including types of communal tenure.

Over the years, it has been clear that land re-distribution has been slow, and that regardless of how much money is made available for housing, there is no point in accessing this until land is available for development and use – hence, key NGO's in South Africa have opted for a “Land First” approach to their work.

In the meantime, the poor live in daily fear of losing their precarious foothold in South African cities. The cost and availability of well-located, suitable land for housing remains a key challenge. It is not in the interest of overcoming South Africa’s past inequalities to continue apartheid-era town planning. It’s vital that the poor are not left on the margins, but are integrated into society, near to work opportunities, schools and health and leisure facilities.

3.6. SOUTH AFRICAN AND INTERNATIONAL ACTORS

3.6.1. NON STATE SOUTH AFRICAN ACTORS

Below brief references are made to community based organisations and nonprofit service NGO’s

26 Focus here is not on research institutes or think tanks, such as Sustainability Institute, Urban Landmark see: http://www.urbanlandmark.org.za/who.html.
relevant for this evaluation.

Community based organisations - FEDUP or the Federation of the Urban and rural Poor is an important (but not sole) people-based and nation wide organisation that seeks to organise and fight for the rights of the poor. They do this by growing their membership; facilitating contacts between the poor and government; and by encouraging programmes such as savings groups. They are part of Slum/Shack Dwellers International (SDI) which supports organisations working with local communities on issues of slums and livelihoods. They meet weekly to discuss issues related to slums and offer assistance and a communications portal between authorities and slum dwellers. This evaluation does not cover FEDUP which is an ally of the Utshani Fund.

Non profit service and advocacy NGOs – Important to mention here is the Urban Sector Network, of which relevant organisations such as BESG, DAG, Afesis-Corplan and Planact were member. According to the evaluation executed by Sogge in 2007, “informal groupings of planners, architects, social scientists and activists began creating organisations in the mid-1980’s to serve emerging initiatives in townships and other low-income settlements.” The groups worked in alignment with the ANC-inspired movement for democracy and non-racialism and formed (by the late 1980’s) an informal association, the Urban Sector Network. In 1995 there were 8 affiliates but after three rounds of EC and Dutch support the network was dissolved in 2005. The central idea of Dutch support (formulated in 1999) was: to ‘develop a range of replicable models and programmes that offer quality choice, incorporate community development principles and are sustainable that will be promoted to improve the policy environment’. (Sogge, 2007). When looking at the delivery performance of the affiliates regarding material improvements, this evaluation shows that the affiliates fell short of the targets they set for themselves (best performance was in the ‘site and service interventions’). Taken as a whole at that time (2000-2002), South African NGO’s were thought to be engaged in no more than 3% of all housing delivery in South Africa. “Their effectiveness was thus found more commonly on terrains of innovation through research, policy proposals and pilot projects. As a network, the central office had to promote national debate but the ambitions were uneven and activities generally failed to meet affiliates’ expectations.” The network delivered a good governance indicators project, a community based maintenance and environmental management partnership (through BESG, with case studies for Eastern Cape, Western Cape and Gauteng Province that were not finalised due to the stop of the network) and the East London Housing Management Cooperative (Afesis-Corplan). One of the spin-offs of the USN is the Good Governance Learning Network.27

BESG – BESG (founding member of the USN) exists to support the poor and vulnerable to access resources and increasingly gain control over their lives and destinies, through the promotion of sustainable livelihoods and habitable environments, achieving basic socio-economic rights, and capacitating local government, with additional focus on smaller towns. Established in 1983, BESG grew out of the struggle to recognise the right of indigent families to live in urban areas. BESG became a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) in urban development, planning, and infrastructure and housing delivery. The approach aims to build social capital among those members of the society who are resource-poor, rather than simply be a service delivery agent.

---

27 see www.ggln.org.za
For Planact, DAG and Afesis-Corplan, see short descriptions in annex. It should be noted that these three NGOs are three of the five organisations (against 8) that remained in place after the closing of the network. In general, the number of NGOs active in the field of housing and sustainable settlements in South Africa are not that numerous (see also appreciation of the partnerportfolio of Cordaid, further).

3.6.2. INTERNATIONAL DONORS

Two streams of foreign funding began well before the change of government in 1994: Swedish Aid and EC Aid (which was decisive for starting the Urban Sector Network (see the above). According to the evaluation of Sogge in 2007, central government ministries were the channel of choice for most donors, led by the EC, though many adopted a multi-channel approach, allocating to central and to provincial and local government and to NGO’s. In terms of volume the EU and the USA were the largest donors. Multilateral agencies have usually played minor financial roles, but their influence over policy has been substantial. The priority to urban issues was modest (for e.g. 8% of all ODA between 1994-1998 went to housing). Projects in support of provincial and local government (mainly training and improved systems) were important targets of support by the USA, UK, the World Bank, Sweden and Norway.

When it comes to supporting civil society and civil society agenda in South Africa, the evaluation of Dutch Aid to South Africa (2007) concluded that the donor support has lead to the strong belief amongst many influential figures in government that “CSO’s ought to abandon or mute their role as articulators of citizen concerns in order to assist the government agenda”. South African researchers found this an explanation for the lack of progress in creating genuinely integrated cities and a robust autonomous civil society (Sogge (2007) 25). A nuanced judgement seems possible, for e.g. for Dutch aid when taking into account other than bilateral Dutch funds, such as the funds from Cordaid reaching out to CSO’s with a certain degree of autonomy. Also in this case a tension is apparent because all funders favorise alliances with government efforts, mainly at the local levels.
4 Evaluation of the Cordaid programme

The evaluation of the Cordaid programme was based on 5 questions:

− To what extent do slum dwellers have increased access (including use and affordability) to basic facilities such as refuse removal, water and energy through the interventions of partners?
− To what extent did slum dwellers develop a claim making power/capacity to ensure the sustainable and equitable development of their community thanks to the interventions of the partners?
− To what extent have slum dwellers been able to use their claim making power to change policies and local government planning/operations regarding access to basic facilities and thanks to the interventions of the partners?
− To what extent was the mix of partners effective and relevant in order to achieve the objectives of the programme?
− To what extent have the four core activities of Cordaid contributed to the effectiveness of the programme and the sustainability of its outcomes?

To answer the questions, the evaluators collected data according to the evaluation framework with judgement criteria and indicators which were based on Cordaid’s programme documents and monitoring protocol. The data helped to describe the findings and to identify explanatory factors. In second instance, the evaluators appreciated the findings along the DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Efficiency in particular was difficult to assess when looking at the aspect of cost-efficiency: the evaluators had little view on the actual costs and spendings from the partners. Therefore, the evaluators focused mainly on the choice of instruments: how did partners choose to intervene and how did they work towards results?

4.1. EVALUATION QUESTION 1

To what extent do slum dwellers have increased access (including use and affordability) to basic facilities such as refuse removal, water and energy through the interventions of partners?

Answer: 5/7 partners of Cordaid intervened directly in the field, working with the very poor and within an urban setting. DAG, Kuyasa Fund, Utshani Fund, Planact and Afesis-Corplan have developed such programmes between 2003 and 2007. They have indirectly addressed the issue of access to basic facilities through housing programmes for slum dwellers, through supporting communities living in shacks on transit camps or informal settlements in their claims to receive land (to a lesser extent) and basic temporary services or through offering adapted financial products to house/land-owners to upgrade their assets (Kuyasa Fund). Most relevant with regard to this evaluation are the interventions of
DAG, Planact and Afesis-Corplan; Kuyasa Fund is providing loans to people that already have a house or some structure on a piece of land (which in most cases comes with access to household sanitation, water and electricity and a service of waste collection provided by the municipality). Utshani Fund on the other hand has not been active/delivering housing programmes in the period of evaluation for reasons that were explained in the above.

The NGO partners are striving for habitable environments and not simple shelter. Yet, they also lobbied for temporary services in informal or temporary settlements. Although important, these services were inadequate to serve the whole community in an appropriate way (but this cannot be considered to be the responsibility of the NGOs).

It should be noted that the outreach of the (housing) programmes (for e.g. when taking into account the number of housing units and the beneficiaries/households indirectly affected) was limited as they were intended as ‘demonstration’ projects, demonstrating an alternative approach to housing delivery towards government (at local, provincial and national level)\(^{28}\). This ‘alternative’ resulted not only in bigger houses of better quality but also in the realization of different systems for water provision (and saving of water), water heating (solar panels), sanitation (pit or flush toilet) responding to the various needs and demands of the communities. The beneficiaries understand where the services are coming from and that there is a prize to pay. Many of them (esp. backyard dwellers) used to be dependent on people with access to water and electricity who had to be paid as well. Participation in savings groups was stimulated by the NGOs which ensured that beneficiaries would be able to carry the cost of home ownership in the form of rates and service charges.

4.1.1. DESCRIPTION PER JUDGEMENT CRITERIUM AND EXPLANATORY FACTORS

To be able to answer this question, the evaluators looked at the number of facilities in place, the presence of unintended exclusion mechanisms that might hamper access to the facilities, the sustainable management of the facilities (ecological, social, financial, institutional aspects) and the ownership.

- More facilities of good quality in each of the three domains at the disposal of slum dwellers and responding to their needs

It is not possible to provide a list of facilities (and their actual users) resulting as concrete outputs from the programmes per NGO/partner for the period 2003-2007. The reason is clear: the partners have not kept record of this and the outputs in the field of water, waste and energy were clearly not their main focus.

\(^{28}\) One could argue that this means that effectiveness and impact should only be assessed in terms of multiplication, scaling up, etc. and not in terms of direct delivery. Yet, the evaluators also looked at direct delivery, as this was requested by the ToR Cordaid drafted.
DAG, Planact and Afesis Corplan have been involved in housing programmes through supporting PHP schemes facilitating access to both individual housing subsidies (DAG in informal settlement upgrading mainly and PLANACT) and institutional subsidies (Afesis) to acquire ownership. Besides that, DAG and Planact have developed some separate small scale interventions for water provision and sanitation (permanent or temporary) and access to electricity; DAG mainly on household level benefiting a limited number of households and PLANACT at the level of community (with water tanks, standpipes, street lights, etc.). The output related to housing units is a fraction of the total roll-out of housing units in South Africa (200,000 to 200,600 units/year, see the above). In general the projects are rather small (maximum of 500 houses) depending on the size of communities that are involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 2003-2007</th>
<th>DAG</th>
<th>Planact</th>
<th>Afesis Corplan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units(^{29})</td>
<td>2,047 intervening in different communities (correct figure not known)</td>
<td>674 in one community (Vosloorus), no information about other building projects</td>
<td>186 in one area (Amalinda) with people from 3 different communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that putting in place facilities and ensuring their functioning and access was not the responsibility of the NGO partners. The facilities came with the housing projects and were the responsibility of the municipality; they were of good quality and the municipal service is ensured (site and service concept) and effectively delivered, according to most respondents in formal settlements: ‘We are served as in the suburbs’ was often heard. Beneficiaries from housing projects did not report major breakdowns or failures to the evaluation team. Visits to a transit camp and more in particular informal settlements (Zandspruit in Johannesburg and Duncan Village in East London) reveal that service delivery here by the municipality is far from adequate: (communal) facilities are not of the quality required, overused (VIP and flush toilets), difficult to maintain (because of limited access or slum dwellers throwing out waste and blocking sewage systems) and dangerous to use for women and children after sundown. Basic services in informal settlements are mostly not functional and people are not using them (safety issues, maintenance is not ensured, or service is not adapted see plastic bags in Zandspruit\(^{30}\)). In general, ‘temporary services’ are not up to standard, but their maintenance was not the responsibility of the NGO partners (who did not address the issue as such).

It should be noted that the delivery of housing units through these NGO programmes was always delayed and that the number of units delivered each year was always lower than the number planned (see further under explanatory factors).

---

\(^{29}\) The norm for the number of people living in each house is between 6 and 8 people.

\(^{30}\) A private contractor handed out plastic bags, these bags were not very solid. People had to keep their waste with them in the shack because collection of waste happened only once a week from a central collection points. Because of the low quality of the bags people did not want to keep the bags in their house and brought it to the collection point earlier or dumped the waste (interview with leadership Zandspruit Joint Steering Committee).
There are no implicit or unintended mechanisms that exclude certain beneficiaries from having access to or using the facilities

Access to basic facilities comes with the housing programmes. The criteria to have access are not set by the NGO partners, but by government or the beneficiaries (leadership). Although criteria to access seem reasonable, they created a lot of tension in some settlements, (for e.g. where a lot of foreigners live, where people did not comply with the savings criteria) that were very disruptive in certain cases (Amalinda and Zandspruit).

**DAG and its diversity approach: major steps forward**

DAG is aware of the many different exclusion mechanism that cut through community dynamics and that leave people (PLWH, single female headed households, ...) at the margins of their communities. In 2006 and 2007 DAG introduced a diversity process (stimulated by Cordaid) which aimed to shift organisational practice through working at the individual and organisational levels. A workshop was convened to explore staff members’ subjective experiences of inclusion and exclusion and to discuss this within the historical context of South Africa and A follow up workshop looked at inclusion and exclusion in the broader urban development context.

Observations were that both community based organisations and government often consciously exclude marginalised people. Most frequently, government does this through failing to provide opportunity for meaningful public participation in decision-making that directly affects people’s lives. CBOs on the other hand practice exclusion as they perceive that resources are scarce and that few people will have the opportunity to benefit; they therefore become competitive about gaining access arguing that some groups should have greater entitlement over others.

At a micro level leaders or members of a community often over-look the specific vulnerabilities of individual households and struggle to provide adequate opportunity for the inclusion of everyone.

DAG developed a discussion paper on the livelihoods strategies of the poor in Cape Town (replies to the questionnaire): “From the paper we came to understand that poor people have a multiplicity of strategies designed to enable them to cope with poverty. We understood that the strategies were complex, varied and not always ethical and that development projects need to be sensitive to them in order to improve household security. We also developed an understanding that the choice of location was very important to these strategies as it facilitated use of particular strategies by providing access to social networks, natural, physical and financial resources.

We then conducted sustainable livelihood (SL) analysis in Netreg and Freedom Park, two projects in their early phases of development to ensure that livelihoods strategies could be supported and not eroded by the development project. We adapted the CARE SL model which enabled us to develop an appreciation for the vulnerability of people in the communities we were partnering. We used a participatory approach involving residents in conceptualising the study, data collection and in analysing its outcomes. We then together looked at how the livelihoods strategies of everyone in the neighbourhood could be strengthened through the development in order to reduce vulnerability. In Freedom Park for e.g. the group identified gender-based violence as a problem and DAG worked with the leadership to consider how this could be addressed in the neighbourhood. A ‘support group’ was set up to focus on the issue and engagement with the local police station followed to ensure that safety in the neighbourhood improved for women and children and to ensure that perpetrators were arrested and charged.

This approach has not been implemented in every project however (social inclusion was not always an explicit goal),

31 Documented very well in the evaluation of SCC, Gunnarsson (2007)
and we have therefore not been rigorous about understanding the vulnerability of people in every community where we have partners and in ensuring the inclusion of all marginalised groups during the project’s implementation. We always try to address it indirectly, but recognise this is quite a limiting approach.

Initially our project partnership criteria was simply biased toward groups that were organised (even if weak) but we eventually realised that organised groups are relatively privileged and the more marginal people in a neighbourhood may therefore effectively be excluded, especially if the group only represents some residents in a community as was the historical trend for our partners. So since about 2003/4 we chose to give preference to groups that would benefit an entire neighbourhood instead of just small groups of residents or beneficiaries. Projects would be inclusive, resulting in benefits for everyone, even the most marginal people in the neighbourhood. DAG’s community partners are mostly led by women as woman’s quality of life is directly affected by the quality of housing and urban environment.”

DAG discusses the issue of HIV/AIDS with all its project partners and convened workshops to raise awareness about HIV/AIDS and de-stigmatise the matter. Condoms, condom dispensers and posters were also sourced and distributed to all community partners who were willing to have them. Although many partners remained concerned about facilitating access to condoms to young people; they viewed this as encouraging sexual activity.

All beneficiaries have to apply themselves for the subsidy (most of them are already registered on a waiting list, sometimes for over 10 years) or have to comply with the rules of the cooperative (case of Amalinda and Afesis Corplan: requirement to save up to 2070 ZAR by a certain date). Not all people qualify for a government subsidy (for e.g. people that previously owned a house, people under the age of 21, people that earn above 3500 ZAR/month and people that do not have a green bar coded ID). In general, the partners assist community members to apply for the government subsidy and to check out whether they applied or not and identify alternative opportunities. In the PHP processes a ‘Community Support centre’ is created (it is part of the PHP scheme) to deal with purchase and storage of building materials and payments to contractors. Sometimes this centre also sorted out individual questions of beneficiaries related to their application (for e.g. married women who live separate from their husbands but need his signature for the application) (for e.g. Freedom Park).

What did NGO partners do to influence on exclusion/inclusion?

-Afesis left it to the leadership of the cooperative to set criteria, keep a record of members and to disseminate information to members; baseline studies were not existing and the follow-up on the situation of individual members by the leadership was limited.

-Planact usually roughly documented the start situation in a community to choose its intervention strategy, but there was no systematic follow-up of the situation of beneficiaries. In general, NGO partners do not check to what extent information from the leadership has penetrated to all the beneficiaries. In one occasion Planact invested a lot of time and effort in one programme (Vosloorus): they organised mass meetings with steering committees (involving the leadership and government actors) in the housing programme and made sure that single women with dependends could be involved as contractors, ramps for handicapped) – as such community monitoring was the case. Planact demonstrated specific sensitivity to issues related to xenophobia: from Planact’s perspective, the inclusion of women was strongly urged but practical elements often made this difficult e.g. security etc.
The project in Zandspruit also included immigrants in being involved in the coordinating structures (Joint Committee) and accessing services.\(^\text{32}\)

-DAG evolved in the course of the years to a more sophisticated approach (see box) that is sensitive to exclusion.

To conclude, partners did not systematically analyze consequences of these criteria nor did they identify or map hidden exclusion mechanisms to be part of the housing programme (for e.g. people that moved in later and were not part of the ‘struggle’ for land were often refused by the community) or to participate in the execution of the program (for e.g. as contractor or simply receiving information through leadership), although they are aware of possible negative aspects.

Once the involvement with a community ends, the partners does not keep record of the access to basic facilities: “Since we are not the ones providing the infrastructure, it is up to government to determine whether there is any systematic problem in all community members being able to access the services”. (interview Planact)

- **The facilities are managed in a sustainable way**

The facilities in the projects that the evaluators have seen are managed by the households themselves (facilities in the house or on the plot) or by the government. The institutional framework for delivering services seems to work in formal and upgraded settlements, but not in informal settlements. There is a problem with (deliberate) non performance in informal settlements from the side of government (to discourage further growth of the settlement or the establishment of new settlements) and with contracting out of certain services (in relation to waste collection, maintenance of communal toilets).\(^\text{33}\) In some cases, the municipality did not yet send out bills for water for some years (Freedom Park, Vosloorus). Beneficiaries are not prepared to pay these arrears that might run up high.

Energy, waste and water efficiency (to minimize demand and costs for the users) is not really an issue in most housing programmes. The NGO partners have tried to make a difference: ‘workshopping’ beneficiaries on how to save water and energy (DAG), introducing environment friendly elements in construction and management of the site (DAG, Planact and Afesis) with mixed results. In general, the principles of eco-friendly approaches were not integrated in the approach.

| **Integration of environmental friendly techniques: some simple ideas** |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------|
| Technique | Impact | Cost |
| Orientation | High – reduces energy costs for heating and cooling | Zero |

\(^\text{32}\) A Planact research project that was focused on xenophobia in the settlement was geared toward helping the community to understand and work through a very violent and divisive period in the community’s history. The study also highlighted the underlying causes of the violence and how lack of good governance on the part of local government and the police have fueled the crisis.

\(^\text{33}\) It should be noted however that the working conditions of municipal personal or contractors serving slums are sometimes far from workable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Overhangs</strong></th>
<th>High – reduces energy costs for heating and cooling</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water saving devices – showerheads and aerators</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces water costs</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greywater systems</strong></td>
<td>High - Reduces water wastage (used for flushing toilets for example) and improving food production</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On site sanitation management</strong></td>
<td>High - Reduces sewage disposal costs and infrastructure – improves local ability to re-integrate nutrients and methane gas energy</td>
<td>Medium – needs to be compared to infrastructure costs (existing) for a meaningful comparison to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solar powered geyser</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces energy bill by around 50%</td>
<td>Medium to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solar powered lights</strong></td>
<td>High – improves ability to study, work and live at lower daily cost</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vermicomposting</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces volume of solid waste by approximately 50%; increases food quality, nutrition, and volume in home food production</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceiling insulation</strong></td>
<td>High – improves comfort in all weather, and reduces heating and cooling bills</td>
<td>Low to medium, depending on materials used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling (materials separation at home)</strong></td>
<td>High - Reduces volume and toxicity of waste; increases local economic opportunity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homemade cleaning materials</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces household exposure to toxic chemicals; reduces costs of having a hygienic home</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the money available for housing, and the steep rates poor people pay for water and energy, an investment in eco-friendly technology would both reduce the running costs of their households, as well as improve their health and quality of life. The evaluators note that one of the partners, the SI was very much involved in developing models for sustainable livelihood which included some of these techniques. Unfortunately, the SI did not succeed in implementing its models (though envisaged in their programma), nor did any cross-fertilisation with the other partners happened.

Looking from the side of the beneficiaries the model of access to electricity could do with some improvement. For e.g. in most houses pre-paid electricity meters were installed: rates in this scheme are usually higher than with subscriptions.

- **The beneficiaries acknowledge and demonstrate joint ownership over/responsibility towards the facilities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Overhangs</strong></th>
<th>High – reduces energy costs for heating and cooling</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water saving devices – showerheads and aerators</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces water costs</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greywater systems</strong></td>
<td>High - Reduces water wastage (used for flushing toilets for example) and improving food production</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On site sanitation management</strong></td>
<td>High - Reduces sewage disposal costs and infrastructure – improves local ability to re-integrate nutrients and methane gas energy</td>
<td>Medium – needs to be compared to infrastructure costs (existing) for a meaningful comparison to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solar powered geyser</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces energy bill by around 50%</td>
<td>Medium to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solar powered lights</strong></td>
<td>High – improves ability to study, work and live at lower daily cost</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vermicomposting</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces volume of solid waste by approximately 50%; increases food quality, nutrition, and volume in home food production</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceiling insulation</strong></td>
<td>High – improves comfort in all weather, and reduces heating and cooling bills</td>
<td>Low to medium, depending on materials used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling (materials separation at home)</strong></td>
<td>High - Reduces volume and toxicity of waste; increases local economic opportunity</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homemade cleaning materials</strong></td>
<td>High – reduces household exposure to toxic chemicals; reduces costs of having a hygienic home</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People do make the link with what they get, how they got it and who is responsible for what. In case of failing service delivery by the municipality, esp. in informal settlements people will avoid stepping in to take over for e.g. when maintenance of VIP toilets is not done (overused, not enough), when skips with waste are not collected. There is some deliberate vandalism but mainly as a consequence of sheer human pressure. The NGO partners did explain the role of municipalities in service delivery (through workshops and meetings in which government representatives are sometimes present) and through the set-up of steering committees in housing programmes (interaction with local government for the leadership of communities). The assistance for communities in informal settlements is less structured, for e.g. in Zandspruit (Planact): “The City was responsible for providing this information and managing facilities. The Joint Committee (with representatives of smaller CBO’s and community groups) was established with the role of lobbying for services and needs identified, and representing the community’s interests, as well as monitoring provision and maintenance of facilities. Planact’s role was to support lobbying for services and social facilitation to organise the community, and to support community members to be involved in planning processes of the city for further land acquisition and upgrading.”

− **Explanatory factors -** What explains these findings?

---

Hangberg: this is our home and we are going to stay here

The Hangberg case is interesting because it concerns a community that recently started working with DAG. This is a site with a strong and shared history (former fishermen): people consider this to be their home and they want to stay on this land. Most of the people have lived here for 40 years and consider themselves to be a community, although they were never formally recognised by the (local) government for upgrading or development.

Community leaders in Hangberg approached DAG after having several meetings with the City of Cape Town about upgrading their settlement. They wanted DAG’s support in getting the City to make an upgrade. In the initial workshops with community members the immediate need was to have basic services improved. They also expressed a desire for security from threat of eviction and so wanted some kind of improved tenure arrangement in the longer-term. The leaders only recently concluded their analysis of the site (with the help of an air picture of their area): they have a lot of details about the different blocks, the families living here and families living informally in other spots of the area. The leaders talked to the evaluators about ‘in situ upgrading’ as if this was their everyday business. Other people have noticed some change on the site and are now ‘invading’ it, hoping to be part of the upgrading. They are meeting strong resistance by the community leaders.

Hangberg is an informal settlement. 302 families (around 2,000 people) are living here, sometimes 2 to 3 families live in one house and the houses are of different quality (a Wendy, shack, …). Almost half of the people are employed so not all of them will be entitled to receiving a housing subsidy for the in situ upgrading.

Before involvement of DAG, local government had put in some basic facilities. Currently, more than 60% of the houses have access to communal toilets (35 in total). The idea was to have more toilets but while there was government money for the materials, the labour money did not come with it (as it was not planned for by the government). The evaluators could see the solutions that people found to improve their access to services. Some of the families have made their own piping and connected their place to the communal standpipes, or are taking water from the flats (at the bottom of the mountain). Some houses have pre paid electricity meters and through this, they connect their neighbours. There is no real sewage system (only for 20 toilets) and no storm drainage which gives serious problems when there is heavy rainfall. There is some waste collection service guaranteed by the municipality.
Water, sanitation and electricity is a simple supply issue in most housing programmes: there is a clear framework and maintenance is ensured. When a housing programme is approved, the municipality has to service the site with bulk infrastructure for water and sanitation and with roads. The main problem is in the planning (and this explains the delays in the projects): housing applications go through the province (who receives money for housing subsidies from the state)\textsuperscript{34}, servicing the sites is the responsibility for the municipalities who have to plan and budget for it. On each level there are blockages: delays in approval of subsidy application, transfer of title deeds, non alignment of planning processes, etc.

There is reluctance for service provision in informal settlements from the side of government. For e.g. in the programmes/interventions of DAG, the city council required that people are legal occupiers of land before they want to install some services. In these cases, DAG had to assist communities first to assert their rights as legal occupiers.

People involved in housing programmes have been workshopped at lot (with some difference in intensity and time investment between the different programmes and main focus on leadership) – but sometimes processes were aborted or support was scaled down to a minimum in the course of the years; NGO partners sometimes had to pull out of settlements because of capacity constraints (for e.g. in dealing with conflictuous Zandspruit) or shortage of funds (for e.g. Afesis which was confronted with endless delays caused by conflict within the community and court cases).

\textbf{4.1.2. APPRECIATION ALONG EVALUATION CRITERIA}

\textit{Relevance} - Where does one start? The need is very high, delivery of RDP houses is quite log and the backlog is enormous (see context). The PHP provided a specific mechanism for co-production of housing between beneficiaries and local government. This is where the NGOs come in. NGOs are sometimes requested by government to step in to mobilise communities and support them in PHP processes. The NGOs are good ‘go in between’s: they are able to unpack the language of professionals (both from government and builders/architects) involved in housing programmes.

DAG, Planact and Afesis-Corplan mainly intervened in housing programmes to demonstrate an alternative approach which departed from a concept of sustainable settlements. This idea became more prominent in Breaking New Ground (inspired by the NGO input) which supports the relevance of the interventions, but the reality is that government is still driven by numbers and that problems in informal settlements are lagging on (putting in some services is just not a solution, not even a temporary one). Therefore, NGO partners want to change tactics: they are evolving to a land first approach. Without land, the entire process of delivering housing is slower and more cumbersome – so frustration and delays are the norm. If land were to be easily made available, it is the belief of the sector that delivery could be both

\textsuperscript{34} A Cordaid Report of a trip to Johannesburg November 2007 elaborates on the power of provinces in this respect: “Basically, the South African Constitution leaves it up to the provincial authorities to carry out policies decided upon at national level. This de facto power granted to provincial authorities is prone to be abused when the latter feel threatened (or are criticised) by the urban poor federations and their representatives, such as UP.
Using housing programmes as a means to an end (sustainable settlements) is a good choice: Community members generally lose interest in community and development projects if these fail to provide adequate housing and infrastructure. The appreciation from beneficiaries of housing programmes is high (see MSCs). A high appreciation seems to be related to the extent to which beneficiaries have been involved in the design of building plans and sometimes the layout of the site.

**Efficiency** – In general, the NGO partners are not organised to keep record of numbers of housing/facilities en to report on the technicity/technical aspects of their projects. NGO partners have no view on the real cost of facilities and/or are not involved in the calculation of costs per unit/facility.

The process of housing (getting the site serviced and building the houses) could take very long, especially if the land was not yet secured (see cases: Freedom Park) and the reason for this is mainly that government processes are not aligned. The NGO partners did not get involve in provision of up front financing to speed up the process (except for UF that got into serious trouble, because the province did not refund them). Only in one case, the municipality was prepared to ensure up front financing (Vosloorus) until the payment schemes were changed by the province with again delays as a consequence.

---

35 It was outside the scope of this evaluation to assess the relevance of this new tactics.
36 There is a list of standard costs provided by the government. The NGOs did not calculate in detail costs of facilities in the settlements they worked in.
37 Some difference between planned and build houses can also be explained by other factors: people that applied for a housing subsidy disappeared or died or were disqualified by the province because they did not meet the criteria.
**Lettie (Netreg), the one who becomes a house owner** - This story of Lettie stands for all the beneficiaries that have been able to receive a ‘real’ home and that have become house owners. These are her words: “My name is Liddy. I guess the greatest significance for me. I was so pregnant by the time we were finishing this whole thing here. And I came and I watched how they build my house. You know. And my stomach is growing. And I said to myself. At least before the baby comes, I want this house to be done. Because I had 2 children and both of them were staying in a shack like a Wendy house, and they grew up there, and it was so small, and they didn’t have enough place for them to play. I had a 2-room Wendy house, and the one room was the kitchen, the bedroom, the sitting room, and the dining room, all in one. And we had to share and stuff like that. And it wasn’t nice, but I tried to make it the best. And they finished my house, and the baby was born after that, and there was no water in the house. And we had to carry buckets and buckets of water to wash the baby, to wash me, and to get everything done. It was a whole process. But I now have a great sense of accomplishment. I’m a homeowner. I can go to my house, lock my door, unlock my door. It feels so great from where I came, to where we are now. And DAG has played a major role in giving us tools, how to save water, how to save electricity, how to be a homeowner. We had workshops how to become a homeowner and how to take care of your house. This was before we had the houses. And this played a major role because when we got the houses, we could say: ‘Hey! Switch off the lights now. We don’t need electricity. Switch off the TV.’ Because we now wanted to be responsible. It’s nice. It’s nice being a homeowner. And having your children sit in their room, you know? ‘Go to your room, and don’t come out until you know what you’ve done.’ It’s nice man. Before, if you say: ‘Go to your room, [the child has to] sit next to you, you know? There is no other room. And maybe you want to watch TV, but you said: ‘No TV!’ So, you have to turn the TV to one side and keep the volume down. But now you can say: ‘Go to your room and close the door.’ They are more disciplined because they know there are house rules, there are ground rules. My boys even made up house rules: We can’t swear; we must love each other; always be there for each other. They also know, we are living in a house! I think it’s nice, it’s nice having a house.”

Lettie made it clear to the evaluators that the workshops on ‘how to be a house owner’ were very important. Another lesson was to save money: we have to ‘save, save, save’, Lettie said. Lettie now sees children headed households (children whose parents recently died and are now living by themselves in the house) with very little understanding of the concept ‘house owner’; they will need more support to learn how to take care of the houses and not continue to live like in a shack, as many children know no other form of dwelling than a shack. As leaders, Lettie explained ‘we are learning to persevere, to be patient -like the people from DAG-and to be tolerant because all households are different’. Lettie had been on the waiting list for 12 years and she knows that the process of community building might take another 10 years. ‘We are at the start, we still have to sort out community issues from our side and we still need to set-up our management and operational structures”. Lettie has all relevant phone number from the municipality in her cell (‘they will come after three calls’). She is now taking a course to help people with aids in the community. To conclude in her words: ‘I am a process, I make the lives of my children and my neighbours interesting’.

NGO partners tried not to take on government roles which is important: their choice is to support communities to get from government what government should deliver. There are however tensions, sometimes they were forced into government tasks and in managing of building projects, but their capacity to this end is limited. The NGO partners did not want to get involved in site management but they developed schemes that allowed beneficiaries to acquire building skills and to be employed as contractors during the housing programme (with specific attention to women). This proved to be very workable and was never indicated as cause for delays.

We note a difference between partners when it comes to the housing products; there are very different results even with the same partner: for e.g. DAG succeeded in delivering bigger houses in Freedom Park and in Netreg (42 M squared) with the same amount of subsidy than for example the houses in Amalinda (42 M squared as well but no ceiling nor plastering). There are two explanatory factors: contractor and labour margin were very small because of self-build in Freedom Park and each community created its own potential (for e.g. the community in Amalinda finally choose to work with private contractors, so no self-build). It should be noted that some partners were able to throw in
extra money from funders: US AID for the eco elements on the houses owned by the Eco Housing Cooperative in Amalinda (Afesis) and The Mellon Housing Initiative, charity which provided top up funding for Netreg and Freedom Park (for e.g. solar heaters) (DAG).

**Effectiveness** - the total of housing provided through the partners was quite low but a high number was never the ambition. The number could have been higher though if Utshani Fund would have been functional in the period of review (and if they would have been able to finish the projects they started earlier). The project of Afesis is not yet finalised. The houses are of good quality and according to government standards (and sometimes even more).

For the majority of the houses build, the NGO partners were able to secure government subsidies in majority for single female headed households. Immediate effect for the beneficiaries of the housing programmes is ‘stability and privacy’ (see also overview of MSCs) and improvement in social cohesion although the latter is still fragile (see also under evaluation question 2).38 The evaluator note that several respondents (projects of DAG and Planact) stated that it is important to be open to other people which clearly is a result of the sensitivity of these NGO partners to exclusion and xenophobia. The NGO interventions have created a new type of ‘house/home owner’, which can be clearly illustrated by the MSC of Lettie in Netreg (see the above).

When looking at the aim of realising sustainable settlements, the evaluators note that more could have been done in the field of socio-economic analysis and integrating training in building skills in a more comprehensive approach to local economic development: some people earned a little bit of money during the building stages but many of them are back to where they started when looking at their access to remunerated jobs.

**Impact** – Having land and a house (an ‘asset’) is very important in the South African housing policy. Visits to beneficiaries from Kuyasa fund confirm that once people have land and a house, they invest in it, start saving and they keep on improving their houses while reaching out to neighbours (strengthening social fabric).

All in all, the impact of the NGO interventions is limited: their aim was to demonstrate alternatives to the housing processes managed by government through private contractors but their approach remained an alternative one: it was recognized as an option by government but not mainstreamed in the main housing programmes. The NGO partners are aware of their weak performance in this respect (see report of feedback workshop) and blame it on their way of interacting ‘nicely’ with government. This typical consensual approach is related to the ‘pacted’ nature of the South African transition: all are concerned with finding a solution for the pressing needs, recognising the need for operational pragmatism to achieve impact (Udesh (2006), 274). NGOs that do not longer follow this path, such as UF find it very hard to get things done from government.39 As such the demonstration projects remain

---

38 Clearly there were also some effects on health and well being although not mentioned by the beneficiaries. This conclusion is based on some research in Freedom park. There is proof of improvement based on a health risk assessment made at the request of Mary Simons from the Department of Sociology at the University of Cape Town before the upgrading of the informal settlement took place. The report (Haffejee, Farhaad and Sanders, David (2001): A Report on Health Conditions - With Specific Reference to the Effects of the Non-Provision of Water and Sanitation - at Freedom Park, Tafelsig, Mitchells Plain) was prepared for the Legal Resources Centre by the Public Health Programme, University of the Western Cape.

islands of success in splendid isolation, a statement which was the result of the discussion between the partners during the feedback workshop at the end of the field mission. The challenge to integrate the alternative approach in all housing interventions and to apply it on a larger scale is far from realised.

The evaluators could notice some impact on local level though:

- Ekhurleni Municipality (Planact) has changed its way of interacting with beneficiaries. Together with Vosloorus they started 10 other PHP processes. In 2005 they decided to hand over all housing construction processes to the province (because of the problems they had with funding flows) and the remaining PHP process were converted into so called ‘community build up projects’, which is based on PHP but is limited to the involvement of community workers through experienced contractors. The municipality respondent confirms that PHP projects deliver more quality (process and outcome) but they are seen as too slow.

- DAG had some impact on the way the province of Western-Cape is working: the province used to ignore both the importance of community preparation beyond ‘mobilisation’ (which was in some cases limited to informing the people when they had to leave the shack to go to a transit camp40) and the importance of having good quality temporary services. Respondents from the Province of Western Cape acknowledge that DAG made them much more aware of problems facing beneficiaries in temporary settlements which means they integrate temporary services in their projects (which was not always the case in the past).

- During the feedback workshop, Kuyasa noted that the recipe of the PHP has been passed on in the townships (and informal settlements at their borders) and communities were looking for opportunities to apply the same approach.

- Through its project introducing the model of cooperatives, Afesis-Corplan contributed to the inclusion of the ‘Co-operative Housing’ as an alternative type of housing type within the Social Housing Policy. Same applies to the influence on the national Department of Trade & Industry policy which (now) recognizes and includes housing as a type of co-operative amongst the other types of cooperatives it has listed. (comment during the feedback workshop).

**Sustainability** – All stakeholders and the NGO partners are under high pressure to accommodate people. Therefore, interventions in informal settlements by NGO partners do not always align with the requirements of sustainable urban planning. The effects are negative sprawling, confirmation and even expansion of apartheid spatial patterns.

Especially when it comes to community building, the NGO partners have made a difference for a smaller group of people (the settlements they have been working in), see also evaluation question 2. DAG, Kuyasa Fund (and Planact) are also aware of the importance of addressing the issue of HIV/AIDS in their programmes: they are confronted with house owners that die leaving their children behind in the house without the skills of being a house owner.

40 In one case, DAG was initially involved in such a project but later on pulled out. DAG passed on all information to the Legal Resource Centre to enable them to advocate for the rights of beneficiaries.
4.2. EVALUATION QUESTION 2

To what extent did slum dwellers develop a claim making power/capacity to ensure the sustainable and equitable development of their community thanks to the interventions of the partners?

This question is about slum dwellers and their communities getting organised, analyzing their own needs and articulating them, understanding the framework in which they have to engage and building skills. The NGO partners that worked with communities in this respect are DAG, Planact and Afesis (or 3/7 partners).41

These NGO partners did not only engage with informal settlement communities through housing projects, but also with other types of groups/CBOs through civic education (Planact), development of local governance monitoring tools (Afesis), organizational development and support (DAG).42 These initiatives were not studied during the field mission, which was focused on the access to basic services.

Answer to the question: the NGO partners supported several communities in developing claiming capacity to get housing and/or services delivered (besides other topics). Social inclusion was addressed indirectly (see also evaluation question 1): in total at least 31 communities (total number of beneficiaries cannot be stated with certainty, replies to questionnaire did not clarify) through workshops, leadership trainings, facilitation of steering committee meetings, inter community events etc. The NGO partners promoted the twofold strategy

- that being engaged in a constructive manner with government is the way to go (although frustration can be very high when government does not deliver, see Zandspruit but also Amalinda and St-Lukes, loosing trust) and

- that collective action (for e.g. to articulate grievances, to plan a site and/or build the houses etc.) is necessary to get something done and in the long run, to create sustainable settlements.

The NGO partners succeeded in setting up schemes for cooperation between slum dwellers in the housing programmes working with different types of existing groups, organizing them in a more formal way (through committees) and supporting their functioning and their effort to realize tangible results. To extend this effect beyond the housing programme (or other concrete outputs) and to state that people are more oriented to community development, is less evident to demonstrate (emerging signs in Freedom Park and Vosloorus). Different cases lead the evaluation team to suggest however that there are signs of new engagement within the community emerging (mainly from being capacitated to help

41 As already mentioned, the UF was not active in this period. UF as such was also also not involved in building claiming power; they left this to their allies CORC and FEDUP. It is true to say that the model that these allies developed to build claiming power was largely 'copied' by the other partners (see also the context description). Kuyasa Fund as such was not directly involved in building claiming capacity of communities.

42 Providing organisational development (OD) support would include assisting the CBO to reflect on its practice and improve its skills in forward planning, negotiation, communication, financial management, conflict management, lobbying, meeting procedure etc. Improving their analysis of the broader socio-political context in which their organisation operates involves information sharing and education about the country's constitution, legislation, the legislative process, power, economics and politics. DAG provides ongoing OD support and information dissemination in meetings and workshops with the CBO.
yourself) even when the structures that were put in place (like joint committees, housing committees, community support centres, …) did not last after the houses were finished or are difficult to maintain as intended.

Leaders of community (those that were involved to co-manage the housing programmes in their community) gained a lot of knowledge and insight in dealing with the community and with government, not only through the leadership training but also through their participation in inter-community exchanges which broadened their view and gave them better access to information (see MSC and additional interviews with leadership during the evaluation mission). They became ‘active citizens’ sometimes surprising themselves and even if they feel a bit tired of pulling the community members to support the collective: they feel responsible to act, they feel capacitated to act and they feel connected to others, being very much aware that there are still people in great(er) need out there. Other community members were build practical skills (for e.g. as contractor, as builder, as support staff, managing small funds through the establishment grant which is part of the PHP policy/scheme). The housing programmes were build on the community leadership model and did not propagate a simple management model. Consequently, the experience did not necessarily strengthen the newly established structures or the whole of the community but it certainly opened new windows of opportunity and affected small and intimate circles (of family, neighbours and friends) with new ideas for initiative within the community. Both in Vosloorus, Amalinda and in Freedom Park community members were stimulated to integrate other projects in the housing programme, such as a playground and community centre (Freedom Park), community garden (Amalinda, Ecohousing cooperative and Vosloorus), homebased care project (Vosloorus) with mixed results.

It should be noted that working in the communities for the housing programmes is often bypassing ward committees and ward councilors which raises questions about the sustainability of efforts to engage for interaction between government and citizens. NGO partners have worked with wards (in other programmes focused on training) to strengthen their capacity (Planact, DAG and Afesis), but an integration of ward capacity building and community capacity building was clearly less evident, except for one case (Vosloorus where there was already a stable socially cohesive community).

4.2.1. DESCRIPTION PER JUDGEMENT CRITERION AND EXPLANATORY FACTORS

− **Beneficiaries involved in the projects are better able to identify their needs for community development and to bring these to the attention of competent bodies**

---

43 Active citizenship: the evaluator uses a concept that was developed within an EU funded project (see www.etgace.be) and which identified three important elements that can lead to active citizenship: feel responsible to act, feel able to act and feel connected to others.

44 The evaluators did not identify a clear reason for this, although many beneficiaries clearly stated they did not trust the ward system or its affiliates when it came to the development of the community. These beneficiaries thought of the wards as political instruments and not as instruments for local development and participation.
**Who are the beneficiaries?** - The beneficiaries in the projects were involved through their ‘community’ or group. The NGO partners did not work with individuals, or very soon moved away from this approach (DAG), and worked with groups that represented people living in the settlement. The settlements as such sometimes displayed very distinct living conditions and needs.

A variety of groups displaying various degrees of organization and formalization and various levels of social cohesion were thus focus of the interventions of the NGO partners. Clearly, the NGO partners embark on processes of more than 5 years (up to 10 years and longer). During the field mission this evaluation mission came across:

- savings groups from three different communities that were approached by Afesis in 1999 and agreed to form a housing management cooperative (°1999) with Afesis’ support. In this case (the Amalinda project), the beneficiaries came from different areas and built houses through 9 separate housing cooperatives on a green field in 2004.
- a CBO in Duncan Village (East London) that has gathered a number of people in 2007 that want to focus on advocacy for water and sanitation. The group is supported by the local branch of SANCO and was directed to Afesis for support in 2007.
- the Netreg Housing Committee (°1986) whose members were people living in overcrowded public rental housing and backyards in the area. They identified a piece of land in the area that allowed them to stay close to their social network and work opportunities. They started working with DAG in 1996 (at the request of municipality). In 2006 houses were completed.
- The future beneficiaries of Wallacedene, which were selected by the government at that time to move to a new settlement. Government asked DAG to come in to mobilize the people into a group in order to facilitate the housing project. DAG finished its interventions in 2006 (houses were done).
- The community of Vosloorus that successfully lobbied for land (before 2000). Local government invited Planact to step in the PHP building project and to mobilize and support the community.
- Different community groups living on a large settlement comprised of a transit camp and an informal settlement with more than 10,000 people living here (Zandspruit). The ward councilors invited Planact to come in and to create a joint committee preparing for interaction and negotiation with government (over basic services).
- Groups in the ward of Orlando (Soweto) consisting of: CBO’s, thematic NGOs, small businesses, different political parties that want to sit around the table with government to discuss future plans (supported by Planact at the request of the City of Johannesburg).
- A community in Hangberg living in an informal settlement that grew in the 90’s after the block of apartments got too small for the families and their children and people started erecting shacks behind the block. They were ‘discovered’ by the mayor in election time and choose DAG to assist them in in situ upgrading.
- The Freedom Park Development Association: in 1998, a group built shacks on local government land destined for a school (the school was never built) and they demonstrated their determination to stay by

---

45 Utshani Fund also tends to work with savings groups that are members of FEDUP, but is not involved in community building. UF has an MOU with the Federation of Rural and Urban Poor (FEDUP) and works for them on a request basis. They manage building projects. Community facilitation in these projects is done by another organisation, CORC which is not part of the partner portfolio of Cordaid. UF has no MOU with CORC but the three organisations meet each other regularly in an alliance. Since UF has not been involved in delivery, the evaluation team was not able to assess the effects and impact of community facilitation.

46 NGO partners have worked with different types of partners. This list is not exhaustive.

47 Wallacedene is the home of a significant milestone legal challenge in South Africa, the Grootboom court case and judgement which affirmed the rights of citizens and the duties of government regarding housing.
resisting eviction from the government. The group was loosely organised before DAG came in (in 2000). In 2005 the area got serviced and in 2006 the first structures were built. The committee as it is now was created through the assistance of DAG.

**Getting organised** - The interventions of the NGO partners aimed at setting up more formal structures (more in particular in the case of housing programmes to allow beneficiaries to negotiate with government) that are answerable to the whole of the community. This means:
- registration of organization (if needed),
- organizing election of committee members,
- identification of community/cooperative members (counting of households, livelihoods analysis in the case of DAG),
- organization of meetings,
- establishment of support structures/site offices,
- establishing smaller groups (per theme or per area/block in the settlement),
- linking up groups to networks or umbrella organizations etc.

Through the whole process, community members collectively identified needs and were supported in identifying the correct counterparts in government (sometimes with main focus on province, where the housing subsidies are coming from) and articulating their needs. Experience shows that government was not always responsive, promised actions were blocked for several reasons or local government was not at all cooperative (see case of Afesis and the Amalinda housing project).

After being mobilized and ‘workshopped’, the community groups do no longer just accept what government is proposing them as a housing solution (e.g. Freedom Park and Hangberg) and they want to challenge municipality to tell them what their plans are (see CBO in Duncan village and NGO in

---

**Patricia (Freedom Park), the one who got interested in community affairs**

This is the story of Patricia, vice chair of Freedom Park. Her story illustrates how a (second) chance can change the lives of people and make them feel responsible, not only for their house, but also for the community. Patricia did not qualify for a housing subsidy (according to the government criteria), she was supported by DAG to become part of a saving scheme to apply for a mortgage loan.

These are her words: “I’m Patricia Christians, the vice chair now of Freedom Park. I’m very grateful to, I’m very grateful to be a part of this project for having a second chance of getting a house. There are many people outside of Freedom Park that don’t have this chance. I have no stress about paying my bond because the payment was a decision that came from me. The loan was interest free. So I pay my bond, and no stress, no interest. Previously I had a house until my husband lost his job. So we moved from room to room because we couldn’t afford a bank house again. No one would give us a loan. We were, like, blacklisted. And all because we moved to a shack here in Freedom Park, and struggled with the people here, that I was offered this loan and got another chance. I can say it’s a real second chance, and I will never slip this chance through my fingers by not paying my house. Because it’s not that it’s a lot of money that you have to pay, and I can afford it. Each beneficiary here in Freedom Park that had a house before, had to join a savings group to qualify for the loan. I pay R300 per month. I won’t mess up my second chance!”

Patricia told the evaluators that she was never committed to community work before: ‘I thought to myself, when my house is finished, I do not longer want anything to do with is, but then I saw there is other stuff to do and there are still many other people living in difficult conditions’. So Patricia continues, even if her husband and children do not understand this and complain that she goes out a lot. As a member of the committee she feels committee members in Freedom Park sometimes feel tired and just want to enjoy their new house, but ‘we must steer and lead, we do not have a choice’.

---
Orlando). For e.g. the Freedom Park committee was offered a proposal for the housing which they tended to accept. But DAG told them they could refuse and propose their own ideas, so they did and only then: (their own words) “the negotiation started”. They told government they wanted a PHP on their site⁴⁸: “we went to the city and we interviewed our town planner, we designed our own houses, we even interviewed engineers. We have a meetings with the top guys every second week and the environmental office visits us every week”.⁴⁹ The leadership of Hangberg states: “we will take it into the city and show them what we want.” “We feel the land rates are too high so we went to government and asked for a change. They did not agree, so now we no longer pay” (Eco housing cooperative Amalinda).

The NGO partners did not directly intervene in the membership of the new structures or the election of members for committees. But DAG and PLANACT tried to influence the views of leaders (see diversity approach of DAG) and to ensure that sufficient number of women was involved and represented in the structures. Although the NGOs focused mainly on the leadership, they had some interactions with the community through ‘mass’ meetings, where they supported leadership to manage these meetings. Further to this, the NGO partners also stimulated saving schemes through their interventions. DAG was most attentive to the variety of needs and problems that exist in settlements (see diversity approach) and the evaluators noticed this through their interviews with leadership: “we are learning to persevere, to be patient (just like DAG is) and to be tolerant, because all households are different” (interviews Netreg and Hangberg).

There is evidence of personal growth at the level of leadership. The leadership is not always appreciated for its task, leaders themselves complain about the lack of engagement from other members (‘it is hard to keep them on board and to be appreciated’). Leadership participated in events initiated by the NGO partners, networks and in learning initiatives (see further). Especially men tended to drop out of the steering committees; a problem that might require some attention. Easier contact between leadership government officials is clear.

- **Beneficiaries that were involved demonstrate an increasing awareness of rights and obligations (check MSC)**

Yes, clearly, in most cases that the evaluation team witnessed, this ‘awareness’ was related to the basic services that government has to deliver. The leadership understands that they cannot ask things that are beyond the mandate of local government.

The NGO partners in particular ensured a better access to information (not the government itself) about government policies and plans (especially for the leadership) through their workshops and events, unpacking the language of ‘professionals’. Further to this, the NGO partners tried to give objective

---

⁴⁸ Freedom park was part of a larger area with 4 plots. Development and housing on these plots was allocated to a private developer by the city council of Cape Town. This private developer was still responsible for administrative issues and channelling of applications for province subsidies, but the community members build the houses themselves and designed plans. Later on, the charity Mellon Housing Foundation came in with extra funds for solar water heaters, tiling, etc.

⁴⁹ There is a recent case study about Freedom Park explaining in detail the struggle of the community: “at every step of the process the space for community participation had to be fought for and protected by the community as there was often resistance by government officials to community involvement in what were perceived as "technical issues"”. The involvement in the layout design was however important as the consultants lacked an understanding of the social realities and knowledge of how this should be accommodated in the new layout of the area. The plan accommodated their specific needs and concerns. In most housing projects communities receive a generic layout plan. (DAG (2008) page 38.)
information about different options (for e.g. advantages and disadvantages of different building options) in order for the people to take informed decisions about their future homes.

The increased awareness about rights and obligations raised frustration because local government is often failing to deliver: beneficiaries have the feeling that they are doing the work of government and government is still not delivering or is not rewarding them for doing their job (Freedom park, Zandspruit). Committee members in Freedom Park feel they should receive more recognition from the city: “We are now skilled field workers, the city should employ us in projects”. In general, many beneficiaries have lost trust in politics and in government. Only few respondents/beneficiaries mentioned the ward as an important stakeholder and when asked for their opinion they were not very much in favour of interaction: “We are not working with the ward councilor, these people are too much involved in party politics and not in development, they see this as other people’s job.” (interview with beneficiary in Duncan Village/East London but also confirmed by respondents in Johannesburg and in Western Cape).

Edward Mthetho (Zandspruit), the one who made a ‘career’

This is the story of a man who could move up on the social ladder: from being involved in a CBO in the informal settlement Zandspruit, he became member of the Joint Committee supported by Planact. Now, he is hired as a community development worker by the municipality and he moved to a rental house in a formal settlement. Mtheto Edward is 39 and has 3 children. He came to the private land in Zandspruit in 2001. He lived in a shack and at “that time, there was nothing: no water, no sanitation and no electricity. In 2003 there were some changes: the mayor was doing a tour in the different regions and we could also speak out at a meeting in the trade centre, which we did. We all went to see the mayor going there in a bus. In that meeting, the mayor indicated that he would find some money in the budget. As a result we received 12 water tanks which were removed and replaced by standpipes in 2005. We also got pit toilets and VIP toilets. Up to date, there is no electricity, the people still use paraffin. At that time we arranged to have some bags for our waste, but we just threw it on the streets, it was not collected. Only when the business centre Honeydew was developed, they put some waste skips at the main road. I moved to Cosmocity two months ago, I am still involved in Zandspruit but now as a community development worker, engaged by the municipality in July 2008. I am renting a house here. I won from 11 other candidates. I do not know how I did it.” The reader can see from his MSC, that he changed camps and is now part of the local government camp (the real situation in Zandspruit is less positive as was witnessed by the evaluators) which clearly illustrates the different perspectives one can have on the living situation.

He feels that the community is now in a position of being able to articulate their needs and even engage business and other stakeholders to help. It is true that there are challenges, but there is also hope for the development that has long been awaited. When he speaks of the position he holds now in the community he is proud to say that this was also as a result of the contribution of Planact that taught him about legislation governing the local government and he got to know how government works.

He speaks of some of the leaders who now work well because of the confidence they gained from the training and engagement with PlanAct. There are still problems in the community but this needs to be fixed in time.

This is what he told Planact before the evaluation mission came round: The most significant change that he sees for the community and himself in particular, is the knowledge and information they gained through engagement with Planact. The training that was offered that focused on “How Local Government works” was an eye opener for them.
Through this training they started to understand where to go and what to do in order to engage the government for their needs, it showed them the importance of participating in government processes like the IDP and with this, the government was also forced to listen to them because they were engaging them in the right platforms. People from Zandspruit were exposed to the outside world when they attended consultative forums through Planact and they were able to start networking with communities who had similar struggles like Zevensfontein Community and Diepsloot. He believes that through this engagement with the local government, they had a breakthrough when the City agreed to bring basic services and now even starting to bring permanent services to the community. The Transit camp has a water borne sewerage system and water in the yards, and the private plots have communal taps for water and VIP toilets that are serviced by the City. The two plots that they gained are being developed now, the infrastructure is there and there is a housing project underway. This in itself is a significant change for the leaders and community members who were persistent.

- Explanatory factors

The way the partner organised the process and their longer term of engagement with communities explains our findings of enhanced skills (capacitated leaders, division of tasks in communities, capability to hold meetings to analyze and discuss), enhanced *formality* of community groups (including their legitimacy and emerging transparency) and the fact that they are starting to act as a collective for the benefit of the community.

The following table gives an overview of the type of activities executed by 3 partners in support of getting the beneficiary communities organized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of community support within housing processes (2003-2007)</th>
<th>Planact</th>
<th>DAG</th>
<th>Afesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Leadership training (included visits to other communities)** | Topics: leadership roles and responsibilities, organizational governance, project management, financial management and fundraising, human resource policy, conflict management. | Annual trainings for leadership since 2005 organized across the different communities (8 weekend sessions): development theory and equips them with practical skills needed in order to lead effectively and lobby for change in their neighbourhoods.
Shift in focus:
-2005: skills and abilities to lead and manage development in the neighbourhood (in a housing-specific context)
-2006: more generic skills training for leaders in informal settlements
-2007: adding component: space for discussion on specific themes | Training for leadership, 6 in total, last in 2005 Topics treated: set-up of a cooperative, subsidies, financial management, leadership issues (such as conflict resolution) |
| In total: 86 participants from | | | In total: 150 participants |
### Training/support to community members

- Training in building skills (through the ministry of labour)
- Training on different topics (not all of them as part of a housing project, but targeting CBOs in a number of communities): roles and responsibilities for participatory governance, gender, HIV/AIDS awareness, organizational development, feasibility studies on PHP
- Information on cooperatives between 2000-2002
- Training in brick laying for 50 members of cooperative
- Training on how government should serve communities
- Training on energy efficiency
- Advice on the court case

### Support to meetings with community and government

- Support to the organisation of mass meetings and support to the preparation of steering committee meetings
- Workshops with the communities: (to determine needs for e.g. participatory community assessment using SLA)
- Engaging developers and Joburg Metro regarding relocation and increased temporary services
- Install community based maintenance programme
- Weekly meetings and regular workshops
- Identification of context/community specific needs to address, for e.g. Freedom Park: gender based violence.
- Workshops with the community
- Support to community members to participate in technical meetings with local council.
- Support in general mainly targeting province when looking at housing processes.
- Information on cooperatives mainly between 2000 and 2002

### Learning events across communities

- Community consultative conference, no specific theme involving 6 communities (85 participants, 30% women)
- 2005: a Habitat Day Forum highlighting challenges faced in developing sustainable habitable environments;
- Community consultative conference on Resident’s Rights (74 participants, 46% women)
- 2006 a Land Rights Workshop (29 participants, 5 women);
- 2007 an IDP learning event to share IDP experiences and provide information on legislation;
- 2007 a Habitat International Campaign event – Global Day of Action for Housing Rights with the theme, “Space for the Poor in the City”;
- 2007 a follow up Land Rights Workshop
- DAG’s activities are therefore limited to creating opportunities for networking and collaboration to spark greater levels of collaboration.
- Horizontal learning platforms
- Client forum:
- Partners meetings:
- Visits to other communities
- Training and sharing experience with the South African Housing Cooperative for all housing cooperatives across South Africa (3 between 2004-2005)

### Actions

- Not in the period of review
- Women’s day/week 2007: exhibition with pictures illustrating lives of women in informal settlements.
- Launch of cooperative housing project with the mayor of Buffalo
interaction with visitors of theater, including several communities DAG was working with.
- World Habitat Day 2008: tour of informal settlements which culminated in a public speak out event.
- Support to the solidarity March Khayelitsha (XX) march of inhabitants of the QQ section (informal settlement) to provincial department of local government and housing to address member of executive committee and resist planned relocation (with success so far)
- 2006-08: support community partners in participating in public hearings hosted by the provincial parliament of Western Cape to comment on annual reports and budgets of the provincial department for local government and housing (access to some funding for transport, workshops to prepare for input and active participation in debates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linking to networks</th>
<th>Not in the period of review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- 2003/2004: support to the establishment of the Western Cape People's Housing Networking Forum with 58 CBO's: focus on lobby to release land for PHP and to raise subsidy, comments on draft PHP guidelines (03/04)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information dissemination</th>
<th>Through (mass) meetings in the community and the consultative conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Support to information dissemination: newsletters and the organization of meetings (general and per block or zone)

- Linking the East London Housing Management Cooperative to the South African Cooperative Housing Association

4.2.2. APPRECIATION ALONG EVALUATION CRITERIA

Relevance – the NGO partners made an effort to establish more formal structures in the settlements, which is quite a statement for an informal settlement. Different respondents confirmed the need for people being acknowledged in a certain role and the importance of a certain hierarchy to get something
done. The formal structures helped groups in informal settlement to gain legitimate power to negotiate with government on behalf of a larger community. The skills of getting organized as such were much appreciated by several respondents in different projects.

Beneficiaries appreciate a lot being ‘workshopped’: “before we were involved in this project, we knew nothing about development, we had no understanding of how the housing subsidies worked, we did not know how to talk to a group of people” (Netreg, Hangberg and Freedom Park interviews), ‘I am seeing and hearing things of which I knew nothing’ (Orlando interview with members of CDC).

The NGO partners made a clear choice for working with already more or less organized groups, sometimes at the request of government. The question is whether they should not be more active to reach out to non-organised slum dwellers (which would for e.g. require a more visible presence in those informal places where poor people are interacting such as shabeens and spaza’s): “We are not/active in those places where a lot of the people from our target group meet” (remark from one NGO partner during the feedback workshop).

**Efficiency** – The NGO partners have done a lot of work (usually more than was anticipated in housing projects) with few people (field workers). In the period of review (2003-2007), DAG has assisted 15 communities, Planact 8 and Afesis 4 (not all with the same intensity though). It was not always easy for the NGO partners to keep the momentum (see lengthy processes Zandspruit and Amalinda) and to keep communities engaged through hardships, delays and local government not being responsive. The community facilitation as such is intense and NGO partners always have to make a choice how/where and when they put in their efforts (which is often dictated by available project funding). During the feedback workshop, a remark was made that NGO partners could try to tap the potential of the community development workers and as such work more efficiently: according to the NGO partners municipalities are really struggling with giving these people meaningful jobs, this could be a potential source for partners, to train and involve them (mentoring them as a spin-off from their involvement in community projects managed by the NGO partners).

Figures on the cost per participant of social facilitation are not available. Only DAG has recently started with time writing. Services and support (from NGOs) under PHP housing projects are in general covered by the so-called ‘facilitation grant’ for which the housing committees of the beneficiaries apply for at the level of the province.

**Effectiveness** - In general, it seems that investing in community building pays off: government respondent in Cape Town confirmed that already 8 PHP processes in Philippi failed because of a lack of community building, the situation in areas with turnkey housing projects are terrible regarding community

---

50 Government respondents sometimes gave the impression that the NGO partners are just an extended arm of government. This was contested by the NGO partners during the feedback workshop: ‘the government might want this but we are resisting this.’ An interview with operational manager of UF confirmed that governments tends to use NGO’s to mobilise people and use their own resources to that end.

51 Much more could also have been done as a means to strengthen community for e.g. by integrating simple cost saving income generating eco-measures providing community members with multiple income streams.
cohesion and people from Kuyasa Fund mentioned a clear difference between areas where communities have been workshoped and others.

The MSC-stories lead the evaluators to believe that more in particular leadership has benefited a lot and has strengthened them, “we now know what we want”. Leaders have grown to be active citizens, feeling responsible (see neighbourhood watch in Freedom Park). Although the leadership sometimes feels tired and people just want to enjoy their new house: “But then we feel we must steer and lead, we do not have a choice” (Patricia in Freedom Park). Civic pride and the wish to help others is there (sense of solidarity, see involvement in actions) especially where projects have been successfully accomplished. The Amalinda project is still lingering on and the cooperative model as it was installed, supported and developed did not (yet) have the desired effects on community building. First, conflict in the community should be resolved.

Leadership in different communities is now taking on new challenges for the community: waste management campaign, bakery, wanting to set up a project for getting the children back to school, ideas about the establishment of a community fund (Freedom Park), community gardens and home based care project (Vosloorus).

Further effects on a larger number of people are hard to determine but the numbers mentioned in the monitoring documents of Cordaid quantifying output and outreach are certainly not reached. Clearly much more effort and input from the NGO partner is needed in settlements where there is little cohesion (see Zandspruit and Amalinda) and where people are living in very bad conditions (Zandspruit): people are not on the demanding side to have community action but they want to see tangible investment and infrastructure to address their basic needs. But this is too much an effort for one single NGO, therefore municipalities should become much more engaged themselves (for e.g. through their community development workers or through a more responsive approach).

**Impact** – It might be expected that when people learned how to speak out, learned how to engage with officials and have interacted with officials on the ground (them visiting the settlements or having meetings in government offices), they have experienced less violent ways of expressing their grievances. Local government people have introduced new ways of interacting with communities and have learned: “Once people are mobilised, you can no longer go around them” (interview with Ekhurleni).

Unfortunately, not all local governments are responsive and even if local officials understand the opportunities here to build more constructive strategies (and the policies are on their side), many bureaucratic, political and capacity blockages stay in the way.

**Sustainability** - The structures that were set up to facilitate housing process do not always remain in place or became much less functional/operational. In the case of the Amalinda cooperative, the evaluation team considers this to be a problem: the cooperative owns the houses and the rights of people on these houses remain a bit unclear. Clearly, there was a lack of ownership towards the cooperative model: “People wanted a house, if they could achieve this through a cooperative, why not?” (interviews Afesis). Afesis has handed over the project to the province who should solve the conflicts
and finalise the project. The last general meeting of the cooperative had to elect new board members but the general assembly members simply agreed (informally) with the same people staying on.

For those structures still in place there is the challenge to get other and new people on board wanting to engage themselves in community building. The housing processes take a very long time and some of the committee members are getting tired but it seems that nobody else is willing to take their place. “Some people keep on expecting things from us” (Lettie in Netreg).

Finally, the lack of interaction with ward committees is worrying for the sustainability of the current processes. In the case of Kuyasa fund, the general policy is to try to avoid these kinds of people. One of the visited projects was an exception to this as it concerned a ward-broad initiative, the Community Development Committee in Orlando.

In general, NGO partners find it very hard to leave communities after being involved for many years. They work with communities on the basis of a formal agreement in the framework of housing projects. This agreement does not always clearly state that assistance will stop once the housing project is finished.

4.3. EVALUATION QUESTION 3

To what extent have slum dwellers been able to use their claim making power to change policies and local government planning/operations regarding access to basic facilities and thanks to the interventions of the partners?

Whereas Evaluation Question 2 primarily looked into the organization and strengthening of the communities (through the housing projects), this evaluation question looked at how communities interacted with other actors (such as government) and the concrete actions they took to change policy and practice with regards to access to basic services (in their own housing project but also further than that). This question is about the availability of having (existing of newly created) mechanisms to engage with government (like steering committees) and about evidence of communities taking deliberate action to get something changed as a collective. The question here is not whether the NGO partners themselves have undertaken effective lobbying (which is not the focus of this evaluation), but how they maybe have supported/enabled communities. The NGO partners that are most relevant for this evaluation question are DAG, Planact and Afesis-Corplan. Utshani Fund is not dealing with community development and did not deliver concrete projects.

Answer to this question: some smaller steps have been taken, mainly as a result of NGO partners stimulating inter-community exchanges (more in particular for DAG and Planact) and mainly confined to the boundaries of a concrete housing project.

The structures that were established in the housing projects (the steering committees) gave the
communities the opportunity to engage in a more formal way with government in so called steering committees that were established for each project. Here, government officials and community leadership shared the same table to ensure an effective execution of the housing project and to negotiate advantages for the community. There were some effects, yet limited to the housing project as such and its leadership.

Learning platforms and consultative workshops (DAG and Planact) offered additional ‘safe’ spaces for interaction between community leadership and government officials and were not connected to a particular housing project. Tools were developed to monitor government performance and are now ready to be mainstreamed (good governance surveys, ward KPI and budget monitoring, Afesis) and in Orlando, Planact started assisting (in 2007) in the shaping of the new Community Development Committee (CDC) as a multi-party/organizational structure that should ensure that the community can grasp the potential benefits of the 20 Priority Township-Programme and the building of Orlando Stadium for SA 2010 (world championship of soccer).

The intercommunity exchanges/workshops/forums and actions were highly relevant. They offer the opportunity to community leaders and communities to reclaim their collective voice. There was an apparent lack of networking between communities and community leaders and this had to be strengthened before any effective advocacy and lobbying could be undertaken. It is this interaction that creates a broader perspective on development, that enables an understanding of the systemic and structural problems regarding slums and basic services and that can promote a sense of solidarity. Another example is that of the CDC in Orlando where different local stakeholders are put together in one committee aimed at developing the whole community: the interacting and the ‘actually working together’ is new and gave way to the “idea that something might happen and that the CDC might actually mean something for development”.

Only DAG has engaged in supporting inter-community actions (see the scheme in the above for an overview of actions). DAG initiated a grassroots forum for lobbying around housing rights in 2003/04; the forum brought together community or membership based organizations in The Western Cape People’s Housing Network Forum (PHNF). While it existed it focused on lobbying for support for People’s Housing Process, mobilizing land for housing development and mobilizing finance.

4.3.1. DESCRIPTION PER JUDGEMENT CRITERION AND EXPLANATORY FACTORS

- Relevant and functional mechanisms are in place to involve slum dwellers in planning, execution and monitoring/evaluation of local government policies regarding basic facilities

The main mechanism for involving slum dwellers in local government policies would be the ward council. We already highlighted the fact that this council was not seen as the appropriate mechanism from the side of the slum dwellers (unless in Orlando and in Vosloorus, Planact). There is a lot of suspicion,
particularly in housing processes about the role of the ward councilors trying to get houses and jobs for their friends.

The mechanism of the steering committee in the housing project was a good example of how government and slum dwellers can interact around a concrete project/investment. Government representatives were: executive directors of housing departments (at municipality level), representatives of the provincial departments of Housing, ward councilors, … . The recurrent meetings (monthly or two monthly) offered the opportunity to the communities to put their demands on the table. However, a lot depended on the responsiveness of government and according to Afesis, local government in East London for e.g. is “dormant”.^52

Community members that were not involved in housing projects (yet) could meet with government people in inter-community workshops and forums. These were not directly aimed at government planning for basic services. Government officials would be invited to share new plans / policies etc., with community members creating a space for interaction. One of the main instruments that DAG used were the public hearings on budget and reports (see overview in the above). For example, in 2006, 2007 and 2008 DAG provided technical support to its community partners to participate in and use the public hearings hosted by the Provincial Parliament of the Western Cape to comment on the Department of Local Government and Housing’s annual reports and annual budgets. The hearings, convened by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts provided some of the communities, poor urban dwellers opportunity to influence budget allocations and to comment on implementation. These community partners prepared a joint verbal submission which was made at the public hearings.

A promising project is the CDC in Orlando (Planact): the CDC convened a range of information sharing and planning workshops which included presentations from different government departments and agencies responsible for Orlando’s development – particularly providing a space for community members to provide input into the Urban Development Framework. There are currently 15 representatives serving on the CDC (of which 5 women). The evaluators note that also different political parties are sitting at the same table (which is quite exceptional). At the most recent community workshop on ward based planning feeding into the Urban Development Framework (coordinated by the Johannesburg Development Agency), approximately 100 community members participated with 60% women.

-There is evidence of concrete initiatives to change parts of the policies or policy making related to basic service delivery

The evaluators note that some initiatives were taken by the communities (supported by the NGO partners) to get something done (in the field of access to basic services), sometimes with success. But in general getting response from government and maintaining interaction is a real battle. Many projects have suffered from a waning support from the side of government.

Examples of changes entail the following:

^52 At the time of the evaluation mission it was announced in the newspapers that national government would take over temporarily government of Buffalo Municipality for reasons of non-performance (amongst others).
Vosloorus: the policy related to payment for housing plans was negotiated in the steering committee which effected a change in PHP policy regarding approval of housing plans (prize was lowered).

Zandspruit: in 2003 a written submission was submitted on the IDP review; a request was also submitted to Johannesburg Council officials to have at least temporary services (water and sanitation) and permanent settlement of the area’s residents. The community was involved in ongoing discussions with the Joburg Area Manager on upgrading services and future plans for developing a permanent settlement. The community also won a commitment from the City of Johannesburg to be provided with free water – 20 tanks installed by the end of 2004.

Orlando: through the project more attention is being placed on influencing the backyard rental policy. Municipal officials are being engaged by members of the CDC and ward councilors on this issue. The city’s Urban Development Framework developed by the Johannesburg Development Agenc has

---

Kevin (Hangberg), the one that will explain to government what kind of development the community wants - Kevin is the chair of the committee in Hangberg, an unemployed father that has lived in the settlement for almost 40 years. He became quite familiar with the mayor and has a direct line to her office.

These are his words: “Our aim is now to get the land ownership. That is the main thing. Development can come afterward, but ownership is the first priority because if the people know they own the land, then they know there is a possibility of development. But now they say ‘Hey. We are sitting on land that doesn’t belong to us, it belongs to this city or that. If people know they own this land, then they know, now we can develop. Then they can bring the materials, whatever they want. We [the committee] went to various meetings with the city to sort out this land story and stuff like that. They still hold up that process. But the committee has land as our first priority this year. ] Otherwise, this project is not going to survive. Now we need to control this whole area. People now are just coming to put up shacks wherever. We need to control this whole area for development. ] DAG was very much supportive. Even when it comes to sending us to meetings, and guiding us through the whole process. They sent us on a leadership course even. Where we went to go study this kind of stuff, even with government. Now we know. That’s why we can go out there and speak to the people, and go out there and speak to the city. Firstly, I didn’t have that courage to speak to a crowd. But now I do.

With DAG, I have definitely helped show my people that there is a way, not to sit, to show them that if we stand together, we can become many things. Because there are a lot of things that government is sitting with [land, housing, sanitation], and we need those things also. There are schools, education. It’s a bit slack around here and our kids are dropping out of school. They are sitting there, smoking ganja, or drinking, or ticking. They are taking the best away from our kids, and leaving them with nothing. That’s not enough for our kids. Parents, they don’t have work. And a kid can’t learn with an empty stomach. ] The government controls everything we need. That’s why our people need to get together and stand together, cause otherwise we will not be able to get what we need. You can’t do it as an individual person. DAG took us on a trip last year to various developments, like rushed developments. The people’s houses are cracking. It’s not suitable. And we don’t want that here. That’s why they took us through, so that we as a committee, bring that back to our community and explain to them what kind of development we want. We don’t want cracks, or whatever. We can’t just accept whatever. We have to be involved.”

53 There were also other initiatives such as lobbying for the provision of Child Care which the Department of Social Services supported.
drawn extensively from the CDC's own strategy documents.

- Freedom Park: the local authority through its structures identified the need to develop a bath house in Freedom Park as their only benefit under the Presidential Urban Renewal Programme. The community however, with DAG's assistance organised itself and engaged with the structure to articulate their own needs and rejected the bath house asking for housing development.

- Public hearings (DAG): in 2007 the submission was so well-received that the Standing Committee encouraged the community partners to engage more with the provincial parliament (through their committees) so that the Dept. of Local Government and Housing can be held accountable.

- **Explanatory factors:**

  The NGO partners (even DAG) are less involved with identifying lobby-topics and strategies with communities in a systematic, step wise approach over different years. They have their own advocacy agenda in which they use their experiences with communities. "It is already very hard for an NGO to be involved in the policy processes at higher government level. The process of policy reviews as it is set up by the government is very exclusive and beneficiaries at grass roots level are normally not invited to sit at the table" (comments during feedback workshop). Partners try to build around this: organizing meetings with beneficiaries and using their input in the discussions with government. There is a consensus amongst the NGO partners that beneficiaries should not be involved because they are beneficiaries (there have been bad examples of beneficiaries being used or co-opted by government in the past).

The evaluators note that there is a lack of consensus on what is understood by lobby and the difference with advocacy and general policy work. It is neither clear to the NGO partners how Cordaid would define the different approaches (feedback workshop).

---

**Primrose Mti (Zandspruit)** - Primrose Mti has been living in Zandspruit since 1994, not on the private land but on the transit land (waiting to be relocated to a new housing plot). She noticed that being organized, the community members were able to open doors that they could not open before. Primrose is one of those people who started to stay in this area as one of the first occupants of the land if one can put it like that. When the first group of people started staying here there were no basic services according to the Constitution of the Republic. People needed water and proper sanitation facilities and, most pressing, they needed housing. As one of the leaders (ward committee member) working with other service organisations, Primrose started to see the difference in people's lives when the city council agreed and promised to provide water tanks and mobile toilets as basic necessities. As a result of the help of PlanAct and others, the community members were able to open doors that they could not open before. Primrose became excited when the 2 plots that people occupied were recognised and people were allocated stands with the promise of housing and proper facilities to follow. Plot 52 and 70 are now fully functional and the Department of Housing has started building houses for people, the infrastructure for flushing toilets is in place and the City is always at hand to come and clean or unblock the drainage system when it is blocked. Life in the transit camp has changed because of de-densification into other plots. The problem they still have is for the people who could not qualify to get a stand and a house. This is because some are from outside the country and others do not qualify because they do not have proper papers or they have qualified already in other areas.
4.3.2. APPRECIATION ALONG EVALUATION CRITERIA

Relevance – When looking at the housing projects, the NGO partners have succeeded in most cases in putting the right people around the table: slum dwellers are actually interacting directly with city officials. The NGO partners did however not develop a specific advocacy or lobby agenda with and for the communities (although some efforts in this respect were taken by DAG, see public actions).

The beneficiaries appreciated a lot that the NGOs have widened their view. “They took us out!”, was mentioned frequently as a token of appreciation by different respondents.

Efficiency – There were few specific initiatives related to supporting advocacy and lobby involving beneficiaries. The evaluators note that at several points in the processes local government has shown waining support or heavy-handed responses, which hurted the projects and communities a lot (Vosloorus, Amalinda, St-Lukes) and that financial problems in Gauteng Province have caused considerable delays in Planact projects.

Effectiveness – The evaluators have noted that leadership is stimulated to consider the wider policy environment and that new ‘species’ of leaders are emerging: Kevin from Hangberg and Primrose: “there is a way, not to sit, we can become many things”.

At the level of the CDC in Orlando (1 example) there is growing excitement and higher levels of participation, including a recent community meeting Planact organised at which the city’s development agency discussed community plans with nearly 200 community members (100 women). When the community first began to meet with city officials, they expressed dismay that the city’s plans seem not to have taken them into account. This has begun to change decisively.

Impact – Now that communities are mobilised, it is very difficult to go around them. As the respondent from Ekhurleni Municipality explained: once mobilised we had to adapt our interaction with communities and we have to involve them in our plans. Also other government respondents confirmed they are trying to do things differently. This is definitely a sign that through the NGO interventions a start was made with changing power relations between government and citizens. The NGO partners themselves are taking up issues in their policy work based on their experiences with the communities and as such they were able to insert their point of view in new policies (such as Breaking New Ground, integration of the concept of cooperatives). However, their impact cannot be compared to the achievements before 2003, when the NGOs succeeded in introducing PHP processes as an alternative funding scheme for housing. The evaluators conclude that the NGOs experienced a backlash after their victories from the past. This can be considered as a natural event in lobby and policy change processes.54

---

54 This point was not further investigated, it would have required more indepth context analysis and analysis at the level of the partner organisations which was not the scope of this evaluation.
4.4. EVALUATION QUESTION 4

To what extent was the mix of partners effective and relevant in order to achieve the objectives of the programme?

This evaluation question was inspired by the move of Cordaid to a more programmatic approach. The idea is not to evaluate the application of this approach but to identify elements that were present in the period of review and to assess the relevance and mix of partners chosen by Cordaid in relation to the three objectives: access to facilities, development of claiming capacity and using that capacity to change something in policy and practice. As described in the introduction, these objectives are inspired by the new programme (post 2007) which should be taken into account when assessing the different judgement criteria. Another aspect is the difficult period the South Africa Programme was going through in this period: the number of partners had to be reduced, there was no clarity about the future budget and at least three different Programme Officers had to take over the programme from one another.

4.4.1. DESCRIPTION PER JUDGMENT CRITERION AND EXPLANATORY FACTORS

The management of a diversified partner portfolio by Cordaid contributed to achieving the objectives of the programme

The link with the objectives is ensured - The objectives of the (new) programme in SA were access to basic services, developing claiming capacity at community level and effective lobby by communities to change policy and practice (see evaluation questions 1-3). Not until 2007, concrete indicators were attached to these objectives. Between 2003-2006 the main focus of the Cordaid programme in South Africa was on the secure tenure and social sustainability (Cordaid policy paper 2003-2006) and not explicitly on the three objectives which were introduced with the new programme. Stimulating, promoting and creating sustainable settlements for the poor and low-income earning households is the main link (common denominator) between the different NGO partners that are supported by Cordaid in South-Africa.

During the kick off workshop of the mission, the evaluators asked the partners to indicate in which different fields they would say they are active/they cover (see report of kick off workshop). Six out of seven partners (in the sample) cover by themselves different fields; yet with variable and proper focus: research and design (very prominent in SI), working on soft issues and capacity building for communities and government actors (less prominent for JHC and SI in relation to communities), hard issues such as support and management of housing projects (except SI which is not an implementer) and policy work (less prominent for UF unless through FEDUP). Kuyasa Fund is a typical MFI and tries to limit itself to this assignment.

As such, the partner portfolio and the activities/programmes of the partners addresses the main
objectives of the Cordaid Programme mentioned in the above. Moreover, the NGO partners represent the main CSOs active in the field of housing and urban development (which are not that numerous) with a track record going back to the ‘80s.

**Little room for deliberate choice/change based on context analysis** - The selection of partners happened long before 2003 but could be justified by Cordaid by the promise these partners held to provide creative and innovative solutions that could inspire and influence policy related to ‘sustainable settlements’.

Most of the partners do have a long history of partnership with Cordaid and the existing partner portfolio at the beginning of the period under review (2003) absorbed almost the full available budget, which left little maneuvering space for Cordaid Programme Officers to identify and add new partners: one partner was added in 2004, Afesis-Corplan by the then programme officer. The reasoning for adding this partner is not fully clear, the following programme officer thinks this was related to the wish to include a partner working on sustainable building techniques and one working on governance (Afesis at that time ran a human settlement programme next to a governance programme).

The central idea (to provide creative and innovative solutions that could inspire and influence policy related to ‘sustainable settlements’) did not receive a systematic or close follow-up at programme level (as far as the evaluators can conclude from the replies from the NGO partners to the questionnaire, the workshops with the NGO partners during the field mission and the reading of reports collected in the Cordaid archives): analysis on aggregated level, consequently interrogating NGO partners from this point of view and determining shifts in focus or strategy if necessary, etc. did not happen.

This does not mean that Cordaid did not reflect upon the experiences; clearly some reflection in the Cordaid team did take place and the documents on Urban Matters demonstrate some accumulated knowledge and experience. But this process did not happen in consultation with the NGO partners between 2003 and 2007 (practice changed in the framework of UM where partners were consulted to discuss this approach).

From the replies to our questionnaire, the evaluators conclude that:
- Half of the partners is not sure what the Cordaid Programme on Slum Dwellers (introduced in 2007) entails (overall objectives, focus etc.). NGO partners state that the programme is only very briefly presented to them. From the Cordaid programme document (2002) it was clear that partners at that time indicated that they were capable to absorb more consultations (given the input they already received from other donors and international organizations) but wanted to concentrate on their work mainly.
- Cordaid mainly conducted one-to-one meetings with NGO partners who consider this (now) to be a

---

55 Considerations for working with partners: the evaluators found geographical considerations (Cordaid wanted to focus on Western and Northern Cape and on Gauteng) but no other considerations to justify the 7 partners. (Cordaid, (2002) South Africa, country policy paper 2003-2006. This paper is based on an analysis of the health of civil society (drafted by CORE and IDASA). The report mentioned 7 NGO partners involved in Quality of Urban Life. In this report it was already highlighted that CSO had to improve on accountability and their capacity to measure impact. The idea was that results at target group level would be made visible on the basis of monitoring systems of partner organisations. The update of the policy paper in 2004 did not provide new information on the partner choice. UF is seen as a partner with a strong government influencing role and the Afesis, DAG and Planact are considered as members of USN and the need is identified to strengthen their lobby role.
missed opportunity for advancing cooperation and networking within South Africa. The evaluators point to the fact that DAG, PLANACT and AFESIS themselves decided to dissolve the USN network. The current position of the NGOs might demonstrate that they are looking themselves to have more cooperation again and that they are now ready to put in more effort in cooperation (see the Land First approach).

The NGO partners appreciated a lot the relations with Cordaid as friendly and reliable. They noticed a shift in report requirements (end 2006-2007) from the side of Cordaid, which was a surprise to them because Cordaid never asked them before to collect data on specific indicators. The partners do not always see the link between the indicators and the work they are doing and find it incoherent with the core funding they receive for the execution of their programmes.

Two of the partners state they have changed their way of working as a result of the partnership with Cordaid. (1) DAG reports to have been included in Cordaid's Gender and Diversity support programme between 2005-2007 (through which they have accessed some additional funding to address the issue in their organization, which they did), although they did not participate in the learning network (involving other partners of Cordaid but mainly in other fields) (replies to questionnaire). DAG's involvement has contributed to the effects of their work with communities (something that could be noticed by the evaluators as well). DAG reports that this experience has made them more conscious of how their practice influences the exclusion or inclusion of some marginalized groups (replies to questionnaire). (2) Afesis-Corplan made a clear move from housing projects and working with cooperatives to the issue of land access. The participation in the IHS courses “made us realize that our interest in land was well placed as this is a common problem and strategic international area for many organizations and countries around the world”. (replies to questionnaire)

The partner portfolio however lost considerable leverage with view to effectiveness in the course of the years: in 2003 the group of NGOs was envisaged as very successful (at the top of its performance) by Cordaid (see different documents, such as Project Kenschets and Considerations), but this changed over the years:

- In 2005, the USN (Urban Sector Network) main office (see also introduction) was closed and the network was no longer functional. Three of the 7 NGO partners used to work together within this network with other CSO to enrich their work and to lobby and influence policy and practice. This was also the type of cooperation that Cordaid wanted to support through its core-funding. The closing down initially meant that affiliates missed the opportunity to, as a collective, influence a number of important national developments such as the introduction of Breaking New Ground. More recently some individual affiliate organizations, have once again started to network and support each other (often on a one-on-one basis) and issue based informal lobby groups are starting to emerge recently, for e.g. the coalition on Land First and the cooperation in the Good Governance Learning Network (involving only Afesis and Planact as Cordaid NGO partners).

- PDLS, a service organisation focusing on community building as a support to the South African Homeless People’s Federation (SAHPF, dissolved in 2001)), closed down in 2005. CORC (Community Organisation Resource Centre) which was established with the same purpose to assist the new Federation of Urban and Rural Poor was not supported by Cordaid (for e.g. as a
replacement of PDLS\textsuperscript{56}). SI states to work with CORC, but the evaluators have seen nothing that suggests more than a loose and ad hoc cooperation on a case by case basis.

- Utshani Fund was supported by Cordaid as the capital fund for the SAHPF and later FEDUP, but was not able to deliver any hard output in housing between 2003 and 2007 (although it continued to receive support from Cordaid). In practice (and combined with the above), this meant that Cordaid lost its leverage to directly touch upon the lives of slum dwellers through the housing programmes and to use what was happening on the ground and translate it into concrete action at a higher level. It should be noted that Cordaid worked with SDI in the same period (of which FEDUP, the affiliate of UF is the local branch) which ensured a certain link between the Cordaid programme and the beneficiaries (slum dwellers), but unfortunately this partnership was not included in this evaluation exercise. It is also true that other NGO partners work closely with CBOs and slum dwellers (and thus ensure a link between the Cordaid programme and the beneficiaries), but from the previous it is clear that they did not develop a common lobby or advocacy agenda with these organizations and they do not represent the slum dwellers as such.

The evaluators conclude that Cordaid could have better analysed and monitored the situation to ensure future leverage power, for e.g. by linking Cordaid support to SDI better to the programme.\textsuperscript{57} Cordaid put in a lot of effort though was put in assisting PDLS to review its strategies with view to its sustainability but there is no evidence that other concrete measures were taken to remedy the situation and to ensure leverage power. Clearly the management of the SA partner portfolio suffered from a high turnover of personnel between 2003-2007 (three different programme officers) and uncertainty about the continuity of Cordaid support to the country after 2006 (interviews with Cordaid).

Further to this, the evaluators note that the relevance of the partner portfolio decreased in the course of the years when taking into account (1) the apparent problem of government to translate research into policy that is consequently implemented\textsuperscript{58} (as such funding for e.g. to SI to develop models can be questioned if there is no clear strategy on how to ensure that government will/can take up the proposed alternative solutions or guarantee that this might happen) and (2) the apparent problem (which is not new) for government at local level to implement policies and to execute planning (not one of the partners has been given direct support to government process to implement planning although one NGO, DAG has recently moved to the municipal wide planning approach, which might fill some of the gaps in the strategy) and (3) the need for communities to have access to financial products to unblock housing processes, for e.g. upfront financing and loans.

\textsuperscript{56} The closing down of PDLS was not beneficial for the trust relations; and as many of the former staff (which was criticised for its approach) went to CORC, Cordaid decided not just to fund them.

\textsuperscript{57} Cordaid has a funding relation with SDI which dates from before 2003. UF is co-managing the SA branch through the alliance (including CORC and FEDUP). The partnership is focused on a strategic poor fund. During the evaluation mission, SDI and its activities were not mentioned by any of the respondents and not included in the UF replies to the questionnaire. According to the policy paper covering the period 2003-2006, the cooperation with SDI was to link funding and lobby activities with other departments of Cordaid. From the update of this policy in 2004, the strategic partnership is again mentioned. Topic are forced evictions. A new topic is the Urban Poor Fund.

\textsuperscript{58} See also conclusions in Udesh (2006) about the link between research and policy. see the contribution of Charlton, page 276: \textquote{\textquote{impact of research is/was not always clear, its focus is often not clearly aligned with recently articulated policy intentions as is indicated by the limited range of research which explicitly focuses on the relationship between housing policy and poverty}.}
- **There is evidence of efforts to create synergy in objectives, strategies and activities between the partners**

The NGO partners are not aware of any initiatives from the side of Cordaid to create synergy (except for the recent Urban Matters initiative and consultations around this in 2008), but they are on the demanding side to have more interaction with view to a common agenda (see report of feedback workshop).

DAG reports to have received some extra funds to convene a roundtable discussion with urban development actors (including other Cordaid partners) with Kirtee Shah in 2007 which was concentrated on the contemporary challenges facing the work of actors involved.

It should be noted that the partners meet each other once and a while at events or on a one-to-one basis but this is not systematic nor incorporated in a particular strategy.

- **The current partner portfolio allows for a programmatic approach**

Not yet, the evaluators feel that some types of partners are missing (see in the above) and that too little effort was done to make cross-fertilisation between partners happen (see for e.g. the sustainable settlement models of SI). Between 2003 and 2007, Cordaid was not really managing a programme in South Africa: the partners that were funded before 2003 (directly or, as in the case of SI through another partner) simply continued to work under the umbrella of a programme. There was no possibility (because of shortage of funds and insecurity about the future presence of Cordaid in the country) to have a selection based on an analysis of complementarity between organisations (and such an analysis did not occur). It should be noted that in the beginning of 2003 this was not that urgent or necessary: the situation was quite promising and also allowed to develop a programme-approach (according to the elements that were mentioned in the 2007 Reader of Cordaid).

### 4.5. EVALUATION QUESTION 5

*To what extent have the four core activities of Cordaid contributed to the effectiveness of the programme and the sustainability of its outcomes?*

The four activities are linking and learning, lobby, funding and strengthening public support. Only recently, Cordaid has started to integrate these four activities in South Africa through the pilot Urban Matters (which was not under review by this evaluation mission). This question aims to assess to what extent elements of the new strategy were already present in the years 2003-2007.
4.5.1. DESCRIPTION PER JUDGEMENT CRITERION

- The linking and learning helped the partners and Cordaid to realise the objectives of the programme and to sustain its results

The partners in SA have been involved in different linking and learning activities. Half of the partners have been able to include some of their staff in IHS training courses which were very much appreciated. Issues that have been included in the work afterwards are: land value capture (DAG is in the process of establishing a partnership on this with IHS and UN Habitat), enhanced knowledge in the area of sustainable human settlements in urban conditions and introduction of new learning methodologies (Planact, through networking with other participants of the courses)). Other examples include the opportunity offered by Cordaid to participate in international workshops for e.g. in Canada, Ethiopia, … Some partners (SI and Kuyasa Fund) have been able to establish relations with other Dutch organizations. The programme officers of Cordaid pointed out that the NGOs in South Africa already receive a lot of opportunity for going abroad and taking part in specific courses, workshops and conferences from other donors.

- International lobby activities supported/initiated by Cordaid have allowed the partners and Cordaid to realise concrete steps forward in securing access to basic services for slum dwellers

The NGO partners were not part of international lobby activities supported/initiated by Cordaid and are not aware of what Cordaid is doing in this field. The NGO’s are themselves involved in a lot of policy work: they are part of policy reviews (for e.g. through reference groups: PHP process and Breaking New Ground as the two processes in which they have been involved) and they draft (parts of) new policies (see for e.g. SI).

- The funding by Cordaid allowed the partners to make the difference

The Cordaid funding was beneficial in two respects: attracting additional funding and expansion the activities. The NGO partners highly valued the Cordaid funding (and the role of Cordaid as a progressive funder) and the fact that they could use this as core funding. For UF it meant that they were able to attract technical staff; JHC was able to realize a considerable growth in the activities of Mkhulong A Matala (the ‘social’ arm of the JHC dealing with community facilitation), through which it could increase its reach in the community and through which it could attract funds from other donors. For Planact, the funding enabled them to maintain a core programme that included other donors: “Most donors are uncomfortable funding an organization that does not have other core support. Cordaid enabled us to ensure a certain capacity within the organization to attract more project-specific funding. As such, Cordaid allowed us to maintain our focus on the core mission of the organization”.

---

59 From the policy paper 2003-2006, the evaluators read that a general strengthening programme of Cordaid’s partner organisations would be elaborated, but further details about this are not available. Support can be provided to partners on the basis of an organisational scan, but further capacity building was not planned for the SA partners.
- **The initiatives to strengthen public support for development cooperation in the Netherlands can have added value for the work of the partners and the work of Cordaid.**

The partners do not really understand what this is about: is it about using experiences from the South to source campaigns in the North (this is valued as something very positive), is it about transferring technical assistance to the South (in this respect there is a lot of hesitation)?

## 5 Conclusions

### 5.1. CONCLUSIONS PER EVALUATION QUESTION

**Access to basic services improved** - yes, for a limited group of people and mainly through housing projects (for communities that have secured land), one can say that access to basic services improved.

**Claiming capacity strengthened** - yes, the partners have provided support to a number of communities for getting them organised and as such providing them legitimacy as counterpart of government, ready to interact on issues that concern the community. New types of leaders and cooperation within the community are emerging thanks to the intense community facilitation.

**Taking action for the collective and changing policy and practice** – yes, to some extent but mainly emerging. Some small steps have been taken, mainly related to the efforts to receive basic services and housing and thanks to inter-community initiatives. These have created the necessary ground for targeted action. NGO partners have not been working though on a specific advocacy and lobby agenda with the communities.

**Relevant and effective mix of partners with view to the objectives** – It is not completely fair to evaluate partners and activities through the lenses of a programme that was defined in 2007. Moreover, the circumstances in which Cordaid had to work did not provide a lot of space to change dramatically the partner portfolio. In general, one could say that in 2003 the partner portfolio looked promising: the partners were strong in their field, had proven already something and covered different field: housing (and access to basic services), community building and policy influencing. After 2005 several changes occurred which negatively affected the effectiveness and which were not subject to a close/closer follow-up by Cordaid. The evaluators noticed that there were few linkages between the partners and their programmes (especially after 2005) and that there were no clear mechanisms to use experience from the ground (or pilots and research) and translate it into action to influence policies or (more important) to change the practices (upscaleing of pilots).

**The contribution of the four core activities to effectiveness and sustainability** – It is clearly too
early to say something substantial about the first firm steps of Cordaid to translate the programmatic approach into the pilot Urban Matters. All stakeholders agree that Urban Matters holds the promise of realising a massive impact in one of the worst of townships of Cape Town. When looking back at the years 2003-2007, the NGO partners have received learning opportunities and funding but they have not been involved in (international) lobby initiatives or efforts.

5.2. CONCLUSIONS PER EVALUATION CRITERION

**Relevance** – The NGO partners were well placed actors to act as go-betweens aiming at the creation of sustainable settlements through organised and formal interaction between beneficiaries/slum dwellers and government officials. As go-betweens the NGOs preferred to work with existing groups that can request for support and invested in them getting better organised. The NGO partners addressed some elements in policy (more clearly identified in Breaking New Ground) that were not taken on by government, such as the importance to invest in community building. The partners’ focus on housing/assets is relevant because the perspective of having access to infrastructure and houses is for slum dwellers a pre-condition of getting interested and engaged in community processes. Both the support for getting organised and the concrete output (serviced sites with houses) were highly appreciated by the beneficiaries. The relevance of the partner portfolio decreased in the course of the years when taking into account the problem of government of effectively implement its policies; none of the partners were really addressing this issue.

**Efficiency** – the NGO partners tried hard not to substitute government or to act as their extended arm. Therefore they did not develop specific activities to facilitate or assist implementation of government plans. The operational framework of the PHP housing projects created some tensions in this respect but also offered the best framework to engage with government officials responsible for executing housing policies. At the same time, NGO partners were confronted with many blockages of different kind at different government levels. In general, the NGO partners tried to support the communities to get from government what government should deliver to them, which required a lot of investment in community facilitation over a longer period of time. The PHP processes were considered to be very slow by government that did not take into account the added value and the importance of community building. The NGO partners did not keep record of the costs of interventions (costs/facility; cost/beneficiary). In general they invested mainly in community building and their proper advocacy agenda.

**Effectiveness** – the NGO partners in most cases delivered outputs of good quality (functional committees and housing according to and even better than government standards) although limited in numbers (when compared to the total roll-out of housing units). Effects on beneficiaries cannot be denied: new houseowners have acquired stability and privacy in their lives. Community leaders are opened up to challenges of community development. The NGO partners succeeded in getting beneficiaries to interact outside of their community (with other communities), mainly through their leadership. This ‘opening up’ was appreciated by the leadership and is in fact a pre-condition for more solidarity and collective action. As such, the first steps for more concerted lobbying have been taken.
When looking at the aim of realising sustainable settlements, the evaluators note that more could have been done in the field of socio-economic analysis and integrating building skills training in a more comprehensive approach to local economic development: some people earned a little bit of money during the building stages but many of them are back to where they started when looking at their access to remunerated jobs.

The effectiveness of the partner portfolio was also under pressure after the closing down of USN and PDLS and the financial problems of UF. A large part of the Cordaid funds was allocated to developing models and studies without realising a direct or indirect tangible output or effect on poor people.

**Impact** - The impact on the lives of new house owners cannot be denied: those who have a house and were ‘workshopped’, further develop their assets, invest in it and take an interest in the further development of their community. Government respondents and NGOs have pointed to the difference between ‘workshopped’ communities and so called turn-key communities where community facilitation has not taken place. The difference is noticeable with respect to the feeling of responsibility and ownership of houses but also with respect to power relations; one cannot ignore a ‘workshopped’ community. On the other hand, the evaluators conclude that the alternative approaches applied by the NGO-partners were not mainstreamed in the housing processes. It is expected by the NGOs that the new strategy of Land First might strengthen them to effectively upscale their approach and to reach more beneficiaries/slum dwellers.

**Sustainability** – Community structures do not necessarily continue to exist: it remains difficult to further engage a full community through a formal structure once the housing project is finished. Those structures need extra support to ensure follow-up of the leaders that have carried the lengthy housing process. The interest taken in community and development issues has been triggered at the level of leadership but it will require further investment; the intra-community initiatives and events/actions are an important instrument in this respect. In general, the evaluators concluded that NGO partners did not necessarily consider alignment between community projects and broader urban planning processes.

5.3. CONTRIBUTION OF CORDAID TO THE RESULTS

Cordaid contributed to the above mentioned results through its core funding of the partners and its openness towards specific requests from partners (related to assistance or additional funding for particular initiatives). Before this evaluation, most NGO partners did not think of how Cordaid could contribute to their work (besides funding) (input during feedback workshop). The partners see a more prominent role for Cordaid to engage with SA government on the basis of the results of the partners, also saying to government that more could have been achieved if government would have been more engaged. Additional input that would be very much appreciated is support in the process of becoming a learning organization. Initiative/input (with ideas and finances) should come from the partners themselves (opinion of the partners). Cordaid could support this learning, sharing and collaboration based on specific learning objectives, but the NGOs would be in the driving seat. In fact this is what
Cordaid aims to achieve with the pilot Urban Matters. Although the evaluators agree that it is not up to Cordaid to arrange more cooperation between partners, there is room for improvement when looking at the follow-up of activities and programmes and engaging in a critical dialogue with the partners.

5.4. LESSONS LEARNT

At the level of Cordaid

Make programme objectives sufficiently explicit - The idea that alternative and small-scale approaches had to impact on general housing processes was never clearly stated by Cordaid as an objective to be reached by the NGO partners (as part of a programme). The fact that this objective would not be reached was never explicitly put on the agenda or written in a document. To measure effectiveness and impact of a programme requires sufficient dialogue with each partner and on an aggregated country level in order to identify the appropriate indicators at output and outcome level that are relevant for the SA context. These indicators can be used to ensure a closer follow-up on strategic issues and partner portfolio level and to engage in a critical dialogue with partners about the progress towards the objective.

At the level of the partners

The added value of community facilitation cannot be denied - Community facilitation pays off; this was clearly demonstrated by the leadership of the communities visited by the evaluators. The evaluators noticed that the introduction of a diversity strategy adds considerable value to these processes. Not all NGO partners invested in this, but relied on community leadership to ensure inclusion; analysis from DAG pointed out that it should not be assumed that communities do not exclude certain groups/members of the group.

Limitations of NGOs - Community facilitation requires a long term investment in community groups, especially in communities with weak social cohesion. NGO partners can only take on part of the work. Two options offer a way out of the limitations: (1) investment in inter-community exchanges (preferably including a community advocacy agenda) and (2) investing in local government processes dealing with implementation of policies. It is important that NGOs make efforts to partner up with (maybe unfamiliar) institutions and organisations that may assist in upscaling their approach.

The government in the past has favored new green-field development efforts in an attempt to house the homeless to the detriment of in-situ upgrading. The reason for this is that green-field development is seen as being technically and socially easier to manage. NGO’s have played an important role in working with community groups in an in-situ upgrading context. The failure to scale-up the alternative model of housing delivery is however a set-back. Clearly, NGO partners have not yet find ways to do this or to work on those actors (for e.g. government) that should be able to take care of this. In general, government does not always fully understands the procedures/rules/dynamics involved in community
membership and community based settlement development processes.

**Limitations of the consensus model** - The consensus model of CSO and government engaging constructively to solve development issues has been long time applauded by donors although it can raise some tensions, more in particular when government is not delivering and CSO’s feel the constant pressure to deliver on their behalf. The question is how to ensure that NGOs do not become the extended arm of government but develop sufficient leverage at the same time to challenge government to consider necessary change.

**Formalisation of community organisation is not necessarily guarantee for greater effectiveness** - The establishment of Voluntary Associations following co-op principles, rather than fully registered cooperatives, are probably a better place to start for community based development efforts. The formality and legal reporting and accounting requirements of registered cooperatives are usually more onerous for organisations of the poor. Once looser organisational structures gain experience they could convert to a more formal structure.

**There are eco-opportunities still waiting** - There are a number of low to no cost actions that can be taken that do have an impact on environmental performance of low income households. The NGOs are not very strong in advocating for green housing or in working on these issues with communities; there is sufficient openness but less practical expertise. Too much has rested too long in the sphere of research and pilot.

**Importance to address land issues** - Access to well located land is a very important pre condition for housing development. The procedures involved in getting land ready for settlement development are long and expensive. Municipalities have a crucial role to play in getting land ready for settlement development. Municipalities however are under capacitated and are not aware of the tools available to them to help them deal with this challenge. Access to well located land is an important activity that many community groups are unable to organize themselves. They are able to engage with municipalities and other land owners but are often at a loss as to how to migrate there way through the complex land packaging and settlement development channels (e.g. environmental approval, town planning approvals, land availability agreements, land purchase agreements, services agreements, financial subsidy agreements, national home builders registration council enrolment, etc.). More specialized NGO’s can play an important role in assisting community groups find land for settlement development.
# 6 Annexes

## 6.1. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED/RESPONDENTS

**Mission South Africa (9-24.02.2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Organisation/place</th>
<th>Partner/topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Thabatha</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Province Cape Town, Local Government and Housing department</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rika Van Rensbrug</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Province Cape Town, Local Government and Housing department</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettie</td>
<td>Inhabitant of Netreg</td>
<td>Netreg Capetown</td>
<td>DAG, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthea Houston</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer of DAG</td>
<td>DAG, Capetown</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen MacGregor</td>
<td>Coordinator – Informal settlement upgrading Development facilitator</td>
<td>DAG, Capetown</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Hobongwana</td>
<td>Other??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Christians</td>
<td>Leaders of the Freedom Park Development Association</td>
<td>Freedom Park, Capetown</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona Miller</td>
<td>Socket – Informal Development facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waheeba</td>
<td>Other??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Inhabitant of Netreg</td>
<td>Freedom Park Capetown</td>
<td>DAG, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adiela Vanschalkwyk</td>
<td>Community Liaison officer for Construction</td>
<td>Housing support centre Freedom Park</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Charmaine??</td>
<td>Chair and vice-chair of the Project Steering Committee</td>
<td>Hangberg Development Association Hangberg Capetown</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Wallacedene Capetown</td>
<td>DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Kusambiza</td>
<td>Executive director</td>
<td>Afesis-Corplan, East-London</td>
<td>Afesis Corplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Eglin</td>
<td>Programme coordinator Sustainable Settlement Programme</td>
<td>Afesis Corplan, East-London</td>
<td>Afesis Corplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Kimemia</td>
<td>Programme coordinator Local Governance</td>
<td>Afesis Corplan, East-London</td>
<td>Afesis Corplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mteteleli Pobana</td>
<td>Facilitator, volunteer</td>
<td>FEDUP, St.-Lukes</td>
<td>Afesis, St-Lukes project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zukiswa Cxesí</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>St.-Lukes Housing Committee</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mteleli ??</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>St.-Lukes Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albie Meiring</td>
<td>Officer for Planning</td>
<td>Buffalo City Municipality</td>
<td>Afesis projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gijis Van Enk</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Intervolve</td>
<td>Intervolve projects and perception of Afesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xolnani??</td>
<td>Member of CBO aiming at advocacy</td>
<td>East-London, Duncan Village</td>
<td>Advocacy on service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primrose Nanzia, Winiwe Ntsontshe, Nokwanda Aplenl, Sentea</td>
<td>East London Housing Management Cooperative and Amalinda Housing Cooperative</td>
<td>East London, Amalinda</td>
<td>Afesis, Amalinda project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandla Magoqwama, Nkosinathi Boltina</td>
<td>Assistant manager and ??</td>
<td>Provincicial ???</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nwabisq</td>
<td>Inhabitant of Amalinda</td>
<td>East London, Amalinda</td>
<td>Afesis, Amalinda Project, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandisa Batayi</td>
<td>Inhabitant of Amalinda</td>
<td>East-London Amalinda</td>
<td>Afesis, Amalinda Project, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpiwe Seti</td>
<td>Manager IDP and Budget Integration</td>
<td>Buffalo City Municipality</td>
<td>Afesis, governance programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Makwena</td>
<td>Senior Project officer</td>
<td>Planact, Johannesburg</td>
<td>Planact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 members of the CDC</td>
<td>Members of Orlando Community Development Committee</td>
<td>Johannesburg, Orlando, community house</td>
<td>Planact, CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gugulethu Shange</td>
<td>Orlando East ADP Manager</td>
<td>World Vision, Orlando, Johannesburg</td>
<td>Planact, CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Motshabi, Sipho Skhosana</td>
<td>Member of CDC, SANCO member, ward committee member, Backyard dweller and member of CDC</td>
<td>Johannesburg, Orlando</td>
<td>Planact, CDC, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 members of the Joint Committee</td>
<td>Joint Committee of Zandspruit</td>
<td>Johannesburg, Zandspruit</td>
<td>Planact and project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Mtheto Gqongo</td>
<td>Community Development Officer</td>
<td>Johannesburg, Zandspruit</td>
<td>Planact and project, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shumani Luruli</td>
<td>Project officer</td>
<td>Planact, Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thembi Rejoice Radebe</td>
<td>Contractor, inhabitant of Vosloorus</td>
<td>Johannesburg, Vosloorus</td>
<td>Planact and project, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mupeti</td>
<td>Contractor, inhabitant of Vosloorus</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
<td>Planact and project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Sitole</td>
<td>Former community liaison officer at the</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Affiliation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebu</td>
<td>Inhabitant of Vosloorus</td>
<td>Ibid</td>
<td>MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Van Rooyen</td>
<td>Executive director, Staff member IT and Marketing</td>
<td>Kuyasa, Cape Town</td>
<td>Kuyasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lungani Dlabathi</td>
<td>Loan officer</td>
<td>Kuyasa, Cape Town</td>
<td>Kuyasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Madlongwana</td>
<td>Loan taker and inhabitant of Khayelitsha</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, Cape Town</td>
<td>Kuyasa, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomvula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Siyange</td>
<td>Loan taker and inhabitant of Khayelitsha</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, Cape Town</td>
<td>Kuyasa, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Mambumbu</td>
<td>Loan taker and inhabitant of Khayelitsha</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, Cape Town</td>
<td>Kuyasa, MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenjiswa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah de Villiers Leach</td>
<td>Project Manager, Energy Efficiency Initiative</td>
<td>Cape Town Partnership</td>
<td>Project SI and Urban matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Thompson-Smeddle</td>
<td>Coordinator of applied research in sustainable neighbourhoods Member of the team sustainable neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Cape Town, SI</td>
<td>Projects of SI and Urban Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Scholtz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunita Kohler</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Cape Town, CORC (Community Organisation Resource Centre)</td>
<td>Urban matters, work of CORC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Marmorato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ines Meyer</td>
<td>Member of staff</td>
<td>Community Connections</td>
<td>Urban matters, work of Community Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheladi Mojapelo</td>
<td>Executive Manager of the project implementation directorate (within the Housing Department), now called Human Settlement Development Directorate</td>
<td>Ekhurleni Metropolitan Municipality</td>
<td>Vosloorus project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Graupner</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Johannesburg Development Agency</td>
<td>CDC in Orlando</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mission South Africa Programme (Feb 9th-24th 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 9th</td>
<td>Team meeting</td>
<td>Capetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10th</td>
<td>Kick-off workshop</td>
<td>Capetown, DAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 11th</td>
<td>Interviews and observations</td>
<td>Capetown, Netreg, Wallacedene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 12th</td>
<td>Interviews and observations</td>
<td>Capetown, Freedom Park, Hangberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with director DAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 13th</td>
<td>Meeting with director Kuyasa and Marketing officer</td>
<td>Capetown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of methodology in team

Feb 14th  
Reporting in team  
Capetown

Feb 15th  
Preparation of meetings with Afesis  
East-London

Feb 16th  
Meetings at Afesis  
Visit to St-Lukes  
East-London

Feb 17th  
Meetings at Afesis  
Visit to Duncan Village  
Visit to Amalinda  
East-London

Feb 18th  
Visit to Orlando and visit to backyard dwellings  
Johannesburg

Feb 16th  
Visit to Zandspruit

Feb 17th  
Visit to Zandspruit and visit to private plot and transit camp  
Johannesburg

Feb 18th  
Visit to Utshani office  
Telephonic interviews  
Capetown

Feb 19th  
Meetings at the Philippi Business Place and walk around cement factory  
Report by the team  
Cape town

Feb 21st  
Visit to Khayelitsha  
Observation of marketing event by Kuyasa team in ??  
Report by the team  
Cape Town

Feb 22nd  
Preparation of the feedback workshop  
Capetown

Feb 22nd  
Visit to Utshani office  
Telephonic interviews  
Capetown

Feb 23rd  
Feedback workshop  
Capetown

Mission South Africa (interviews after the mission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Organisation/place</th>
<th>Partner/topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Ayogu</td>
<td>Director of operational services</td>
<td>Utshani Fund</td>
<td>Skype interview: non-performance of UF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taffy Adler Lindi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannesburg Housing Company</td>
<td>Telephone interview: position of JHC in the partner portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. LIMITATIVE LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS

Cordaid. All documents related to the different partners and projects on CD-rom (provided December 2008)
### 6.3. OVERVIEW OF SUPPORTED PARTNERS AND PROGRAMMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>period</th>
<th>Total budget</th>
<th>Cordaid contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afesis-Corplan (301163)</td>
<td>151/10052</td>
<td>April 2004 (3 years)</td>
<td>1.654,557.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151/10052 A</td>
<td>January 2007 – 2 years</td>
<td>914.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Institute (302326)</td>
<td>151/10086</td>
<td>1-11-2008 – 3 years</td>
<td>1.055.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151/10068 A</td>
<td>1.10.2006 10 months (delays!!)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utshani Fund (has taken over financial part of PDLS)</td>
<td>151/1510 D</td>
<td>01-06-2003 – 3 years</td>
<td>774.728,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151/1510 E</td>
<td>1 April 2007 - 2 years</td>
<td>1,901.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLS/People’s dialogue (closed down in 2005)</td>
<td>151-1540B</td>
<td>01/04/03-01/04/06</td>
<td>930,000 = 30% of total budget, according to PK, other funds: 30% from Misereor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyasa Fund</td>
<td>10063</td>
<td>1.07.2005 3 years</td>
<td>251,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10063A</td>
<td>1.08.2008 12 months</td>
<td>543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Action Group (DAG)</td>
<td>151/1542 A</td>
<td>1.04.2004 3 years</td>
<td>2,584,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151/1542 B</td>
<td>1.04.2007 3 years</td>
<td>1,746,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg Housing Company LTD</td>
<td>151/10061</td>
<td>01-07-2005 – 3 years</td>
<td>718,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANACT (17172)</td>
<td>151/1516 B</td>
<td>01-04-2004 – 3 years</td>
<td>1,627,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151/1516 C</td>
<td>01 april 2007 - 3 years</td>
<td>1,030,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-systems (301519) = Dutch organisation, activities (3rd phase) are now managed by a contractual relation with the Sustainability Institute</td>
<td>151-10068</td>
<td>01/06/05-01/02/06 7 months (extended to 1 year)</td>
<td>136,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**6.4. DESCRIPTION OF EACH PARTNER**

**Description of partner: Afesis Corplan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global objectives</th>
<th>Promote and support community based approaches to sustainable settlements development, and democratic and participatory local government processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services | Motivating for Land first including upgrade and new development (very recent)  
Help people set up cooperatives and negotiate with government for funding to get land, services and houses. |
| Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves | Introduce organisational strengthening through capacity building in developmental related aspects  
Specifically (but only very recently) raise understanding about different development approaches like the concept of “Land First” which looks at acquiring well located and planned land as a first step in housing development” and how it differs from others.  
Develop co-operative model and train homeless (living in slums and backyards, etc.) in how to set up co-operatives (approach is more or less abandoned for the time being, quite donor driven Swedish donor) |
| Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice | -Work with other NGO’s and invite organisations (e.g. Federation of Urban Poor) to workshops we organise on land access and land first.  
-Focus on building capacity of cooperatives so that they can themselves lobby for change |
| Main direct beneficiaries | Communities residing within the Eastern Cape Province |

**Description of partner: DAG**

| Global objectives | DAG’s overall objectives are:  
1. to influence the views and practice of the state to become more developmental in satisfying the needs of the urban poor by demonstrating good practice, and through critical partnerships with the state; and  
2. to build capacity within civil society for inclusive participatory development by enhancing the capacity of communities, and of other non-governmental role-players to influence praxis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services</td>
<td>Part of social development strategy. Communities define and prioritise their needs. Advice from DAG is focusing on provision of technical information, assistance with development of layout plans, house designs, approval of housing plans, developing and managing construction programmes (including materials procurement) and training in building (management) skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves | DAG is only working on a request base and working with groups demonstrating various levels of development. DAG’s strategy recognises the need for poor people in urban areas to act collectively within their neighbourhoods and across neighbourhoods to effect change.  
-Ongoing provision of organisational development support (skills in forward planning, negotiation, communication, financial management, conflict management, lobbying, meeting procedure etc |
| Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice | DAG has gone through a learning process. To date:  
-DAG acts as expert informant providing information to CBOs clarifying |
| **practice** | which government department (and official or politician) takes the decision, what the decision making process is, helping them to prepare their argument giving consideration to their needs as well as the interests of the decision-makers. Where options exist DAG provides information about the range of options available and the potential advantages and disadvantages of these.  

-DAG facilitates networking between different CBO groups to help them share information and experiences and to encourage collaborative action in solidarity with each others struggles. DAG has initiated and supported the grassroots forum, The Western Cape People’s Housing Network Forum (PHNF). |
| **Main direct beneficiaries** | Households in urban areas with incomes ranging from R0 per month to about R3500 per month living without adequate housing. |

**Description of partner : PLANACT**

| **Global objectives** | The overall aim of the organisation is to help improve the living conditions of the urban poor in informal settlements and disadvantaged urban areas in South Africa, with a geographical focus on the Gauteng Province. The mission is to support and mobilise community processes that enhance good governance at the local level to improve people’s habitable environment in ways that alleviate poverty. Planact’s vision is for people that lack access to habitable environments will be able to defend existing gains and advance the collective interest of the poor and marginalised. |
| **Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services** | Planact has largely assisted communities to access housing with security of tenure and basic services and informal settlement in-situ upgrading. We also aim to ensure that those processes link issues of provision to participatory processes, decision-making and ownership of projects and that economic benefits that accrue from these processes actually benefit communities directly. |
| **Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves** | Planact begins its interventions at community level starting from the community perspective by undertaking an assessment in partnership with the community—in recent years this has included use of Sustainable Livelihoods Assessment (SLA). The intervention strategy adopted will therefore depend on the needs identified that are appropriate to Planact’s capacities, and Planact would work with the community to facilitate partnerships or strategies to meet other community needs as appropriate  

Intensive organisational development: training workshops on leadership, strategic planning, project management, communication and conflict resolution and skills development. (work in 8 communities between 2003 and 2007).  

Cross-community exchange and learning events:  
-e.g. oct 2003 (no title): different communities participated (150 participants), speakers from government (municipality councillor), researchers, lawyer. Topics: secure tenure and land, HIV and shelter, gender in the context of land, conflict mediation (alternative dispute resolution). Discussion on how these affect communities, identification of actions, identification of role for Planact.  
-e.g. March 2005: “Housing the Nation, community participation in the new housing policy breaking ground”: 100 participants from different communities, speakers from university  
- October 2005: “world habitat day celebrations Vosloorus”: issue of Habitat is not only about the erection of a superstructure, but entails questions of sustainability, well-being of inhabitants, services (water) |
Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice

Capacity building programme where direct services are provided to community organisations, ward committees and local government structures. Planact uses its training manual, "Communities Count" as a key means to develop skills amongst those elected into the ward committee structure, intended to advance community participation in local government. Other community leaders receive the same training, so they can maximise their influence by understanding formal participation processes.

This includes training and support in terms of community/ward based planning to feed into the Integrated Development Planning processes.

Initiatives for information sharing across communities - e.g. in 2008: event "Global day of action of housing rights": space for the poor in the city, with representatives of different communities and a councillor, based on a study on land management (2007)

Main direct beneficiaries

Poor, marginalized community members located largely in informal settlements in urban areas mainly in the Gauteng Province. Secondarily, are those involved in local government, including ward councillors, ward committee members and officials, who receive training to enhance their role in public participation.

Description of partner: Utshani Fund

Global objectives

To promote community development and sustainability by using housing as a vehicle to grow the social movement for the poor.

Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services

UF consults the community. They usually will be the ones who identify land for purchase. In case the land is not yet serviced (which is often the case), UF assists the community to lobby the government for servicing of the land or if capital can be found see how UF can do the servicing ourselves.

Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves

UF relies on its partner in the alliance with FEDUP, which is CORC. They work hand-in-hand together to prepare communities for projects with uTshani doing the technical side and COURC doing the social facilitation.

Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice

UF assists community members to write letters, they accompany them to meetings and coordinate meetings with government officials as requested by the communities.

Main direct beneficiaries

People that are eligible for government housing subsidies. Most of them contribute to the Urban Poor Fund.

Description of partner: Kuyasa Fund

Global objectives

Kuyasa aims to create sustainable households and communities through facilitating access to housing finance as a tool for improving well-being and supporting the development of a financial sector for the poor.
The objectives are:
- To provide responsible credit to those outside the formal banking sector, particularly to traditionally vulnerable groups including women and the elderly
- To support this access to credit through promoting saving groups and regular repayment
- To provide credit with the aim of improving housing and building social capital
- To enable clients to build adequately-sized houses which meet their needs
- To provide an example of successful lending to the financially marginalized and to pioneer a methodology for finding sustainable solutions to poverty

**Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services**

Kuyasa Fund is an MFI institution and is not directly involved in provision of basic services

**Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves**

Kuyasa Fund encourages people to save in groups to build cohesion and support for the building process. However, KF are not directly involved in capacity-building for organisational purposes within the communities we serve and wants to maintain a strictly commercial relation.

**Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice**

NA

**Main direct beneficiaries**

Kuyasa provides microfinance services to those with secure operational rights who are excluded from formal finance, because no other appropriate sources of housing finance are available to low-income households.

The direct beneficiaries of Kuyasa’s work are the clients served with financial products – the client profile is:
- 76% Women
- 75% between 40 and 60 years old
- 60% Informally employed & Pensioners
- 60% earning below R1 500; 93% under R3 500
- Regular income - formal & informally employed or dependent on social security grants
- 92% is member of a savings group

**Description of partner: Sustainability Institute**

**Global objectives**
The SI is an international living and learning centre for studies and experience in ecology, community and spirit.

**Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services**
NA: the SI is a research and training organisation

**Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves**
NA: the SI is not directly working with groups of slum dwellers in the field

**Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice**
The SI provides training courses in lobby

**Main direct beneficiaries**
Fedup, and other Slumdwellers international subsidised housing beneficiaries and community members (through their organisations), Business Place Philippi
### Description of partner: Johannesburg Housing Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global objectives</th>
<th>The JHC is committed to urban regeneration through the provision of quality, value for money (rental) accommodation and service for all who choose to live in JHC projects and neighbourhoods, in a manner that is both sustainable and promotes growth.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to put in place facilities for basic services</td>
<td>NA: the JHC is not dealing with access to basic services. Services are provided in the rental stock that is owned by the JHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to strengthen capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves</td>
<td>NA: the JHC delivers supporting services to its tenants through its organisation ‘Makhulong A Matala’ which is cultivating the empowerment of tenants (not necessarily as members of a group/or aimed at groups). Tenants are taking responsibility for managing programmes such as the sport leagues and after-school centres. Tenants are also appointed as facilitators to increase the involvement of tenants in the activities presented by Makhulong A Matala. Tenants are further actively involved in tenant committees which they run independently from Makhulong A Matala.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy to assist slum dwellers to lobby for change in policy and practice</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main direct beneficiaries</td>
<td>Individuals from low to middle income groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5. OVERVIEW OF MSC

Overview of MSC from DAG, Planact and Kuyasa

SI and JHC: not required

Utshani Fund and Afesis Corplan: information from existing projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAG</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Living here since</th>
<th>Member of committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible home owner and house rules</td>
<td>Lettie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Netreg, house owner</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved family life</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freedom Park, house owner</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy, starting over in our house</td>
<td>Shameena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Netreg, house owner</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and freedom</td>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Netreg, house owner</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality time with my family, privacy, speaking out</td>
<td>Koebra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Netreg, house owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big place to sit together with my family, skills as treasurer</td>
<td>Rosemarie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Netreg, House owner</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now we know and we can go out and speak to the city</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hangberg, shack/Wendy house/no landtitle</td>
<td>Since long</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few good things like water to a certain extent and electricity</td>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hangberg, shack/no landtitle</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committee keeps on going to the government</td>
<td>Charmaine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hangberg, shack/no landtitle</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some improvements (toilets), a stable committee</td>
<td>Lana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hangberg, shack/no landtitle</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am educated, my vision is broader</td>
<td>Mona Miller</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freedom Park, homeowner</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a second chance to be a home owner</td>
<td>Patricia Christians</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Freedom Park, homeowner</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know a hell of a lot of the construction side of things, opportunity for a better job, passion for working with communities

Lesar (Lee)  
F  
Freedom Park, homeowner  
No

First of all my house and then: seeing the beneficiaries

Adielah  
F  
Freedom Park, homeowner  
?  
NO

I can no longer hear wind nor rain

Waheeba  
F  
Freedom Park, homeowner  
?  
X

---

**KUYASA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kuyasa Fund</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>F/M</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Living here since</th>
<th>Member of committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boost of confidence</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, house owner</td>
<td>??, client since 2000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment (crèche)</td>
<td>Mrs. Nqwede</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, house owner</td>
<td>1986, client since 2005</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am now a very happy lady</td>
<td>Mpana Nyameka</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, house owner</td>
<td>1997, client since 2005</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud and confident</td>
<td>Josephine Mambumbu Tenjiswa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, house owner</td>
<td>1989, client since 2003</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost of the relationship with my handicapped child and all the children, retain normality of my family life</td>
<td>Beatrice Madlongwana Nomvula</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Khayelitsha, house owner</td>
<td>1997, client since 2005</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further elaboration of MSC in Khayelitsha

**Beatrice Madlongwana** - She has been living in Khayelitsha since 1986. She used to live in a shack. In 1991 she got a house build in a couple of months by local builders and with government subsidy. In 1998 roads were build. Beatrice is working as a domestic and has two grown up children: a boy and a girl, both working. The girl is handicapped and has to use cruches. Three of the grandchildren are living with Beatrice, her daughter is helping out, financially. She is member of a savings group, the women’s league of the church and a burrillal society. She has taken three loans with Kuyasa: for a roof, an extension and tiles. She heard about Kuyasa through somebody else. “IN the beginning I was very scared because I only earn a small amount of money (100 R/day and I have to pay my transport costs
from this), but I joined the savings group and one of my bosses helped out as well. I know have two hands with money: my own money and that of Kuyasa. People see me sometimes with a T-shirt from Kuyasa and ask me what it is and then I explain. Kuyasa has asked me to join them on a travel to PE and everything was payed for me. We showed other groups where we came from with pictures. I have no problems with paying my bills, I can go to the municipality office nearby and pay in cash for the services.

**Rose** - ‘The loan from Kuyasa has helped me to make my house bigger, you know that government subsidy only provides for houses of 27 sq meter? I moved here in 1980 from Transkei, where I have such a subsised house. My house was build with the savings of my husband. He is a builder, which means that my house is still not finished (she laughs) and I keep on complaining to him about this. Olivia (director of Kuyasa) made us understand what it is, having a house, she made us think about saving money, the number of rooms we want. We are know working together with 4 women to make dolls and other things with recycled materials. We started a stockfell with a group of 10 people to buy other materials and we teach each other and other women how to be creative. We even have a store on the sportsground but we do not always go there because we have to pay 90 R upfront. We learned how to do things on our own, for ourselves.’

**Josephine** - “Kuyasa is the father of the orphans, the man to the women who do not have a husband”, “Not one child got one R in this house”, ‘I should be an organiser for Kuyasa, I have brought so many people to them, they should pay me”. ‘the government is not doing anything for old ladies, kuyasa should do more for old ladies”. ‘The little business is from my cousins’ son’

---

**PLANACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planact</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>F/M</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Living here since</th>
<th>Member of committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the lives of backyard dwellers</td>
<td>Dan Motshabi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orlando, homeowner</td>
<td>Grew up in the area</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and beautification of the area</td>
<td>Sebolao Mosimane</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orlando, ?</td>
<td>Grew up in the area</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the area</td>
<td>Tshepo Mvuyane</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orlando ?</td>
<td>Grew up in the area</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to amenities</td>
<td>Kaizer Gau</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orlando, ?</td>
<td>Grew up in the area</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exited about plans to upgrade the area</td>
<td>Sibusiso Mosia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Orlando, ?</td>
<td>Grew up in the area</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding how local government</td>
<td>Edward Mthetho Gqongo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cosmocity, Currently rents a</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
works, knowledge about legislation | home (lived in shack at Zandspruit) | 1994 | No
---|---|---|---
Open doors we could never open before, dedensification of the area | Primrose Mti | F | Zandspruit, Transitcamp, shack/no landtitle
Some minor changes (water tanks and VIP toilets) but still many problems | Ellen Shuping | F | Zandspruit, Private Plot, shack/no landtitle | 2001 | X
More space and relief for the family New windows of opportunity (home based care and gardening) | Gladys Macala | F | Vosloorus, houseowner | ? | X
People can rent out rooms for extra income, less overcrowding | Thembi Rejoice Radebe | F | Vosloorus, homeowner | 1992 | X
More space, window of opportunity (home based care project and gardening) | Morwa Kgoroba | F | Vosloorus, homeowner | ? | No
Building experience, social interaction | Abigail Mkoko | F | Vosloorus, homeowner | ? | No
Sufficient space | Lebu | M | Vosloorus, living with parents | 1993 | No

Additional MSC (see also Lebu and Brenda in the above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Living here since</th>
<th>Member of committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No changes yet</td>
<td>Mteleli</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St.-Lukes, ?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>St. lukes, homeowner</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place to invite friends</td>
<td>Yandisa Batayi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Amalinda, living with parents</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFESIS

From a presentation at a Swedish conference:

"my name is Richard Siyabulela Apleni. I am a member of the East London Housing Management Co-operative, and I am serving on the Board of Directors as vice-chairperson. I joined the housing co-operative in order for me and my family to live in a better house.

I was staying in Mdantsane at Zone 10 in a shack with my wife and my three children for 12 years from 1992 and 2004. It was difficult to stay in a shack because when it was raining, the shack leaked, and the roads to our shack were muddy. There were no toilets, when one wants to use a toilet we had to go to the bush or a friend in the neighbourhood, which had proper houses and toilets. For water there was one standpipe for 50 shacks, and there was no electricity.

In 1998 I joined the East London Housing Management Co-operative (ELHMC) and participated in the housing co-operative meetings, and saved money R30.00 a month. It was difficult to save because I had no formal employment. I relied on piece jobs (casual work). My wife assisted me by selling vegetables and liquid paraffin to get money for savings.

In January 2004 I was allocated a house at the Amalinda housing project by the East London Housing Management Co-operative. Now I am happy because I have a 45 square meter house. My house has five rooms, i.e. two bedrooms, a dining room, a kitchen and inside toilet.

It has electricity and clean running water. My house is close to town, I pay R3.50 by taxi to go to town, but while I was in Mdantsane I used to pay R8.50. Now my children can study their books and do their school homework because we have electricity. I feel that me and my family have dignity and I am respected in my community.

Collected during the evaluation mission by the evaluators

The story of Zukiswa (chairperson of the cooperative in St-Lukes) - "I was elected by the church to liaise between the church and the project. We have secured 20 ha for housing, each plot will be around 20 to 25 meters. Afesis took us to another project to learn. To be a member of the cooperative, we paid 60 R. As such we brought the number of people down from 400 tot 200, because there is only room for 200 houses. I get my water from a standpipe now and I do not pay for that. They tell me I will have to pay for water when I want water in my house, but I want it. The reason why I want to be part of the savings group is because I want to save money for health issues and for my children to go to university. I want to concentrate on education. A new house will be the problem of my children. If you want to have something from the government you need to have some kind of a structure, the government likes that,
so we should go on with the cooperative. The work of Afesis was good, they gave us workshops on how to handle the process, such as ‘how does a chairmen acts’. They introduced Buffalo City to us. They (the city) are responsible for measuring the plots (this would be the land affairs section), they promised us to build roads and they should bring water, sewage and sanitation. We discuss with government in our community house, we also went to them, that was the first time for me to go there. We has also some trainings with the beneficiaries to discuss with them the idea of the cooperative. 70% of our members for sure is poor and lot of them live in mud houses. Not all of them are members of the church (she clarifies upon a question of me). We also had a workshop on the tasks of the municipality. We heard they can give us electricity but we did not want it. Now we want it, because we want TV and fridges, upgrading our way of living. Afesis stopped working with us because they are short of funds. I feel very bad about this. Fedup will not be the same, but they are coming to us and have workshoped us several times. The most important change in me is that I can stand here and be bold and say what is good to the people. I have meetings with the whole community. Beneficiaries are all over, we use the ward councillor to contact them; they have a phone, they can trace people and deliver messages; they know of people in the government that can help us. I want to be trained as a contractor. I do not know when it will start, but we want our people to be trained on everything: electricity, plumbing, building, for job creation.”

*Mteleli (St Lukes)* - There was a process of consulting the community, local authority and the amakhosi (chiefs – traditional leaders) in the area prior to the project being launched. The project has plans to promote agriculture; more housing; sports for the youngsters; better policing; support clinics and businesses. Agreement was reached, and then the community nominated the committee. Afesis ran some workshops, then the co-op was formed. They had to save money, which took some of them a long time, due mainly to unemployment. They needed 200 people for the project, and not all have paid. The Buffalo City Municipality (BCM) has been problematic, with them calling Afesis “outsiders”. The diocese offered the land, and the process demands that each member provides a photograph of themselves, and there is a consultant funded by the diocese. But there has been a loss of faith and trust in this consultant, which resulted us in calling FEDUP to be involved. I would prefer that the R50 we each had to save was donated.

Comments from the evaluator: they have found it expensive to travel to BCM for information, updates and support. Access to water is an issue, and has been delaying the process. In the future, Mte thinks they should find donors for services, so that the subsidy can be used to build slightly bigger houses, or as he puts it, “Life can be alright”. He also feels that the committee has been active for too long, and does not feel acknowledged or rewarded for the work they do. He wants to run a small spaza shop; help build a playing field for children; wishes to teach agriculture; and looks forward to an office for the co-op. FEDUP is and will assist in teaching, especially in how to earn and how to save. Afesis had offered to build skills, but this did not happen. “We ask CORDAID for help”

*Yandisa Batayi (Amalinda) – 14 years old:* He and his family used to live in Mdantsane, but shared a house with other people. He loves it that the family has their own space, with all the services, and he is involved in music, sports and friends. He mainly likes the fact that he can now invite his friends to come and visit him, as there is now space for them to stay. He would like to be a doctor or a vet, as he wants to heal. His toilet was broken, but it will be fixed by family friends. He knows where to go if there is no water – to the nearest standpipe!
Biggest change for the members of the ecohouse cooperative (collected during the group interview):

- I now have my own house and a home to my children, I am safe now
- I can have my own garden
- No stress when there is rain, the municipality used to come in and destroy my shack
- Privacy, own room, water, electricity and roof tiles
- We do not even close our doors.

Nwabisa (Amalinda) is 27 and lives with her cousin who is the owner of the house since 2003. Her mother is still living in a shack in Ndanzane. There is no water in the house and no toilet. She uses a bucket. Life is even better in the shacks. It seems that the cousin of Nwabisa is one of the ‘invaders’ who says she is entitled to a house (she was accepted on the second list of beneficiaries after the court case), but somebody else is living in her house now. ‘we are always fighting, I do not know where my house is, but it should be somewhere around here, and somebody else is living in it, we do not know what is happening”. I have electricity but I do not pay the bills, the owner of this house lives in Duncan village and the bills are on his name. I am still member of the cooperative. Now somebody else also invaded one room in the house. The house is not finished and it is raining inside.
6.6. SHORT REPORTS OF KICK-OFF AND FEEDBACK WORKSHOPS

Kick off workshop feb 10th 2009 - short report

Participants: Utshani, SI, DAG, Planact, Afesis Corplan ; Kuyasa and JHC were excused

See PPT

Agenda 9 am-5:30 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme evaluation Slum Dwellers Cordaid, February 10th 2009: kick off workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome – <em>Muna Lakhani</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief presentation of the participants and expression of expectations regarding the programme evaluation (<em>round table</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of evaluation approach by <em>Corina Dhaene (ACE Europe)</em>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-identification of result chain and assessment of results at the level of slum dwellers: challenges and limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-collection of data combined with MSC stories: added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-selection of partners and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy of each partner – exercise - <em>Corina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you do? And what do you do with other people? (partners etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Most Significant Change and the arguments to select this MSC story within the partner organisation. <em>Presentation by the partners (10 minutes each)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of (quantitative) data at project level about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-direct access to basic services for slum dwellers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-development of claiming power at the level of slum dwellers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-policy influencing activities including slum dwellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Presentation of preliminary data collection together with identification of sites/groups/individuals to visit by Corina Dhaene (ACE Europe) and discussion about how</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of relations with Cordaid: Question 4 and 5  short presentation by Corina, then

1) Is the partnerportfolio effective in relation to CORDAID’s objectives?

2) How should CORDAID promote synergy between partners?

3) Any thoughts, questions or concerns about Urban Matters

Synthesis and finalisation of itinerary
Arrangements for the feedback workshop on February 24th 2009

Goodbye

1. Main expectations of the participants towards the evaluation:

- Clarification of the methodology of MSC and how the evaluation team tends to work with this during the mission.
- Discussion and exchange with colleagues about the results that come out and the differences in approach of the partners
- Better understanding of context specific elements in which the partners have to work

2 Presentation of the focus of the evaluation

Partners explain that it is difficult to see their programmes from this angle only (access to basic services). They are doing so many other things (large training programmes, working on civic education and participatory governance, integrated human settlement, …) and others like SI and Kuyasa Fund are specialised (resp. in research and working as an MFI).

Feedback from partners include understanding or otherwise of the questionnaire: there were some disconnects, as in some cases, only community engagement information was provided; some partners did (for example) policy work, which did not have any verifiable number of beneficiaries; critical was that some of the work the partners do was excluded from the responses, as the questions were in some ways, limiting.

3. Discussion on the strategies of partners

Based on answers to the questionnaire and exercise

Conclusions:
- the partners see themselves as catalysts that are adaptive and responsive. Their main aim is to shift practice on the ground.
- the context dictates them to be generalists: ‘so many of us are involved in so many things’, ‘we know that we need to apply a multiplicity of strategies’. There is little specialisation (exc. SI), yet the organisations state that they are recognised as specialists on soft issues (capacity building, empowerment, …).
- the link between research and being active on the ground is seen as strong/positive in relation to policy influencing
- most of the organisations have been around quite long
- they feel they sometimes function as the service arm of the state: filling the gaps by default

Exercise: where do partners fit in, and who else may they be working with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Research and design</th>
<th>Soft Issues and Governance</th>
<th>Hard issues / investment</th>
<th>Promoting accountability by government</th>
<th>Policy And practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Integrated settlements / training for national housing board</td>
<td>Administration of govt funding scheme</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uTshani</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (implementing policy on breaking ground)</td>
<td>Self help housing delivery</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAG</td>
<td>land practice local and Africa / identification of foreign best practice / In cooperation with foreign agencies</td>
<td>Community support, accompanying certain groups</td>
<td>WC provincial budget / public service commission review of housing delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ref group / sust human settlements PHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afesis</td>
<td>Co-op housing concept / land access first principle/</td>
<td>Local governance tools / OD with community groupings /</td>
<td>Local governance programme (community based accountability) – capacitate CSO’s to understand what is due, LA engagement, etc. / PHP, GGLN learning network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planact</td>
<td>Land management and democratic governance WITS and Urban Landmark partners; with DAG and Planact on socio-economic rights research; ward committee research, use that to feed public participation</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Channeling funds All spheres of govt and communities; project management</td>
<td>CSO, ward committees; LA, councilors; KPI initiative; education on IDP monitoring</td>
<td>GGLN; PHP; many informal fora; some international policy influencing channels, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A critical analysis of what partners do is a response to the need at the time, resulting in the wide diversity of actions, practice, etc. by the partners. For example, practice is sometimes required for credibility, to ensure that the call for changes (in policy, for example) are backed up.

4. Discussion on Most Significant Change

-appreciation of methodology: point of view of beneficiaries

-comments: method goes very much to the micro-level and subjective feelings. Reply ACE Europe: that is exactly why (1) some stories will be verified, (2) the method is in addition of the questionnaires that aims to collect quantitative data. DAG: not always easy to apply the methodology in an oral culture where people do not easily put things on paper. All MSC were therefore collected and written down by the partner. DAG organised discussions with the beneficiaries to let them identify the MSC for their group. Other partners did not make a selection of MSC.

-stories available from Kuyasa, Utshani (only some input from existing documents), Planact, DAG. Not yet ready Afesis Corplan (they presented an existing case).

Identification on the MSC for all the projects by the partners/participants: “improved self-esteem and capacity to do for yourself (new skills that can be marketed) and the community”. The partners feel that they can create circumstance for unlocking the potential in the communities.

Partners clearly struggle with exit strategies, there is a need for practical home education and maintenance of some infrastructure for e.g. storm water drainage. Different for Afesis with the cooperative housing concept (manual with guidelines is available).

Individual people did not always value collaborative action and for the partners it is clearly difficult to maintain collaborative action in communities in the way they helped to install it: ‘we created structures and thought these would still be there, but we find out they are not always there’. Conclusion of the discussion: a structure as such is not the objective but a working instrument; people involved in the structures and the projects are doing different new things now (and are coming out).
Partners explain their new focus on 'Land first', because because the product (the housing) takes to long to deliver now.

Overview of MSC presented by the partners (combination of hard and soft issues):
- Creating a family with rules, safety
- Purpose of life
- Space for children
- Upgrading ethos
- Taking on leadership and opening windows to other things
- Collaborative action and formalised partnership in the community
- Skills (through education and training): interaction, job qualifications, taking on leadership roles, going to local officials/municipality
- Capacity building – education and training
- Going to the municipality
- Feel like somebody

5. Overview of quantitative figures

Very few data were available at the time of the kick-off workshop (only some data from Planact).

6. Relations with Cordaid

- Only DAG knows about the diversity programme, was also trained in HIV
- Added value for Utshani: recruitment of engineers and architects
- Cordaid very flexible: ‘supporting us to pursue our own objectives’
- This is the first evaluation from Cordaid in years for most of the organisations
- Cordaid only conducts one to one discussions= missed opportunity (consultation on urban matters is new)
- Partners wonder how Cordaid is informed in its advocacy and lobby (mainly by the development context in the North, where is it sourced?)
- Social housing is a big priority for the government, but they hope this is not the core issue for Cordaid. This was clarified during the feedback workshop: the term social housing is used by Cordaid in a broad sense and refers to programmes that aim to improve access of poor citizens to security of tenure and housing.

7. Questions and concerns about UM

The following questions/remarks were recorded from CORDAID partners:

1) How will local people (residents and CBO’s) be included in delivery?
2) How will evidence be generated on the project – how will it be used to inform development practices?
3) Is capacity building and training of local people / stakeholders a key part of the project?
4) Will this develop a replicable model of good practice? (which can be rolled out elsewhere)
5) Do the ‘experts’ have all the answers?
6) Development is not sexy, it is hard work and requires a TOTAL commitment to a bottom-up approach.
7) Appreciate the idea of synergies amongst different role players – are they ready to engage with development on the community’s terms? What about when the community says no – makes things difficult for the project…
8) What is the primary aim of Urban Matters – to access Northern private sector money, or maximize synergies between local NGO’s and companies?
9) Why should Urban Matters be limited to one specific site?
10) Should UM be “managed” by one of the local partners?
11) UM vision… correct issue, focusing on urbanization & cities as sites of marginalized, BUT approach to development partnerships needs attention.
12) Wouldn’t it be more sustainable and effective if this collaboration was initiated through the expansion of one or more local partners’ existing interventions?
13) Our government is doing top down ‘sexy’ development just fine by themselves = SA and Dutch NGO’s don’t need to join this trend.

14) The best intended physical development projects can be undermined through a lack of community ownership and involvement, so plan VERY carefully.

15) How have local government partners been involved in conceptualization / design?

16) UM needs a common definition of ‘slums’ so that the same issues are talked about and addressed sensitively.

17) Needs to have a clear focus on the marginalized, with understanding of context.

Other issues to take note of from informal discussion and inputs from others:

1) Problems in Phillippi are generally resolved with violence, and one project lost a project leader who was killed – should UM take the same chance?

2) Regardless of overseas perceptions, Phillippi is an ANC (national government) ward in an opposition (DA) city – history shows that the City is unlikely to give it any special treatment or attention.

3) How much REAL public participation has taken place with residents and community organisations within Phillippi? Consulting with one or two NGO’s who work there is not adequate to ensure community ownership, so further analysis of who was actually consulted is required.

4) Most telling comments to date: “a scary project” “Frightening”

8. Clarification of approach site visits

This scheme was used to explain the field visits to partners and to fine-tune planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Site Observation and Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual interviews</strong> – Supply Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local govt officials, esp. in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
service delivery by partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People involved in capacity building programmes run by partner</th>
<th>Structures of project</th>
<th>MSC – identified by Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial and national govt</td>
<td>Local govt structures eg ward committees, etc</td>
<td>And possibly individuals that received training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

feedback workshop feb 24th 09 - short report

Participants: Planact, Afesis-Corplan, Kuyasa Fund, Utshani Fund, DAG, SI.
JHC: not present
Agenda: See PPT (agenda included)
This report summarizes the main points of discussion per Evaluation Question.

EQ 1: Access to basic services

The partners react to the conclusion that they underperformed when looking at hard delivery and number of housing units. The partners note that their ambition has never been to be measured by the number of housing units per year. The only partners that are working by numbers are Kuyasa Fund and Utshani Fund.

The involvement of partners in housing processes is a means to an end (with the exception of JHC). Being NGOs, they have their limits especially with regards to the magnitude of the housing backlog. Their main idea was to demonstrate the added value of PHP processes and to demonstrate the value of alternative delivery of housing units. As such, the partners have created value:

- In comparison to RDP houses: the houses delivered with facilitation of the partners have extra qualities and a sense of community has been build around them. The products look different for each community/project because demands and needs of the community have been taken into account. As such, inhabitants feel more responsible about their house/home.

- Partners, such as DAG have inspired other communities to use their ‘recipe’ (see mouth to mouth advertisement in the township of Khayelitsha)

The partners do admit however that they were unable to mainstream their approach in the
government housing policies (although they influenced on some policies through their involvement in policy reviews and reference groups at national level, such as the enhanced-PHP and breaking new ground, which was a manifestation of many years of advocacy). Other influence was the contribution of Afesis to the thinking of government on cooperatives.

This means that the government recognizes PHP as a valuable alternative for delivering housing units but that the partners and their approach are not seen as the ‘it’ in housing. As such their projects are islands (in ‘splendid isolation’) or ‘nice’ ideas (in the case of SI) with limited impact on urban development. The performance weakness of the partners lies in the slow pace of change and their inability to upscale their alternative approaches. Part of the responsibility lies with the NGOs themselves: ‘we have been too patient and too much engaged in a constructive relation with government who’s pace we followed. We should have been more assertive.’ Clearly, there was a (horrific, sic) lack of cohesion amongst the NGOs in dealing with government policies.

The partners are very much aware of this weakness: ‘It makes no sense to delivery Rolls Royce services in just one community, the scale really matters given the magnitude of the problems’. Clearly the partners cannot provide sufficient scale, but then ‘we should have ensured that others do this’, while assisting them with the integration of tools to address poverty and empowerment of communities: “If we do not succeed in this, we are busy ensuring sheltered employment for ourselves”. Other quotes: “CS as a sector does not stand up and is not taking the state on (many good people left and got employed in other sectors), but is very much focusing on projects’, hence ‘we do no longer have the voice/are the model voice’.

It is noted by Planact that, ‘because we are dealing with people’, the PHP processes/sustainable settlements approaches will not easily transform into scale. A solution is not formulated, but the partners agree that they should give this more thought (‘how do we work together and how do we come together?’).

A pre-requisite for up-scaling alternative housing and settlement approaches is government’s understanding of the process of community empowerment and capacity building. However, government is driven by a numbers debated and opts for a contractors driven solution (to achieve ‘massification’). The challenge is to take the experiences and knowledge from working with smaller communities to the public sphere, for e.g. through training of government officials. Most partners liaise with government officials through steering committees where beneficiaries and government sit at the same table. While this is extra ordinary and an achievement, the interaction and the involvement of government
officials tends to laps after the project (although government clearly integrates some lessons learnt in its consultation of citizens, see Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality).

The evaluators ask whether the ‘municipal wide planning’ approach that was introduced by DAG in 2008 might be a solution to include government, address the blockages in the housing processes and ensure qualitative work with communities. This is not yet clear. Up till now, partners have identified solutions at project and organizational level, but not yet at government level. There is a need for a paradigm shift in ‘how we see government planning and how we can relate to that’. The partners understand that this shift will complicate their work and that there is a call for different kinds of partnerships with different kinds of people mobilized under different strategies. DAG for e.g. already tries to stimulate different communities to develop some consciousness about the need to show more solidarity with the struggles of other communities. A weaker point of the partners is that they are not active/seen in places where a lot of the people from the target group meet, for e.g. in shabeens or spaza’s (see remark from Kuyasa).

Another idea to link up with government (in order to achieve up scaling) is related to the community development workers: according to the partners, municipalities are really struggling with giving these people meaningful jobs, this could be a potential source for partners, to train and involve them (mentoring them as a spinoff of their involvement in the partners’ projects).

According to the partners, the USN network which was dissolved in (??), has fundamentally impacted on the way the housing department at national and provincial level has dealt with housing. ‘We then tended to focus on the broad policy environment and did not satisfy ourselves with closing special deals with government’. The partners consider the end of USN as a big loss.

EQ 2 : groups and communities getting organized

The partners state that housing is only a project in a settlement development strategy which goes beyond a particular community and which entails a wider process of working with communities.

Partners however admit that they are weaker in documenting what is happening in their projects and processes, that they do not share and do not learn sufficient about the factors of success and failures in different communities. There is a lack of analysis of underlying factors in communities (power relations, physical and cultural boundaries of communicities, etc). DAG seems to be more advanced in systematizing its experiences and other partners could learn from this. Planact is now focusing on more action research. The
ambition of the partners is to evolve to learning organizations, ‘we should be more testing our practice to what is happening on the outside of our organisations’. There is a trade-off however: see large investment in people’s hours.

Although all partners say to work with communities (except SI and Kuyasa), they mainly focus on the leaders, ‘hoping’ that information and messages will get through to the larger community. They admit that there are limitations in working with leadership. In general, the partners do not always have an in-depth understanding of how communities and leadership work, for e.g. the relations of the leadership with the beneficiaries is not really mapped nor monitored during the course of the project and existing community networks and their functioning are not really analyzed. DAG seems to have evolved over the years and sophisticated their approach (see for e.g. identification of additional leader figures).

Partners want to take on new topics and issues with beneficiaries, but that is difficult with the current staff, for e.g. ecological aspects.

EQ 3: Communities taking deliberate action for the collective

- The role of ward councilors: ward councils and councilors are not necessarily seen as good mechanisms by the beneficiaries to be involved in planning or to interact with government. Some wards seem to work good, but in general there is a lot of suspicion (more in particular in housing process) about the role of the ward councilors (trying to get houses and jobs for their friends). Kuyasa Fund for e.g. is avoiding (almost at all costs) the ward councilors and ward councils.

The main discussion point was about how the partner involve beneficiaries in their policy work. Most of the partners try to include policy issues in their work with beneficiaries/communities:

- Afesis-Corplan has worked in the field of local governance, but this was unfortunately not connected to the housing projects. Through the housing projects, the idea is that beneficiaries are supported to engage with government. There are of course different types of government response, according to Afesis, the government in Eastern Cape is ‘dormant’.

- DAG is focusing on building citizenship, they want to enable citizens to engage with government through (1) skills building and exposure and (2) through developing political consciousness

- Action of Utshani Fund depends on what the beneficiaries want (see for e.g. current involvement in thinking about multiple store buildings around Durban).
Planact states that sometimes it is almost too hard for an NGO to get involved in policy processes at higher government level. For communities there are even more barriers (such as transport costs). Moreover, it is not because an NGO was involved, for e.g. in the PHP process, that government invites/informs the same NGO when further initiatives are taken.

The process of policy review as it is set up by the government is mostly very exclusive and no beneficiaries are invited to sit at the table. Partners try to build around this: organizing meetings with beneficiaries and using their input in the discussions. There is a consensus amongst the partners that beneficiaries should not be involved because they are beneficiaries (there have been bad examples of beneficiaries being used or co-opted by government).

The partners clarify that working with communities does not mean that they are accountable to them when it comes to their political and developmental activities: advocating for the interests of these groups is not the same as representing them; ‘our interventions are based on our experiences and our analysis’. The partners do not agree with government quote that they are ‘the extended arm of government’, although they confirm that government might want this. It is true that partners are sometimes engaged by government on their requests (except for Kuyasa Fund) but this is only true for a small portion of the budget (‘we sometimes need other projects’) and the partners make a choice based on their values and strategies.

It should be noted that the scope for civil society action and involvement has become much more limited than in the years after 1994, the sector is in crisis and is fighting for survival.

EQ 4: programmatic approach

No translation of the Cordaid programme(as a programme) to the SA reality: what did Cordaid want to achieve in SA with the different projects?

EQ 5: Four activities

- Learning and linking: input would be very much appreciated in the process of a learning organization. Initiative/input (with ideas and finances) should come from the partners, Cordaid could support this learning, sharing and collaboration based on specific learning objectives

- Cordaid is valued for its flexibility as a funder. Before this evaluation mission most partners did not think about what Cordaid could mean to them beyond funding.
The partners see a role for Cordaid to engage with SA government on the basis of the results of the partners, also saying to government that more could have been achieved if government would have been more engaged.

Some thoughts about the Urban matters project

Partners do feel a moral obligation to be active/to invest in very difficult areas. As such, they cannot say no to the initiative of urban matters and its focus on Phillippi.

- how to link this with municipal wide planning (to avoid another island)? And who should ensure the link? It is essential that this project is integrated in the framework of overall urban planning. The city should take up this project and then NGOs can define their roles within these parameters. The city wide approach is what UM should support, the activities in phillipi can then serve as a leaver to do the right thing. If not, ‘we will create another pocket of more wealth where people will flock to and new tensions will arise. Again we will have the same situation where poor people fight each other for basic services.’

- engage government: ‘if we do not do this, we might take government off the hook and this is very bad for our democracy’.

- take into account the role of municipal workers and also address their difficult work circumstances, (‘carrying buckets full of shit on flip flops through the whole township’). Partner up with them to address the issue of informal and uncontrolled settlements. They are stakeholders too.

- Cordaid should give us information about the projects in other countries.

Conclusions and goodbye

Partners will forward their lessons learnt from the past experiences (2003-2007). ACE Europe has specified conclusions on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability in an adapted version of the ppt, for the partners to comment on it.

6.7. QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE PARTNERS

What follows is the questionnaire to partners. For each partner there was additional explanation in green. This example is the questionnaire to UF.
The comments of ACE Europe are marked in green. I understand your frustration in dealing with some of the questions which are drafted to accommodate a programme evaluation in Mali, Peru and SA. Moreover, UF has clearly made a major shift in 2005 (see grant application to Miseror from 2006 of which the tone and the analysis is dramatically different from what we have read before). Nevertheless, this evaluation requires that we also collect data before 2005.

INTRODUCTION

With this document, ACE Europe would like to inform you about the evaluation mission and the way of working. At the same time, the document also invites the partners to start collection of specific data to assist us in the evaluation. As it is, Cordaid does not possess all the data we need and therefore we have to collect them at the level of the partners and their beneficiaries.

Here and there, we can find some information in your narrative reports, but the information is not recorded in a systematic manner. We assume that you would have this information ready made, the format might be however different.

This evaluation is about the access of slum dwellers to basic facilities in the field of water/sanitation, waste collection and removal and energy, next to questions about the programmatic approach of Cordaid.

Concerning the first topic of the evaluation: we understand that through its operations and approach, Utshani Fund is helping more people to access government subsidies in a quicker way and that people can built bigger houses with the same amount of money. We assume that with a house, also private facilities are in place: bathroom, connection to electricity and that those living in a newly build/refurbished settlement can also count on/use a system for household waste collection and removal because UF is ensuring relations with local government. If our understanding is correct, than the number of build houses gives an idea of access to basic facilities.

ACE Europe is executing this evaluation by means of two consultants: Corina Dhaene and Muna Lakhani.
The evaluation consists of two phases:
- a preparatory phase executed by Muna Lakhani (between December and beginning of February 2009) — the more data we can collect before the mission, the more time we have to talk to people about their experiences and perceptions.
- the proper evaluation mission between February 8th and 24th 2009, executed by both experts. A detailed travel scheme will be developed by the local consultant.

The evaluation will focus on the projects that are listed below. It was necessary to make a selection in order to save sufficient time for interaction with beneficiaries. The evaluation focuses on five evaluation questions (see further) that have been translated into judgement criteria and indicators. They will be the lead for interviews and discussions. (see further).

We will first highlight some important points, then add a questionnaire and some formats. To end this introduction, we would like to express our gratitude to your cooperation in advance!

What follows are the organisations and projects that are part of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afesis-Corplan (301163)</td>
<td>151/10052</td>
<td>April 2004 (3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha van der Walt</td>
<td>151/10052 A</td>
<td>January 2007 (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager Afesis-Corplan (old)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Kusambiza (new)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 11214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Wynne Street, Southernwood, East London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel: 043-7433830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 043-7432200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail: <a href="mailto:samantha@corplan.wn.apc.org">samantha@corplan.wn.apc.org</a> f <a href="mailto:Fred@afesis.org.za">Fred@afesis.org.za</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Institute (302326) (is now taking lead of projects started by E-systems, and is involved in the pilot ‘urban matters’)</td>
<td>151/10068 A</td>
<td>1.10.2006 (10 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact: Thompson-Smeddle Lisa SI <a href="mailto:Lisa@sustainabilityinstitute.net">Lisa@sustainabilityinstitute.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utshani Fund (has taken over financial part of PDLS)</td>
<td>151/1510 D</td>
<td>01-06-2003 (3 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P.O. Box 34639  
GROOTE SCHUUR 7937  
e-mail: cheryl@utshani.org.za

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDLS/People’s dialogue (closed down in 2005) 16729 – process of closing not evident, some activities are integrated in Utshani fund – questions to be answered by Utshani Fund: is this possible: do you have information about this?</td>
<td>01/04/03-01/04/06</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyasa Fund (founded by DAG in 1999) Mrs Olivia van Rooyen, Exec. Director, 3 Wrensch Road, Observatory 7925, CAPE TOWN <a href="mailto:oliviav@kuyasa.org.za">oliviav@kuyasa.org.za</a> <a href="mailto:info@kuyasa.org.za">info@kuyasa.org.za</a> +27 (0) 21 448 3144</td>
<td>1.07.2005 (3 years)</td>
<td>1.07.2005 (3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Action Group (DAG) Mrs. Anthea Houston 101 Lower Main Road, Observatory 7925, CAPE TOWN e-mail: <a href="mailto:antheah@dag.org.za">antheah@dag.org.za</a> <a href="http://www.dag.org.za">www.dag.org.za</a></td>
<td>1.04.2004 (3 years)</td>
<td>1.04.2004 (3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANACT (17172) Ms Rebecca Himlin 15th Floor, 209 Smit Street, Braamfontein, 2017 Johannesburg, South Africa Tel:+27-11-403 6291 Fax:+27-11-403-6982 E-mail: <a href="mailto:becky@planact.org.za">becky@planact.org.za</a></td>
<td>01-04-2004 (3 years)</td>
<td>01-04-2004 (3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-systems (301519) = Dutch organisation, activities (3rd phase) are now managed by a contractual relation with the Sustainability Institute, questions to be answered by the Sustainability institute</td>
<td>01/06/05-01/02/06 (7 months)</td>
<td>01/06/05-01/02/06 (7 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT IS IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO KNOW?**

**During the preparatory phase,** you are requested to assist us in collecting relevant data.
To this end, we provide you with some specific questions and formats for replying. (see further)

**Output expected:**

1. ACE Europe gains a better insight in who the beneficiary groups are with whom you are working
2. answers in writing to the questions and filled out formats (deadlines are mentioned on the formats)
3. identification of respondents for the method of Most Significant Change (see box below), preferably before the end of the year: for each beneficiary group that you have been working with under one of the projects identified for this evaluation, we would like you to identify at least 5 respondents for this method (for e.g. if you have worked in one of the projects with 5 different groups/wards/organisations, you should identify 25 respondents to be involved in the inquiry). Of course all will depend about the number of beneficiary groups the partner is working with (something we do not know yet); in order to limit the work: 25 written replies on the question per partner organisation should be the absolute maximum. It is important to have a good balance in the group of respondents; at least you should ensure as many female as male respondents. Once identified, the local consultant/evaluator might assist you in collecting the answers from the respondents; he will propose a travel scheme to that end should it be required. Ideally, your beneficiary groups are able to record some answers themselves, if not, the local consultant can assist you in the collection.

Please note, that the local consultant will identify additional respondents at the level of households in the areas of intervention, paying attention in particular to single female headed households and having a balance between newcomers and long-time residents in the area. The local consultant will consult with ACE Europe on the sample and will execute the collection of answers prior to the evaluation mission starting on February 8th 09.

**During the evaluation mission:** the partners are asked to gather in Cape Town for a kick-
off workshop (preliminary date is February 10th 2009 (full day)-- to be confirmed). Cordaid will contact one of the partners to provide us with the venue for this workshop and for the feedback workshop. Cost for meals and transport for partners coming from Johannesburg and Eastern Cape will be covered by Cordaid. The feedback meeting will take place on February, 24th 2009. (half day), also in Cape Town.

An itinerary (for the visits between kick-off and feedback) will be developed and communicated to you in due time.

Topics that will be discussed during the kick-off workshop:

- Presentation of the participants and their interventions to support access to basic facilities for slum dwellers
- Presentation of the evaluation approach (ToR, implementation, consultants, preliminary programme).
- Analysing the effectiveness and impact of the interventions at local level and at the level of the final beneficiaries: presentation of Most Significant change (see further), discussion about the self-assessment for each partner along the judgement criteria (work executed during the preparatory phase)
- Analysing the effectiveness and impact at programme level: mapping the initiatives and mechanisms (supported by Cordaid) through which the counterparts could establish synergies, mobilise additional financial resources, influence policies related to access to basic services for slum dwellers. How have the counterparts been involved and to what extent did the partner relationship with Cordaid help them in being more effective (also appreciation of the relations with Cordaid as a funder).
- Practical modalities for the execution of the mission; changes following the MSC method.

Output of the evaluation mission: a report with main discussion topics in kick off workshop and feedback meeting and a country mission report.

**Most significant change – some background**
The deskstudy (which is only available in Dutch unfortunately) made it clear that it will be very difficult to collect data on beneficiary level through Cordaid and even through the partners (CP or counterparts). Therefore ACE Europe suggests working with the method of Most Significant Change (MSC).60

Experiences with this method have demonstrated that the method can help in evaluations of complex programmes (executed by different partners and at different levels using various implementation mechanisms and achieving different types of results and outcome) that are aimed at realizing social change and for which there are no reliable monitoring data available. This method was presented to Cordaid during the kick-off meeting and accepted. Cordaid confirmed that partners will cooperate on this.

The idea behind this method is that MSC stories will be collected amongst the CP of Cordaid and their beneficiary organizations.

- **What kind of information will be collected:** the idea is to ask people involved in projects what are the MSC they have observed/experienced in the lives of beneficiaries when looking at a certain domain. This domain should be determined before the collection. The domain relevant for this evaluation is: the direct living environment of slum dwellers.

- **How will this information be collected:** the CPs are asked to contact the staff/members of beneficiary organizations/groups per identified project to answer the simple question (in writing): “what has changed most significantly in the lives of the slum dwellers/your life when looking at their/your direct living environment?” Each beneficiary organization/group (if organized groups are involved) should collect preferably 5 different stories and should make a selection amongst the most significant changes (or make a ranking) arguing why they choose this change/ranking. The next step is at the level of the partner organisation: from the MSC they received from their beneficiary organizations/groups, they have to select again the MSC according to them (while justifying their choice).

**This means there are two steps:** 1. collection of stories amongst those that are involved in the project (from the different groups you are working with) and 2. discussion within the

---

UF about the MSC according to you. These stories will be presented during the kick off workshop. All the stories however should be recorded because they are illustrations of changes.

- **Who organizes this process?** The partner organisation to start with (in cooperation with the beneficiary organisations). The local consultant can support and motivate the CP to select the MSC. The counterpart will make sure that all collected stories will be kept properly (see format).

- **When should this take place?** This process should take place prior to the field mission. The advantages of this method during the preparatory phase is: that the local consultants will capture unexpected outcomes (next to the indicators that are formulated under each evaluation question), that a wealth of information will be collected at beneficiary level at a reasonable cost. It might be possible that based on these MSC the itinerary of the evaluation mission should be adapted.

- **What will happen with the information during the field evaluation mission?** The collected information will be used to feed in the joint workshop planned in each country with the CP at the start of the field mission. It will allow the CP to exchange information with each other and to analyze the impact of their programmes together with the evaluation team. (for the organization of this workshop, see the above). After this workshop, the evaluation team will select the MSC stories and visit the related sites and beneficiaries to verify the stories, to add to their content and to collect additional information.
QUESTIONS TO PARTNERS

Below, we formulate some questions for you to prepare the mission. We would appreciate a reply by December 20th 2008 in order to allow the local consultant to start working. In annex, you will find the main evaluation questions and an overview of judgement criteria and indicators. These will hopefully clarify to you how we will be looking at your projects. Make sure to indicate which data are missing. This will help ACE Europe to identify additional ways of collecting data if necessary! When asked for examples, please do not only mention that you have them, but also try to describe them briefly.

Deadline: December 20th 2008, please send the answers to Muna Lakhani (muna@iafrica.com) with copy to Corina Dhaene (corina.dhaene@ace-europe.be)

Below, we ask you to fill out the formats related to
- Your organization
- your point of view on the projects
- identification of respondents for the MSC (Most Significant Change)
- collection of data following evaluation questions, judgment criteria and indicators.

You will also find a format for collecting answers on the MSC

Collection of data per organisation and project

Name of the organisation: Utshani Fund
General questions

3. What strategy is applied by the organisation when putting in place facilities for basic services?

Answer:
Our understanding: UF is not directly involved in this; however: assisting poor people in making actual use of the government subsidies leads to the construction of houses with individual bathrooms and connected to a kind of sewage system. The local government should ensure access to community services – what is UF doing to make sure that this happens/or is there never a problem: are the so called partnerships and Memoranda of understanding the answer? Our question: to what extent is the way you are facilitating the township establishment (planning) taking into account access to services such as household waste collection and removal and connection to energy/electricity?

4. What strategy is applied by the organisation when strengthening the capacities of slum dwellers to organise themselves?

Answer:
Our understanding: UF is working on this in an indirect way: they only support groups that adhere to certain principles (shackdwellers’ international network). You have field workers: what are they doing, what are their relations with the community networks? You assume that the networks your are working with (such as FEDUP) and their activists support the poor during their development activity; what kind of support is necessary to make the intervention of UF successful? In other words: what should be in place? Very interesting in your application for Miseror in 2006 (page 10) is your critical attitude against a membership approach to social mobilisation!!! What about the community centres, mentioned in the narrative reports? On your website is stated that through your way of working, the UF builds social capital: what do you mean by that: do you mean the ‘federation approach’?

5. What strategy is applied by the organisation when assisting the slum dwellers (and their organisations) in lobbying for
changes in politics and practices towards the competent bodies dealing with provision of basic services?

Answer:
Our understanding: the UF is a practitioner of action advocacy using the SA housing subsidy entitlement. To what extent is your approach changing the minds of local governments when planning for and delivering services, such as connection to energy and household waste collection and removal. An interesting case might be the project in Tshwane Ga Rankuwa (see your narrative report April-June 2008).

6. Who are the main direct beneficiaries of the organisation?

Answer:
Our understanding: the main direct beneficiaries are the community networks: do you have a list of those you are/have been supporting together with an estimation of people involved (men and women) from 2002-2007? The final beneficiaries are the people that receive a house: do you have a list of the number of people that are being served (or number of households, do you have data about the number of single female/children headed households)?

7. What are the global/overall objectives of the organisation?

Answer:
I believe this question is clear.

8. Which local, provincial or national government role-players have you engaged with? Provide details, including contact details

Answer:
I believe this question is clear.
9. which local, provincial or national policies do you consider relevant to the work you do, and what are their shortcomings?

Answer:
I believe this question is clear

With the following, we would like to check our information based on the databases and information within Cordaid
Below we are mentioning the information we have, please check this information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr of project</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Number of slum dwellers reached (direct and indirect)</th>
<th>Local NGO partners</th>
<th>Other stakeholders</th>
<th>IMPACTS of the project (the appreciation of the project manager)</th>
<th>Qualitative indicators of change</th>
<th>Quantitative indicators of change</th>
<th>Identification of respondents for MSC: identify the beneficiary group and the 5 respondents for each beneficiary group and their gender*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Code 1510/D   |                |                                                  |                   |                  |                                                 |                                |                             | Beneficiary group 1: XX (name)  
1. XX respondent  
2.  
3.  
4. |


To identify respondents for the MSC method, I suggest the following groups:

1. Community centers: ask 5 people in one of the community centers that was involved in PDSL/UF project about the MSC of being involved.

2. FEDUP: ask 5 community activists about their perception of the MSC of being involved in the projects with PDSL and/or UF.

3. Inhabitants of a settlement belonging to a saving group (choose a settlement from the period before 2005 and one after 2005): ask 5 people in two different settlements about how being assisted by the federation and UF has changes their lives when looking at their living environment. Try to make a difference between tenants/owners (if applicable), old/newcomers.

As such, the UF will have collected 20 replies/MSC stories from which to choose the MSC for UF.

Please check the information in the following and try to add:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Result area (coding from Cordaid)</th>
<th>Outreach planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151/1510/E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>period</th>
<th>Total budget</th>
<th>Cordaid contribution planned</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151/1510 D</td>
<td>01-06-2003 – 3 years</td>
<td>774.728,25</td>
<td>530.000.00</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151/1510 E</td>
<td>1 April 2007 - 2 years</td>
<td>1.901.706</td>
<td>300.000 DAB: 70% MO: 20% BB: 10% DAB 3 BB1 MO 1 DAB 1 MO 2</td>
<td>10.000 people (60% women) 6 initiatives 10 organizations (60% women) 60.000 (60% women) 10 organizations (50% women)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Utshani Fund (has taken over financial part of PDSL) |                             |                         |

| PDLS/People’s dialogue (closed down in 2005) 16729 –process of closing not evident, activities are |                             |                         |

*The evaluator Muna Lakhani, will contact you to organise the collection of answers from these groups.*
Source: Cordaid: DAB is direct poverty alleviation, MO is civil society development and BB is policy influencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr. Title of project</th>
<th>Target area</th>
<th>beneficiaries</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Results expected</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utshani Fonds 151/1510 D</td>
<td>8 provinces, Which settlements?</td>
<td>Indirect: Members: 80,000 of which 90% women Direct: 277 community organisations (women’s savings collectives) affiliated to the federation</td>
<td>The federation (as part of the alliance) -government institutions at different levels</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>-Support saving schemes and networks to negotiate subsidies with municipalities and provinces -Monitor loan repayments -Monitor and witness legal contract -Monitor unfinished developments -Re-collection, formulation and implementation of the plans at regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151/1510 E</td>
<td>6 provinces which settlements?</td>
<td>The urban poor</td>
<td>The federation (as part of the alliance) -government institutions at different levels</td>
<td>-600 new houses constructed or in progress by December 31 2007, 1000 in each participating province -complete existing projects (unfinished houses) (how much?) -provide wholesale top-up credit to urban poor funds in each major region by the end of 2006 -learning groups have been set up for advocacy</td>
<td>-intermediate between the SA housing subsidy system and organised communities -source and administer technical professional support for community interface (not clear??) -support community driven credit by our partners (what exactly is meant by this?) -investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLS (closed down in 2005) 16729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cordaid

For us, it is not clear where we can find the most information? Is it in Cape town, or should we also include other provinces in our mission?? What sites/settlements would you suggest?
Collection of data per evaluation question

**Organisation:** Utshani fund
More information per evaluation question is in annexe

## Questions at project level

Please fill out per project !!

*Project nr. 1510 D and 1510 E (fill out the questions for each project co-financed by Cordaid) you can take the two projects together*

Would you be able to collect information about the PDLS project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ1</th>
<th>JC 1</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>0.1 - 0 Water and sanitation</th>
<th>0 Waste collection and removal</th>
<th>0 Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each year (of the project intervention) and each domain addressed, you should be able to provide

**EQ1 (Evaluation question 1) To what extent do slum dwellers have increased access (including use and affordability) to basic facilities such as refuse removal, water and energy thanks to the interventions of the CPs?**
quantitative data on the number of facilities (fill out the X) – for the years that there was no project, just put NA (not applicable)

I suggest you mention per year (between 2003-2008)

- Number of houses planned and executed (and specify when applicable those with connection to sewage system, proper toilets, connection to energy for e.g. solar power?)

- The number of settlements created (and if applicable: the provision of household waste collection and removal, arrangements for water collection and drainage – is this covering the whole settlement or not?).

You can make your proper table format:

-may be UF has developed specific pilots which might serve as a case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Water/sanitation (nr. of facilities)</th>
<th>Wast collection/removal (nr. of facilities)</th>
<th>Energy (nr. of facilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>XX community level</td>
<td>XX community</td>
<td>XX community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX household level</td>
<td>XXX household level</td>
<td>XXX household level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>XX community</td>
<td>XX community</td>
<td>XX community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXX household level</td>
<td>XXX household level</td>
<td>XXX household level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>XX community</td>
<td>XX community</td>
<td>XX community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1</td>
<td>JC 1 Ind 1.4.</td>
<td>Do you have a baseline study for this project? If yes, please mention title, author, date. When you assist in the creation of new settlements and housing: what is the information you collect about the (potential) inhabitants, the environment, …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1</td>
<td>JC 1 Ind 1.4.</td>
<td>Do you have figures about the number of actual users of the facilities (set-out against the number of potential users)? If yes, can you provide us with an overview for the whole project/facility/group of facilities during the evaluation mission? Continue with your new table: if you have the total number of houses: who is living in them, how many unfinished houses are there every year, who lives in these houses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1</td>
<td>JC 1 Ind 1.5.</td>
<td>Do you have concrete data about the functioning of the facilities or services (and the breakdowns?) If yes, can you provide us with an overview for the whole project/facility/group of facilities during the evaluation mission?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQ 1 | JC 2 | Ind 2.1. | **What are in general the criteria for having access to the facilities (per domain). Are there variations per facility? On what do they depend?**  
Water/sanitation:  
Waste collection/ removal:  
Energy:  
I understand that the poor need to be part of a group that adheres to some principles before UF will assist them. What are the exact criteria and how often does it happen that UF withdraws? |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EQ 1 | JC 2 | Ind 2.1. | **Do you have data on the cost of new services/facilities (in each domain) for the individual beneficiary/household?**  
Water/sanitation:  
Waste collection/ removal: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | 2  | 2.2. | Does your organisation conduct analysis to ensure that there is no exclusion? If yes, how are you conducting this analysis?  
By exclusion we mean: is it possible that some groups in society are excluded from your assistance, for e.g. because they cannot be part of a group? For e.g. HIV infected persons and PLWHA, children headed households, etc. Are you aware of this/doing anything about this? |
| 1  | 2  | 2.3. | How many slum dwellers (if any) have received a financial support (credit, loan, micro-finance, …) for establishing facilities? Please mention gender segregated data.  
Next to your facilitation of accessing housing subsidy, what other financial products is UF offering? |
| 1  | 3  | 3.1. | Do you have/use specific charts/descriptions of mechanisms illustrating how facilities are managed? If yes, can you provide us with this during the evaluation mission?  
Not applicable |
| 1  | 3  | 3.2. | What are the strategies (introduced and applied) to ensure financial sustainability of the facilities (and what are the results?)  
Are you dealing with this or not at all? |
<p>| EQ | JC | Ind | How has the project explained the management of facilities to the beneficiaries and the role division between |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>4.1. stakeholders involved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are interested in how you explain to beneficiaries the system of subsidy and service delivery by the government, for e.g. through your field workers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>4.2. Can you see any changes in mind set or behaviour of beneficiaries (related to water/waste/energy)? If yes, what changes can you witness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>You do not have to limit yourself to the basic services, you can think about 'wider living environment'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQ2 To what extent did slum dwellers develop their claim making power/capacity to ensure the sustainable and equitable development of their community thanks to the interventions of the CPs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>1.1. How did the project support the beneficiaries to sit together and to jointly discuss their needs and problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I can imagine that you sit with beneficiaries when designing and planning for a new settlement? Or not? Or is this left to the partners’ responsibility such as FEDUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>JC</th>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>1.2. Are there examples to demonstrate that there is a certain community dynamic/collective action with regards to access to basic facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the examples and which people/groups played a role in them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You mentioned in your narrative report of 2008 an example in Tshwane; are there other examples between 2003-2007?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQ 2 | JC 1 | Ind 1.3. | Do you know about examples taken by the slum dwellers to take their problems and questions to the competent bodies/authorities?  
*See my remark in the above* |
| EQ 2 | JC 1 | Ind 1.4. | Did you organise trainings on leadership? Who were the participants? (we would like to include them in the evaluation mission).  
*Question remains, just answer yes or no* |
| EQ 2 | JC 2 | Ind 2.1. | How did the project contribute to better access to information about access to/better services?  
*Question remains* |
| EQ 2 | JC 2 | Ind 2.2. | How did the project work around the theme of social inclusion with the slum dwellers?  
*Question remains: was the topic addressed or not?* |

**EQ3**  
To what extent have slum dwellers been able to use their claim making power to change policies and local government planning/operations regarding to access to basic facilities thanks to the intervention of the CPs?  
| EQ 3 | JC 1 | Ind 1.1.-1.2. | How did the project ensure a link (involvement) between slum dwellers and certain (formal/informal) systems for planning, execution and evaluation of competent bodies/institutions?  
*Question remains: was there a link, even indirect, or not at all? Is the involvement of community activists in* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 3</th>
<th>JC 1 Ind 1.3.</th>
<th>What are the changes that your organisation have witnessed when looking at the interaction between the slum dwellers and the public authorities (regarding access to basic services)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 3</td>
<td>JC 2 Ind 2.1.</td>
<td>Have there been specific initiatives initiated by the slum dwellers formulating concrete proposals for change programmes in any of the domains (water/sanitation, waste, energy)? Does UF receive concrete applications for supporting projects in settlements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the following questions remain valid/relevant

Questions at the level of the partner organization and its relations with Cordaid
**EQ4 To what extent has the mix of partner organizations (CPs) supported, been the most effective and relevant in order to achieve the objectives of the program in each of the three countries?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 4</th>
<th>JC 1</th>
<th>Ind 1.1.</th>
<th>How did Cordaid discuss with you (in the beginning and during execution) the objective of its programme directed to slum dwellers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4</td>
<td>JC 2</td>
<td>Ind 2.1. 2.2.</td>
<td>Cordaid tried to stimulate a synergy between the partners: do you know about concrete initiatives and was your organisation implied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes: how has your organisation been involved and what were the results of that involvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4</td>
<td>JC 3</td>
<td>Ind 3.1.</td>
<td>How would you assess the link between the objectives of your organisation and the objectives of the Cordaid programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4</td>
<td>JC 3</td>
<td>Ind 3.2.</td>
<td>How have you cooperated with other partners of Cordaid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 4</td>
<td>JC 3</td>
<td>Ind 3.3.</td>
<td>Did your organisation adapt its strategies/intervention logic with view to the cooperation with Cordaid?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQ5 To what extent have the four core activities of Cordaid contributed to the effectiveness of the programme and sustainability of its***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 5</th>
<th>JC1</th>
<th>Ind 1.2.</th>
<th>What are the activities for linking and learning in which your organisation has participated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>Ind 1.3.</td>
<td>Have these activities enabled you to introduce new elements in your organisation? If yes, can you give examples?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>JC 2</td>
<td>Ind 2.1.</td>
<td>What are the (international) lobby activities supported/initiated by Cordaid in which your organisation has been involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>Ind 2.2.</td>
<td>Did this involvement change anything for your organisation? If yes, in what way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>JC 3</td>
<td>Ind 3.1.</td>
<td>What is the percentage of activities from your organisation aimed at slum dwellers and their access to basic services (according to the budget and per year since 2003)? Estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2003: XXX% of the budget aimed at slums | XXXXX% aimed at slums and access to basic services |
| 2004: XXX% of the budget aimed at slums | XXXXX% aimed at slums and access to basic services |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 5</th>
<th>JC 3</th>
<th>Ind 3.2.</th>
<th>Did the (financial) support from Cordaid enable you to identify and have access to additional financial resources? If yes, can you give examples?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>JC 3</td>
<td>Ind 3.3.</td>
<td>What is, in general the added value of the financial support of Cordaid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>JC 4</td>
<td>Ind 4.1.</td>
<td>Has your organisation been involved in initiatives with Dutch organisations? If yes, can you give examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>JC 4</td>
<td>Ind 4.2.</td>
<td>What does your organisation expect from the pilot Urban matters (as far as you are informed)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are at the end of our questions! Thank you for your cooperation which is much appreciated.
FORMAT FOR COLLECTION OF ANSWERS TO MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

Written answer to the question/per respondent

“what has changed most significantly in the lives of the slum dwellers/your life when looking at their/your direct living environment (the area where you live) since 2003 (or the date of the start of the project)?”

Name of the person that recorded the answer:

Name of respondent:

Gender :

Area/Ward :

Living here since:

Link with the following organisation (fill out) XXX:
(what link? Fill out): XXX

Answer to the question (try to have answers on the period of change, a description of the change and explanation why this change was so significant according to the respondent?

I suggest some questions:
Tell me how you (the storyteller) first became involved in working with PDLS/UF?

From your point of view describe the most significant change that has resulted from your involvement in your life and the quality of your direct living environment?

Why is this significant to you?
The idea is that UF chooses the different MSC-stories the most significant from its proper point of view and argues its selection. The evaluators should be able to consult all the stories.
### Questions at project level

**EQ1 To what extent do slum dwellers have increased access (including use and affordability) to basic facilities such as refuse removal, water and energy thanks to the interventions of the CPs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC1 There are more facilities of good quality in each of the three domains at the disposal of the slum dwellers and responding to their needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality is identified as: according to the technical ‘rules’ /standards of the country</td>
<td>1.1. The actual number of facilities for refuse removal (common and household) and evolution since 2003 (in the area of intervention and compared to baseline data if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. The number of facilities for water and sanitation (common and household) and evolution since 2003 (in the area of intervention and compared to baseline data if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. The number of facilities for energy (common and household) and evolution since 2003 (in the area of intervention and compared to baseline data if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. The number of actual users (M/F) or number of connections to common facilities/systems is acceptable (compared to the identified potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5. The facilities are according to the nationally accepted standards and of quality (check for number of breakdowns, the duration of breakdowns, functioning of sewage under heavy rainfall, …)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EQ2 To what extent did slum dwellers develop their claim making power/capacity to ensure the sustainable and equitable development of their community thanks to the interventions of the CPs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| JC2 There are no (implicit or unintended) mechanisms that exclude certain beneficiaries from having access to or using the facilities | 2.1. Criteria to have access are accepted by all beneficiaries as reasonable/adapted to their situation (the cost for the new service is justified in relation to the advantages) *  
2.2. There is evidence of CP’s analysis of exclusion mechanisms (geographical, financial, cultural, ethnic, nationality) and gender sensitivity at the level of projects and beneficiary organisations (prior and during project execution) and appropriate action if necessary  
2.3. Number of slum dwellers that benefited from micro-finance for establishing facilities (only relevant for SA) |
| JC3 The facilities are managed in a sustainable way | 3.1. There is evidence of formal and functional mechanisms for management of the facilities in which the stakeholders (competent government players, users and others) involved have clearly defined tasks and responsibilities (institutional sustainability) – description of different mechanisms  
3.2. There is evidence of strategies to ensure financial sustainability (policy and practice) |
| JC4 The beneficiaries acknowledge and demonstrate joint ownership over/responsibility towards the facilities | 4.1. The beneficiaries feel informed about the management of the facilities and can explain the task and role division  
4.2. A change in mindset and/or behavior can be witnessed in each of the three areas (water, waste, energy), including the willingness to pay and the actual payment of services |
| JC1 Beneficiaries involved in the projects are better able to identify their needs for community development and to bring these to the attention of competent bodies (in an organized manner) | 1.1. Evidence of beneficiaries organizing themselves to identify community development needs (emergence of community groups but also less formal groups of a temporary character)  
1.2. Evidence of involvement of beneficiaries in these initiatives (including the involvement of women and youth) (check for inclusion and exclusion mechanisms when mobilizing beneficiaries for action)  
1.3. There are concrete examples of beneficiaries addressing competent bodies to clarify their needs in an organized/prepared manner at different levels, from household to city council (pay attention to innovative approaches and strategies, see youth in Peru)  
1.4. Participants of leadership training acknowledge they have acquired new skills to communicate and negotiate on behalf of the community (and this is confirmed by beneficiaries and other respondents) |
| JC2 Beneficiaries (that were involved in the Cordaid projects) demonstrate an increasing awareness of rights and obligations | 2.1. Beneficiaries know where to find information (about policies, budget spending, data on the situation in their community) to sustain their claims (preparatory work)  
2.2. Beneficiaries can explain why it is important to develop inclusive strategies, involving women, youth, elderly, … and can explain how they have integrated this in their initiatives  
2.3. Beneficiaries can explain what the roles are of different stakeholders involved in the development of their community and can give examples of how they are dealing with this |

**EQ3 To what extent have slum dwellers been able to use their claim making power to change policies and local government planning/operations regarding to access to basic facilities thanks to the intervention of the CPs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**JC1** Relevant and functional mechanisms are in place to involve slum dwellers in planning, execution and monitoring/evaluation of local government policies regarding basic facilities (process)

1.1. There is evidence of different types of mechanisms* to involve beneficiaries in planning, execution (…) of service delivery in general being applied (pay attention to the identification and selection of participants, management of process, the concrete output, …)

1.2. x slum dwellers that are involved (estimate the % of beneficiaries (households and if possible individual men and women) and their organisations involved in Cordaid projects

1.3. Slum dwellers and local government can give concrete examples of changes in the way they are cooperating/interacting (and the results of this)**

1.4. The mechanisms are adapted to the local context and are in line with the needs of the slum dwellers and the policies developed.

**JC2** There is evidence of concrete initiatives to change (parts) of the policies or policy making related to basic service delivery (ad hoc activities)

2.1. x initiatives that have been undertaken by slum dwellers for the benefit of the larger community (higher goals, with or without support of the CP, specify level and aspects that are targeted)

2.2. Respondents can give examples of concrete changes resulting from these initiatives

---

**Question at the level of the partner organization and its relations with Cordaid**

**EQ4 To what extent has the mix of partner organizations (CPs) supported, been the most effective and relevant in order to achieve the objectives of the program in each of the three countries?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| JC1 The management of a diversified partner portfolio by Cordaid (and the PV) contributed to achieving the objectives of the programme (see EQ 1-3) | 1.1. Identification and selection of partners is related to the objectives of the programme (that are relevant for this evaluation)  
1.2. There is a good balance between the different types of partners and their intervention strategies (adapted to the context of the country) |
1.3. There is evidence of correspondence of the CP’s objectives, strategies and way of working/approaches to beneficiaries with those of Cordaid

1.4. The relevance and effectiveness of the partner portfolio is monitored by Cordaid and adjusted if necessary

| JC2 There is evidence of efforts to create synergy in objectives, strategies and activities between the CP in each country | 2.1. x of initiatives taken by Cordaid to establish and promote synergy
2.2. xx of CP involved (in one way or the other) in these initiatives |
|---|---|

| JC3 The current partner portfolio allows for a programmatic approach | 3.1. The CP can relate their interventions to the objectives of the programme (that are relevant for this evaluation)
3.2. There is evidence of (emerging) coalitions and cooperation between the counterparts in each country aiming at achieving the objectives of the programme ‘Slum dwellers’
3.3. CPs have adjusted their strategies to seek complementarities with other stakeholders (with view to the objectives of Cordaid’s programme) |
|---|---|

**EQ5 To what extent have the four core activities of Cordaid contributed to the effectiveness of the programme and sustainability of its outcomes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| JC1 The linking and learning helped the CPs and Cordaid to realise the objectives of the programme and to sustain its results | 1.1. x activities/opportunities offered by Cordaid (country and cross country) that were relevant to the country context (see conferences and workshops, desk study, page 25)
1.2. xx of CPs taking part in these activities
1.3. CPs confirm they have been able to introduce new elements in their organization and in the approach towards the beneficiaries to realize the objectives and to sustain the results
1.4. The PV’s of Cordaid confirm the added value |
| See also case ‘Urban matters’ | --- |

---

Creating synergy between CP was more on the agenda of Cordaid after 2007
the learning and linking initiatives and can identify lessons learnt for Cordaid’s intervention in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JC2</th>
<th>(International) lobby activities supported/initiated by Cordaid have allowed CP and Cordaid to realize concrete steps forward in securing access to basic services for slum dwellers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | 2.1. Number of CP that have been involved in /are aware of lobby activities through the strategic alliances of Cordaid (see deskstudy, p. 23-24) and the quality of this involvement*  
2.2. CPs can give concrete examples of benefits of this involvement (at institutional, organizational and beneficiary level) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JC3</th>
<th>The funding (and related support) by Cordaid allowed the CPs to make a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | 3.1. The proportion of CPs activities aimed at slum dwellers and basic service delivery and the number of beneficiaries involved (for each CP) justifies the related Cordaid funding  
3.2. CPs have gained a better view on local fundraising  
3.3. The co-financing of Cordaid serves as a leverage |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JC4</th>
<th>The initiatives to strengthen public support for development cooperation in the Netherlands (and involvement of the private sector) can have added value for the work of CP and vice versa for the work of Cordaid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | 4.1. X concrete initiatives that have been set-up  
4.2. Ex-ante assessment of this type of activities by the CP (to the extent they are aware of these activities) |

*who is taking part and when, who is representing the counterpart, how does feedback happen?