



**KHANYA**

**Workshop on  
Community-Based  
Planning  
in South Africa**

19 & 20 June 2001,  
Umhlanga Rocks Hotel,  
KwaZulu Natal

Decentralised Development Planning, DPLG  
LOGOSUL Project, DPLG  
CARE  
Mangaung Local Municipality

**Khanya – managing rural change cc**

17 James Scott Street, Brandwag, Bloemfontein, 9301, Free State, South Africa  
Tel +27 (0)51 430 0712 Fax +27 (0)51 430 8322 Email [goldman@internext.co.za](mailto:goldman@internext.co.za)  
Website [www.khanya-mrc.co.za](http://www.khanya-mrc.co.za)

**CONTENTS**

<b>PART 1: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
1. Introduction .....	1
<b>PART 2: SCENE SETTING</b> .....	2
2. Introduction to the CBP project and the partners .....	2
3. Local government in 2010.....	4
4. Guidance on participation in the development planning process .....	6
5. Overview of community-based planning (and management).....	8
<b>PART 3: CASE STUDIES</b> .....	10
6. Experiences in using sustainable livelihoods approach in setting LDOs in the Free State .....	10
7. Isulabasha/Mvunyane water and sanitation project.....	13
8. Planning for community eco-cultural tourism development in the Maluti area, Eastern Cape...	14
9. The Western Joubert Park Precinct Pilot Project.....	17
10. Diepsloot .....	23
11. The Kuyasa capacity building programme.....	25
<b>PART 4: GROUP WORK</b> .....	26
12. Group work.....	26
<b>PART 5: WAY FORWARD</b> .....	29
13. Way forward.....	29
Annexure 1: Programme.....	31
Annexure 2: List of Participants .....	32

**GLOSSARY**

CBO	Community-based organisation
CBP	Community-Based Planning
CDF	Community development forum
CTO	Community tourism organisation
DANIDA	Danish international development agency
DDP	Decentralised Development Planning
DFID	UK's Department for International Development
DPLG	Department of Provincial and Local Government
DRA	Demand responsive approach
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
GJMC	Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council
HBRI	Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative
IA	Implementation agent
IDP	Integrated Development Plan
IMDC	Isibalasha/Mvunyane Development Committee
ISD	Institutional and social development
JICCF	Johannesburg Inner City Community Forum
JPNC	Joubert park Neighbourhood Centre
LAP	Local action plan
LDF	Local development forum
LDO	Local Development Objectives
LED	Local economic development
LOGOSUL	Local Government Support and Learning Programme
LTO	Local tourism organisation
NGO	Non-government organisation
O&M	Operation and maintenance
PMC	Project management cycle
PSC	Project steering committee
PRA	Participatory rural appraisal
RDP	Reconstruction and development programme
SALGA	South African Local Government Association
TA	Training needs assessment
TJSB	Tugela Joint Services Board
TRC	Transitional rural council
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UTO	Ukhahlamba Tourism Association
WSA	Water Services Authority
WSP	Water Services Provider

This report is available from [www.khanya-mrc.co.za](http://www.khanya-mrc.co.za)

# COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING IN SOUTH AFRICA WORKSHOP REPORT

## PART 1: INTRODUCTION

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background

Khanya-managing rural change is co-ordinating an action-research project involving Ghana, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Uganda to see how to strengthen community-based planning as part of a decentralisation process. This is being funded by DFID London, and will involve a review of experience in each of the 4 countries, followed by visits to two countries where such systems are working (India and Bolivia) and developing lessons from these for applying as a pilot in the four partner countries. The first stage of this work is the review and workshop in each country.

This workshop was held on 19 & 20 June 2001, in Umhlanga Rocks, Durban to bring together practitioners involved in participatory planning, to review the current experience and situation in South Africa, and identify learnings and gaps.

#### 1.2 Workshop objectives

The objectives were that by the end of the workshop participants would have:

- An understanding of the present mechanisms, structures and systems that are being put in place for participatory planning in terms of recent local government legislation and guidelines;
- Reviewed current experience with structured participatory planning in SA, identified learnings and gaps and how to involve other stakeholders (notably business and government departments) in the planning process; and

- Helped to create a learning network of people in South Africa interested in participatory planning.

#### 1.3 Workshop Programme

The programme covered the following main elements:

- Introduction (background, opening and personal introductions)
- Scene setting – processes, policies and institutions in CBP in SA
- Presentations of case studies by various organisations
- Discussion groups on emerging themes
- The way forward and closure

The programme is in Annex 1. The workshop was opened by Councillor Joe Nene, Speaker of the Durban Unicity Council and closed by Councillor Z A Zumane of Mangaung Municipality.

Participants came from national departments, Eastern Cape, Kwazulu/Natal and Free State provincial governments, municipalities and NGOs. A list of participants is in Annex 2.

## PART 2: SCENE SETTING

### 2. INTRODUCTION TO THE CBP PROJECT AND THE PARTNERS

#### 2.1 The community based planning project: learning from experience.

James Carnegie, Khanya-managing rural change.

In 1998-2000, Khanya undertook action-research funded by DFID looking at “Institutional Support for Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa”. The main focus of the work was looking at institutional issues arising in South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe, if a sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach were to be implemented. This identified that if livelihoods of poor people are to improve, we need to improve the linkages between micro level (community) and meso level (local government and district service providers).

This new Community-Based Planning (CBP) project focuses on one aspect of this, community involvement in the planning process. Unless poor people can influence the resource allocation system, the ability to promote sustainable livelihoods for poor people is limited. The planning system is a key system for resource allocation. Current attempts at participatory planning have usually focused on ad-hoc, expensive and unreplicable PRAs. This project will aim to learn from best practice as to what systems for community-based planning can be developed and implemented, linked to the local government planning system, so that poor people can influence resource allocation. Once again the project is funded by DFID, through the Rural Livelihoods Department’s Policy Research Programme.

#### *Project purpose, outputs and activities*

The purpose of the project is that “realistic plans have been developed in each country for policy change, implementation or piloting of community-based planning systems, which participating institutions are committed to take forward”.

A participatory action research approach has been adopted with multiple partners and stakeholders to help support local processes in relation to community-based planning in each country. The partners in each country include key national Government departments, a local government where improved community based planning systems will be implemented, and an NGO partner, typically involved in the facilitation process.

The project will learn from best practice in 4 participating countries (Uganda, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Ghana), and in 2 countries to be visited (Madhya Pradesh in India, and Bolivia). As a result proposals will be made for implementation of CBP by participating local governments with the assistance of the development facilitators involved, and for policy change to enable such types of community-based planning to happen.

#### *Key activities*

These include:

- In-country review processes of the status of community based planning (June-July 2001)
- Implementation of improved CBP mechanisms (On-going)
- Cross-country workshop in South Africa to share learnings (August 2001)
- Study tours to India and Bolivia (Sept 2001/Feb 2002)
- Piloting methodology in South Africa (Sept/Oct 2001)
- Final workshop to share learnings (Around April 2002)
- Plans for implementation of CBP (and possible funding) (On-going)

#### *Partners*

Khanya-managing rural change of South Africa is managing the project overall. It is also managing the piloting of the methodology in South Africa. Other South African partners include Decentralised Development Planning and LOGOSUL in the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG), Mangaung Municipality, and CARESA.

In Uganda the partners include the Local Government Development Programme, CARE Uganda, Bushenyi District Council,

Programme for the Modernisation of Agriculture.

In Zimbabwe the partners are the Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing, IT Southern Africa and Gwanda Rural District Council.

In Ghana the partners are the Ministry of Local Government, ISODEC, Adansi East District Assembly, and Asante Akim South District Assembly.

ODI of the UK are also a partner, supporting on methodology, the visit to India, and in dissemination.

## 2.2 Introduction to the SA partners

The project has two partners within the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG), the Local Government Support and Learning (LOGOSUL) project and Decentralised Development Planning (DDP). Mangaung Local Municipality is also a partner, as is CARE, represented by CARESA.

DDP is responsible for developing and overseeing the development planning process with local government in South Africa. It is in the Directorate of Development Planning and LED in the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG). The DDP Steering Committee includes SALGA, representatives from the Provinces and National Sector Departments, plus the DDP Task Team.

It aims to support the introduction of developmental local government, through municipalities practicing an integrated system of development planning and delivery in a participatory, strategic and implementation-oriented manner

It must produce the following outputs:

- Refining/supplementing the IDP methodology;
- Development of procedures and tools for implementation management, municipal M&E, and IDP review;
- Developing a strategy framework on an intergovernmental planning system;

- Raising awareness of the relevance of the IDP;
- Establishment of an IDP learning network;
- Running training programmes and capacity building
- Expand and consolidate the Planning and Implementation Management Support System (PIMSS)

LOGOSUL is a project developing a learning network amongst local governments in South Africa, and will be focusing on a limited number of municipalities in Kwazulu/Natal, Eastern Cape and Northern Province.

Mangaung Municipality is involved as a partner committed to test out the participatory planning methodologies the action research project develops

### 3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN 2010

Esme Magwasa, Director, Department of Provincial and Local Government

#### 3.1 Brief historical background

##### *Local government dispensation*

In the past local government was designed to perpetuate segregation and inequity. It was not designed to give expression to the will of the people. It was characterised by top-down planning and decision making.

The advent of a new local government dispensation came with the proclamation of the Local Government Transition Act of 1993 and Constitution of 1996. In terms of these Acts local government became one of three spheres of government, designed to give expression to the will of the people, and required to tackle challenges of poverty and unemployment

##### *Constitutional objectives of local government*

Under the new dispensation local government is expected to:

- provide democratic and accountable government for local communities;
- ensure sustainable provision of services;
- promote social and economic development;
- encourage the involvement of communities in the affairs of local government;
- promote a safe and healthy environment.

##### *White paper on local government*

The White Paper on Local Government advocated for “developmental local government”. The White Paper defined a developmental local government as a “local government that is committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic and material needs and improve their quality of lives”.

##### *Legislative framework*

Key pieces of legislations that provide the legislative framework for local government are:

1. Municipal Demarcation Act: reconfiguration of local government to play a developmental role;
2. Municipal Structures Act: creation of accountable local government structures;
3. Municipal Systems Act: to provide for systems to involve communities in determining development priorities and monitoring performance;
4. Property Rating Bill: to redress disparity in revenue sources and ensure equitable treatment.

#### 3.2 Policy programme

Policy processes which are aimed at complimenting legislation include:

- Municipal Service Partnerships
- Integrated Development Planning
- Local Economic Development (LED)
- Tariff Guidelines
- Local government public administration
- Framework: Monitoring of Provinces & Municipalities
- Strategic Review of Intergovernmental relations and Governance

##### *Administrative transformation process*

Regarding the transformation process, the Municipal Systems Act (MSA) is at the centre of local government transformation. The IDP is another process of transformation. In terms of law, IDP's should focus on prioritisation and link to medium term financial planning. Public participation is crucial in informing priorities, hence the relevance of the CBP project. The performance management system is to monitor performance and ensure accountability.

#### 3.3 Current challenges

##### *Developmental local government*

Developmental Local government is a new concept that puts a lot of pressure on some municipalities. The local government transformation process that came about through municipal demarcation process brings more pressure to bear. An independent body was created to re-demarcate municipal boundaries. Re-demarcation aimed at creating non-racial unified cities; reducing the number of municipalities; achieving administrative and

financial efficiency; and ensuring redistribution and poverty alleviation at the local level.

### ***Local government transformation***

Institutional transformation of local government is happening across the country. A single tier system was developed for Metros, and a two tier system was developed for rural areas, with District and Local Municipalities. The institutional transformation further aimed to address key issues linked to dis-establishment and establishment of municipalities, to establish political structures and basic functional administrations

### **3.4 Phases**

#### ***Stabilisation phase [present - 2002]***

It is envisaged that the stabilization phase will run through to the year 2002. This phase will among others involve:

- Establishing the new institutions/systems;
- Assisting in preparation of Integrated Development Plans;
- Supporting of ongoing service delivery ;
- Consolidation of developmental local governance within a macro-political framework for governance;
- Proactive monitoring and support to local government to ensure that programs of three spheres are mutually reinforcing;
- Developing strategies to make municipalities financially viable;
- Proper resourcing of transition and restructuring process;
- Developing and implement nationwide a local government capacity-building policy framework.

#### ***Consolidation phase [Jan 2003 - Dec 2010]***

This phase will involve the consolidation of the developmental orientation, institutions and systems established in the stabilisation phase, the extension and acceleration of service and infrastructure delivery, and a focus on sustainable development.

#### ***Sustainability phase [Dec 2010 - beyond]***

Full realisation and ongoing support to developmental local government is anticipated by this time.

### **3.5 DPLG strategic areas of support**

DPLG is expected to provide clear national statements clarifying the importance of integrated development planning. It will focus on district municipalities, including the use of the PIMSS to support local governments to undertake the IDPs. Other support will be provided through IDP guide packs, and the training of councillors, municipal managers and sector specialists to manage and own the IDP process. DPLG will also ensure complementarity between national and provincial government's support strategies.

Strategic flagship programmes for DPLG include Local Economic Development, the Social Plan and the Consolidated Municipal Infrastructure Programme (CMIP).

This requires co-operation between national, provincial and local government. We must accelerate development, create opportunities and alleviate poverty. There will be a focus on building the district council system, and ensure that municipalities are catalysts for local economic development. We have to help them to broaden their fiscal base and develop a capacity building strategy for local governments.

### **3.6 Conclusion**

“We should be aware of the risks of mystifying participation in planning. After all, people's participation in planning is nothing more and nothing less than a tool to enhance democracy and to make better, more sustainable plans”

#### 4 GUIDANCE ON PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PROCESS

Yusuf Patel, Department of Provincial and Local Government

##### 4.1 Developmental local government

The constitutional guidelines for Developmental Local Government include:

- White Paper on Local Government (WPLG), 1998;
- Municipal Demarcation Act, 1998;
- Municipal Demarcation Board;
- Municipal Structures Act, 1998, (Amendment, 2000);
- Municipal Systems Act, 2000 regulates core municipal systems.

The White Paper on Local Government emphasises the need for developmental local government, and makes provision for:

- A distinct sphere of government, working in co-operation with national and provincial spheres
- Wall to wall municipalities
- “Local government that is committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic and material needs and improve the quality of their lives”

Developmental local government is expected to take on new roles that include the provision of household infrastructure and services; the creation of liveable, integrated cities, towns, and rural areas; local economic development; and community empowerment and redistribution. The tool to realise the required outcomes is the IDP.

##### 4.2 Legislative requirements for integrated development planning

In the terms of the Municipality Systems Act, IDPs should provide a strategic focus for the actions of the Municipality and other agencies in the area. IDPs should accommodate other (national/provincial) sectoral plans in a single planning process, e.g. Water Plans, Transport

Plans. Citizen participation in the process is a cornerstone.

IDPs should contain a vision for long term development, an assessment of existing level of development, development priorities, development objectives, strategies, spatial development framework, operational strategies, disaster management plans, financial plan, key performance indicators and targets.

The IDP drafting process must allow for the local community to be consulted in its development needs and priorities. and to participate in the drafting of the IDP. Organs of state, including traditional authorities, and other role players should be identified and consulted on the drafting of the IDP. This must be managed by the executive committee or executive mayor of a municipality, or a committee of councilors appointed by the municipal council.

The IDP process should among others:

- Strive for better targeting of resources to those in real need;
- Attract and coordinate funding;
- Set strategic goals and targets;
- Create a level of certainty for investment;
- Direct national and provincial funding flows;
- Stimulate local economic development;
- Create local income opportunities;
- Promote financial sustainability of municipalities;
- Target public services;
- Promote poverty alleviation.
- Address gender imbalances

According to the Municipal Structures Act (MSA) a municipality is an organ of state within the local sphere of government, exercising legislative and executive authority within an area determined in terms of the Municipal Demarcation Act, 1998. It consists of the political structures and administration of the municipality, **and the community** in the area of the municipality. The municipality functions in its area in accordance with the political, statutory, and other relationships between its political structures, political office bearers and administration and its community,

and has a separate legal personality which excludes liability on the part of its community

A municipal council:

- Must strive within its capacity to achieve the objectives set out in section 152 of the Constitution;
- Must annually review
  - the needs of the community its priorities to meet those needs;
  - Its processes for involving the community;
  - Its organisational and delivery mechanisms for meeting the needs of the community;
  - Its overall performance in achieving the constitutional objectives;
- Must develop mechanisms to consult the community in performing its functions and exercising its powers.

In terms of community participation, according to the MSA a municipality must develop a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative government with a system of participatory governance, and must for this purpose encourage, and create conditions for, the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality, including in the preparation, implementation and review of its IDP.

It must establish, implement and review its performance management system, contribute to building the capacity of the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality, and to allocate resources and budget for community participation.

**Ward Committees** are also provided for under the MSA. The object of ward committees is to enhance participatory democracy. Ward Committees make recommendations on any matter affecting their ward to the ward councillor or through the ward councillor to the metro or local council, executive committee and executive mayor.

The ward committee consists of the Councillor representing the ward who must also chair the committee, and not more than 10 other persons. Councils must make rules regulating the procedure to elect the members of the ward

committee taking into account gender equity and diversity of interests. In addition, metro or local councils must make administrative arrangements for ward committees to function properly.

### ***IDP Representative Forum***

One of the structures that must be established for the IDP is a Representative Forum. This should form a structured link between municipal government and representatives of the public through ward committees. It should provide a means to transfer and clarify information between all the stakeholder representatives including the municipal government. It provides an organisational mechanism for discussion, negotiation, and decision-making between stakeholders, and monitors the performance of planning and the implementation process.

It should be composed of:

- Chaired by member of executive committee, exec. Mayor, or a member of committee of appointed councillors;
- Members of Exeo;
- Ward councillors;
- Municipal manager and/or IDP manager;
- Heads of departments;
- Stakeholder representatives of organised groups;
- Advocates for unorganised groups;
- Secretariat.

### ***IDP Steering Committee***

Another structure is the IDP Steering Committee. This should commission research studies and screen the content of the IDP. It provides terms of reference for planning activities; processes and summarises inputs from the participation process; considers and comment on inputs from sub-committees, study teams; discuss and comment on inputs from provincial sector departments and should provide comment on draft outputs from each phase of the IDP process.

The Steering Committee is chaired by the Municipal Manager, includes selected members of Exeo. or a committee of appointed councillors, heads of departments or senior officials, a Secretariat and professional planning support.

## 5. OVERVIEW OF COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING (AND MANAGEMENT)

Ian Goldman, Khanya-managing rural change.

### 5.1 Definition of community-based planning (CBP)

CBP is a new term, but most development practitioners are familiar with participation. Community-based-planning (CBP) can be used to refer to any planning which addresses activities or problems at community level, in which members of the communities are themselves involved. Community here refers to a level at which local people can identify themselves as belonging to, often the lowest level of the planning system or below (here Ward, in other countries lower).

The type of community-based planning depend on:

- The nature or scope of activities/problems (project, sector.....);
- Linkages with higher level planning processes, eg municipality;
- Stage of planning cycle the community are involved;
- Degree of community involvement at each stage - consultation, participation - whole ladder of participation and often used as a catchword;
- Type of external organisation (if any) which initiates and supports the planning activity (NGO, local government.....)

### 5.2 Why do we do CBP?

Community-based planning may be undertaken for a variety of reasons. These may include:

1. To make plans more relevant to local needs and conditions
2. To make services more relevant to local needs and conditions
3. To increase community involvement in provision of public services, due to lack of capacity of government agencies
4. To increase people's control over their own lives and livelihoods.

There are important implications for the type of planning. In the CBP project we are assuming it must be all 4, and that it must be

linked into the government resource allocation (planning) system, in a sustainable way.

In order to make a significant contribution to improve livelihoods, we need to ensure that:

#### At micro (community) level

- **poor people** are active and involved in managing their own development;
- there is a responsive, active and geographically dispersed network of **local service providers** (community based, private sector or government) ;

#### At meso (service organisations) level

- at **local government level**, services are facilitated, provided, promoted, managed and co-ordinated effectively and responsibly, and held accountable (*lower meso*);
- at the level above, there is the capacity to provide support and supervision, as well as for regional initiatives (*upper meso*);

#### At macro (policy) level

- **national level** is providing holistic and strategic direction around poverty, redistribution, and oversight of development;
- **international level** is strengthening capacity in-country to address poverty;
- there are effective linkages between these levels.

The particular issues that are key for this topic are the first three of these issues. Critical issues for ensuring that poor people are active and involved in managing their own development include:

- Involvement in decisions on resource allocation (i.e. planning);
- Involvement in managing local initiatives;
- Involvement in maintenance or operation of infrastructure/projects;
- And empowerment as an end in itself – overcoming dependency and mobilising local energy.

Regarding the question of ensuring effective, well-managed, co-ordinated services delivered from local government level, there is much evidence that decentralisation is an important ingredient (although this is not foolproof as

there can be capture by elites). Therefore it is very important that power is given to this level, especially fiscal – and there is confusion in SA about district and local municipality levels. There is a need for co-ordination with provincial departments in particular. However, in SA, local government powers are weak compared to some other countries like Uganda where service departments have been decentralised to local governments.

There is therefore a need to link local government with community - hence the importance of community-based planning. CBP also stresses the need for strengthening accountability both above and below.

### 5.3 The SA case studies

At the workshop we will look at the following case studies:

1. Qwa-Qwa and Bloemfontein, where in facilitating the IDP process, representative structures were set up, as there were no formal structures. This involved representatives with whom livelihoods analysis could be done and outcomes developed by Ward;
2. Mvula Trust water project, which involved communities in planning for water points - using a participatory methodology;
3. EDA Matatiele which deals with participatory planning for community tourism;
4. Participatory planning in central Johannesburg (Hillbrow and Joubert Park);
5. Diepsloot (Planact), a participatory planning to empower people in process of housing;
6. A BESG project in the Natal Midlands which highlights strategic planning with 8 communities.

### 5.4 What type of community-based planning do we need?

The type of CBP needs to be empowering and so about broad action in the community, not just begging for resources (holistic). It must be based on strengths and opportunities, not needs. It must identify where support is needed from outside (partnership). It must be by legitimate structures that can take funds. It

must be sustainable so using resource levels that can be maintained, but also planning for short-term-long-term trade-offs. It must link local structures and local government/services

Critical questions in making this happen include:

- How practically can we make all this happen within a realistic resource situation?
- What level of planning is needed – in Uganda the parish would seem appropriate (about 3000 people) – in SA we have Wards of 8-20 000+?
- What structure should do the planning (Ward, below.....)?
- Who should facilitate the planning (local government, Social Development, NGOs.....)?
- What type of planning and process would be sustainable (not require too much effort) yet be empowering (enough effort)?
- What training is required to make this happen?
- Who should provide this training?
- What human and other resources are required?

These are some of the questions the CBP project seeks to address.

## **PART 3: CASE STUDIES**

### **6. EXPERIENCES IN USING SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS APPROACH IN SETTING LDOs IN THE FREE STATE**

Mathilda Roos, Green Zebra Development Initiatives.

#### **6.1 The case studies**

The first case study is of QwaQwa rural and urban. Urban QwaQwa includes Phuthaditjhaba, a settlement of approximately 63 km<sup>2</sup>, with a population of approximately 70 000 people and reasonable infrastructure. Rural QwaQwa has a peri-urban community of approximately 250 000 people living in villages without basic infrastructure.

The second case study is Bloemfontein, the capital of the Free State Province, with a population of 350 000–450 000, and areas ranging from residential areas with excellent infrastructure to squatter areas with basic infrastructure.

#### **6.2 The legal requirement**

The Development Facilitation Act, No 67 of 1995 required the formulation of a strategic plan (LDO) for development for a 5-year period, which needs to be reviewed annually. The process proposed in the guideline suggested a typical strategic planning methodology, namely Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA).

The legal requirements were to:

- Analyse the current situation;
- Identify priority areas that need to be addressed in the short term;
- Formulate a shared Vision;
- Define objectives for a five-year period;
- Do a proper analysis of the priority areas;
- Identify alternative options or strategies to achieve the objectives;
- Identify projects for the strategies adopted;
- Link budget and resources to projects;
- Monitor, evaluate and review.

This was a new process, and government issued guidelines that outlined the approach and methodology. In the Free State the process was consultant-driven, with the participation process interpreted in different ways by different consultants.

#### **6.3 Case study 1: QwaQwa**

A Free State town planning company was appointed as facilitator, who worked with a local development company experienced in participation.

There were ten wards. As a planning process a Ward Representative Committee (WRC) of between 30 – 40 people was established in each ward. In the first round of workshops, WRCs analysed the present situation in their ward, defined the priority needs and desired outcomes and developed a vision for each ward. During the second round of workshops WRC's explored various avenues to achieve desired outcomes in effective and sustainable way.

A LDO Steering Committee (LDOSC) was established with elected representatives from each WRC, officials and Councillors of the local authority, and representatives from service agents. LDOSC workshops were then held to develop a vision, integrate the inputs made by each WRC, align strategies with government policies, programmes and plans, and to formulate the overall priorities, objectives, strategies and projects.

The officials from both provincial and national departments and some Councillors did not attend these meetings while representatives from the WRC's were committed and always present.

#### **6.4 Case Study 2: Bloemfontein**

A town planning company from outside the province with experience in LDOs in South African cities was appointed as the lead agency, with a small Bloemfontein based company with experience in participatory developmental planning, as an emerging agency.

Two participation approaches emerged whereby the lead planning company proposed a five-year approach with the first year setting the basics. One mass meeting where the community could express their 'needs' was held. Three follow up meetings for report back on progress were also organised. Facilitators experienced apathy, distrust and no interest by the residents.

On the other hand the emerging planning company proposed sustainable livelihoods analyses per ward to develop a culture of participation. The idea was to use the information collected to plan development programmes, and especially to alleviate poverty. Consensus was reached to do sustainable livelihoods analysis as an experiment in planning.

Participating structures included:

1. The Municipality;
2. Department of Urban Planning and Housing, which was the home;
3. A working group of officials and consultants formed to guide the process;
4. An official was tasked to be the contact person, but also to learn and to drive the process in later stages;
5. Community structures;
6. Thirty wards, each with a Councillor;

In Wards 1 to 12 in the 'traditional white' suburbs, there were no Local Development Committees, as councillors believed residents were not interested in council affairs. In Wards 13 – 30 in 'township' suburbs, there were Local Development Committees, chaired by the Councillor, which identified their needs and proposed development projects to the council.

The planning process involved harnessing the support of political party caucuses in the municipality. Sixteen workshops, one per ward, were held with responsible councillors. Pamphlets were distributed via schools, posters with dates and venues in the wards at shopping centres and weekly articles in the two newspapers.

Quantitative information was collected on assets and access to communication, health services, transport and local markets. The

number of participants involved with specific activities was counted by showing of hands. Qualitative information was based on the opinion expressed by those present.

A technical report was compiled on infrastructure to supply water and electricity services, types of streets, number of clinics, schools, etc. Each ward determined their own desired outcomes, which were combined into ten priorities for whole area. Each ward elected two representatives onto a LDO Forum. The purpose of the forum was to meet regularly to make an input into the planning process.

At the first meeting of the LDO Forum, which was well attended by the ward representatives, officials and politicians, the ten selected outcomes were discussed and targets set. The vision of the city was discussed at this workshop.

### ***Problems***

It was felt by some that 630 participants did not represent the view of all the residents. Workshops were described as unrepresentative, because councillors invited participants, which were considered as selective. Most resistance came from officials who did not attend the workshops. A local professor in Urban and Regional Planning requested the process to be declared null and void. This brought an end to the participatory planning.

The leading company decided that the participatory process was against their approach. It was agreed that systems for public participation would be developed over time. The existing plans of the different departments were collected as development strategies.

The LDO Forum met again three times. Each time there was fewer participants, and at the last meeting only the Heads of Departments were present.

## **6.5 Challenges and lessons**

These include:

### ***Empowering staff and citizens***

- Who should be empowered, politicians, officials, or the people? Empowering takes

time and funds need to be allocated for this;

- In many of the LDOs it was expected of consultants to do the work, rather than being done within the Municipality. Officials should also be involved in writing the documents and generally be more involved, to empower them in the process, and to ensure they are committed;
- Participatory planning is only useful if tangible results are seen as a result. It is essential that the participatory planning is linked in reality to decision-making and budgets. It is important therefore to plan for the ward with a known budget

#### ***Ensuring that people's priorities are listened to***

- Political processes are often biased. It is important to get a structured and representative process for participation involving different stakeholders and different social groups from the beginning;
- It is important to acknowledge differences within the white community, and it is difficult to get white women involved;
- It is important to listen well, understand the context, and to attend community sessions. People lose belief if they are not listened to;
- It is difficult for people to conceptualise the outcomes they want;
- Needs-based planning with current skills often leads to unsustainable projects. It is important to build on strengths;
- Lower level analysis tends to get lost when local priorities are aggregated into the overall plan – how can local priorities be maintained?

#### ***Structures***

- Structures established for planning must have powers and the capacity they need;
- Need some top-down priorities to guide decision-making;
- There is confusion between implementation responsibility and development responsibility;
- We are in a transition phase within local government, and so structures such as ward committees are not yet known. This provides difficulties and opportunities.

#### ***Ensuring informed decision-making***

- There is a danger of being over comprehensive and overcomplex. The approach can be holistic in terms of each groups and overall, but often interventions will be sectoral. It is important to be strategic and focus on the main priorities;
- Opportunities, like markets must be acknowledged and included in the planning process;
- Environment is often not a direct priority and so it is a challenge to consider environmental issues effectively in a participatory process.

## 7. ISULABASHA/MVUNYANE WATER AND SANITATION PROJECT

Mbongiseni Buthelezi: MVULA Trust

### 7.1 Introduction to the project

The project is located approximately 35km south of Vryheid in the Nqutu District of KwaZulu/Natal. It falls under Inkosi Mdlalose of Hlahlindlela Tribal Authority. It was funded by DWAF and DANIDA through the Mvula Trust and started prior to the enactment of local government, hence the involvement of traditional authority and the Tugela Joint Services Board (TJSB). It was recently funded by the Department of Traditional and Local Government Affairs.

At inception only the youth group was in place. This was subsequently constituted as a Development Committee, hence the name "Isulabasha" which means the "plan of the youth". The local Traditional Authority played a prominent role. Other structures were set up including gardening, poultry, piggery and block-making sub-committee, all operating under the Isulabasha/Mvunyane Development Committee (IMDC). There was a positive outcome in the co-ordination of development activities, community based planning, Local Economic Development (LED). In the event water served as an entry point for LED

### 7.2 The planning process

#### *Pre-implementation /planning phase*

The first phase involved community mobilisation, including committee formation. A funding proposal was drawn up. Consultants were appointed as Social (Training Agent) and Technical (Project Agent) consultants. A Community profile, training needs assessment and training plan (TA) were undertaken, plus a feasibility study (PA). A detailed design and training plan were then developed. All planning was community driven and consultative. Mvula Trust (IA) and DWAF (Funder) provided constant support and guidance.

The IDP did not guide planning and national planning processes related to RDP standards and subsidy policy.

#### *Implementation phase*

This involved construction and institutional and social (ISD) training and capacity building. The project was commissioned which was followed by the Operations, Maintenance and Mentoring process. The Bambamanzi prepaid system was installed, funded by DANIDA. There was a delayed transfer process to the Water Services Authority. The IMDC still serves as the Water Services Provider. Learnings and gaps were identified.

#### *Evaluation and continuation phase*

The Project Management Cycle (PMC) is characterised by continuous monitoring, communication, awareness creation and stakeholder participation

### 7.3 Funding flows and how they relate to planning

The community drove project prioritisation. Project funds and decisions were made locally and funds held locally. Some of the lessons learnt were the importance of fiscal discipline and accountability, and a good track record. One of the gaps is that funding from the Department of Traditional Affairs was not disbursed to IMDC.

### 7.4 Relationship of community structures to CBP

Development planning and initiatives were guided by the community. The IMDC consists of twenty (20) members, eleven (11) - EXCO, nine (9) sub-projects. So the outcome was that it was an all-inclusive community based and bottom up planning process.

### 7.5 Involvement of traditional structures in CBP

The Inkosi plays a prominent role as an ex-officio member (with a clearly defined role). The funds are secured from the Department of Traditional and Local Government Affairs. The key lessons learnt is that the project had a unifying effect, and has shown ability to rise above political limitations. A gap was the poor relations between the Inkosi and the local government structure.

## 7.6 Involvement of stakeholders

There was stakeholder participation throughout the PMC. This included the community, Mvula Trust, DWAF, DANIDA, Tribal Authority Dept. of Health, Department of Traditional and Local Government Affairs, as it was a multi-institutional project.

## 7.7 Following up the plan - community management

There was visible community participation which was a key pillar of success. It was a labour intensive project and operations and maintenance (O&M) were done by trained community members. Other local skills involved a bookkeeper, water minders, plumbers, pump operators, etc. In case of breakdown it was dealt with by either the water minder, pump operator, foreman, management systems operator or office clerk (spares). During emergencies, the chairperson may be involved.

The project was efficient, involved good governance, cost recovery, effective monitoring and sustainability. There was a high degree of institutional and social development.

## 7.8 Structures and linkages required

To ensure the success of this type of initiative there needs to be an effective committee mandated by the community, good communication and relationship between committee and traditional leadership as well as local government. Government departments should be visible and accessible and there need to be clear guidelines in terms of service provision. There should also be maximum stakeholders involvement to ensure a Demand Responsive Approach (DRA).

## 7.9 Training and support needs

There needs to be institutional and social development training and capacity building. Training is needed in particular in project management, financial management, contracting, bookkeeping, communication skills, conflict resolution, health and hygiene, O&M, etc.

## 8. PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY ECO-CULTURAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN THE MALUTI AREA, EASTERN CAPE

Zandile Ntombela, EDA Matatiele.

### 8.1 Introduction and project background

The Maluti District LDO / IDP process in 1998 identified tourism as one of the major strategies for addressing Local Economic Development, through its potential to have an impact on income generation and livelihood improvement for rural communities in the foothills of the Drakensberg. During this process EDA facilitated successfully the establishment of the district level structure called Maluti District Planning Committee. This committee was composed of representatives from each of the ten local tribal authorities.

Following the process the Village Development Committees through Local Development Forums prioritised tourism as the major economic development activity for Maluti. EDA assisted in securing the necessary funding, facilitating the planning process, capacity and institutional development, working closely with community institutions on the ground.

Eco-cultural tourism is gaining momentum as an alternative economic activity to agriculture, especially as the Maluti area is highly degraded because of high population pressure and low productive capacity of the soils. There are also a lot of unresolved land tenure cases, which have resulted in large tracks of agricultural land being taken out of production. But with the rich cultural heritage of the area, together with the scenery, tourism has been determined to have greater potential as a land use than agriculture to benefit local livelihoods whilst simultaneously helping to restore the degraded natural environment.

The idea of a village-to-village trail through the foothills of the Ukhahlamba mountains in the rural Maluti District was first envisioned in late 1998 by members of the Environment and Tourism Task Team, established during the LDO/IDP process driven by the then

Department of Local Government and Housing.

## 8.2 The planning process

The Maluti District Planning Committee had various task teams representing interests in land and agriculture, youth issues, water supply, tourism, roads, gender equity issues, health and welfare, and education. Tourism featured prominently throughout. The objective was to reach out to all tribal authorities and to share information and also that local level issues and problems be discussed by all at a common place. In such discussions, exploration of opportunities, potential for tourism development, and availability of resources in each village were reviewed.

Each task team had the responsibility of mobilising relevant Government Departments, traditional local authorities, Transitional Rural Councils (TRCs), Community Based Organisations, Local Development Forums, and a range of other service providers, to ensure buy-in before moving to the next stages. Prominent functional village based structures then were traditional leaders, TRC's, Local Development Forums, and Community-based Organisations.

To ensure sustainability, guidelines were developed which were aligned with existing policies, followed by a workshop to familiarise local communities with the new "community tourism" concept. As the process unfolded, it was apparent that that in order to develop a successful community tourism product, there should be involvement of the private sector, government, NGOs, and CBOs, with the communities driving the process for their own benefit. Other stakeholders who have recognition at national and international levels, such as Fair Trade in Tourism (SA), Eastern Cape Tourism Board, Local Government and Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism were brought on board in order to provide guidance based on experience and internationally recognised guidelines.

After this a series of tourism awareness workshops followed. Eventually a Steering Committee representing Maluti and Mount Fletcher Districts was established. The reason

for the involvement of Mount Fletcher was their expression of interest to participate. From within the Steering Committee, the executive committee was elected. This formed the Local Tourism Organisation (LTO) called Ukhahlamba Tourism Association (UTA) which was officially launched in September 2000. From this perspective, a series of village based structures called Community based Tourism Organisations (CTO) emerged. Currently there are eight CTOs in this area. CTO's and LTO members were trained in leadership and planning skills, financial management and role of office bearers. EDA assisted them to open a bank account. A certain amount, which according to the budget was allocated for community costs, was transferred to this account. The UTA is now managing this account.

## 8.3 Planning for implementation (Phase 2 of the project)

As CTOs at local level were busy establishing tourism-related activities and developing their Constitutions, EDA in consultation and close co-operation with UTA continued to fundraise for the actual establishment of the community based tourism product in the area. Towards the end of last year (2000) an amount of R850 000 fund was approved by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism poverty relief. This will be utilised to build Maluti/Ukhahlamba hiking and horse trail and accommodation facilities within the villages situated at the foot of the Drakensberg mountains. Local resources and skills are being deployed for the construction and monitoring during the construction period, so that maximum benefit can accrue to the communities. Public Works Department has been drawn in for technical support and quality control to ensure that the best standards of workmanship are followed.

## 8.4 Community involvement in planning

EDA first facilitated a process that could assist to identify resources and skills in each CTO. A PRA mapping exercise was done with villagers in each CTO. This process involved Community Based Organisations, Traditional Leaders, Councillors and Local Development Forums. There is a continuing process of

consultation and support from Department of Land Affairs, Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, and District Councils. The primary objective underlying this multi stakeholder participation is to make sure that all stake holders are well informed so that if issues such as land allocation, water service provision arise, they are in position to resolve them relatively quickly, unlike if they would be brought on board only when there is a problem.

There are altogether four CTOs that are directly along the route of the trail. Each CTO has a functional and effective Project Steering Committee (PSC). This committee is responsible for effective implementation of the construction phase based on the principles of Fair Share which stress fair and equal share of benefits for each village with regard to employment, collection of materials like thatch grass, stones, poles, bricks, etc. Not all villagers will benefit in this phase. Others will provide fittings for the accommodation chalets at later stages. With support from EDA they are already mobilising for phase 2 which is the operational phase of the project. For phase two community members involved in the production industries such as vegetable production, poultry and piggery projects will supply the tourism projects with the food. Local sewing groups will provide materials like duvets, curtains, sheets, and so forth. All these have already been identified as these projects are already operational. Handicrafts are also already available. What needs more attention is the improvement of the production skills in order that the project beneficiaries can compete at higher levels.

Each PSC has elected their own supervisor and administrator for the construction phase. Currently they are busy discussing their own strategies for paying employees during construction. There will be approximately thirty unskilled and five skilled employees to complete each accommodation chalet.

### **8.5 Problems, lessons and gaps**

When decisions were made to go ahead with phase one, local authorities that were in place then were traditional authorities and Transitional Rural Councils (TRCs). The major problem in this regard was that roles of

these authorities was not clarified from the government point of view, especially when it comes to their participation in the ownership and management of community assets. Both of these were not formally introduced into the new democratic and transformation process and have not been given the necessary capacity. As a non partisan and neutral organisation working with these communities, EDA had to intervene and based on community information and other forums, capacity of the different community institutions is being built based on identified roles in the development processes.

It is quite evident that development is implemented according to government policies and priorities. Where these are not clear, NGOs undertake to provide the necessary information, resources allowing, by clarifying policy issues before proceeding further to actual implementation of development programs.

Local Development Forums and TRCs were perceived as a threat to traditional authorities as their role was not well understood by the latter. It was therefore not easy to work or plan together with both of them.

Concerning phase 2 where there are Ward Councillors and Committees, nothing has changed either, the newly elected councillors have no capacity and have not been formally introduced to new democratic and transformation processes. The issue of working with communities and local leaders including different stakeholders cannot be underestimated, and therefore it is essential that all parties are brought on board and given the necessary capacity to ensure their effective participation.

Ward Committees on the other hand seem to be the overseer of all development initiatives at local village level. As it is they lack the necessary information which is currently vested in CBO 's and LDFs both of whom have been involved in development issues since 1994. It is therefore necessary to also build the capacity of these Ward Committees.

The issue of land administration is also confused.

It is essential that development practitioners should facilitate a process that makes communities develop their self confidence, a sense of personal commitment and responsibility – not just recipients of change and charity in the form of financial support . Development also entails an element of self reliance and independence, and currently this is lacking.

Democratically elected structures are not conversant with integrated development processes.

Political and development structures are not yet working together as they should because the political structures believe they should be the senior partners even without the knowledge that is presently possessed by the development structures. The spirit of working together for the benefit of communities has not as yet been inculcated within the ranks of the newly elected local governance structures.

Although it has its own problems, effective community involvement in planning is a powerful empowerment tool.

## 8.6 Conclusion

It is important to realise that human development is the core aspect of development. Community-based planning is one of the best ways of ensuring sustainability, as it builds capacity and confidence within the ranks of the beneficiary groups. It is an investment in human capabilities. It ensures that community members get involved in social, cultural and political processes that affect their lives, thus enabling them to identify and own the processes and the resultant developments. It further creates an environment that makes it possible for each individual to see how their efforts can contribute to sustainable development of their communities.

## 9 THE WESTERN JOUBERT PARK PRECINCT PILOT PROJECT AND HILLBROW/BEREA REGENERATION INITIATIVE

### 9.1 Background

The Joubert Park Neighborhood Center was set up by the then Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council (GJMC) under the ambit of the broader Western Joubert Park Precinct Pilot Project, and began operations during 1999.

Its aim was to develop policies for urban renewal and residential rehabilitation, using a precinct-based approach. It focused on problems experienced in a specific inner city residential environment, between the central railway station and Johannesburg's premier park, Joubert Park, and sought to initiate various management and physical development interventions that would inform the policy-making process of the GJMC.

As well as establishing a functional and equipped precinct office (including a Landlord/Tenant Advice office in terms of the Provincial Landlord/Tenant Act), now referred to as the Joubert Park Neighborhood Center (JPNC), it included the following initiatives:

1. The Park Central Taxi Facility on the site of a former park and underground parking garage.
2. An urban upgrade programme of the physical environment, and the establishing of the Park City Taxi Facility built on a deck over the central railway station.
3. A Direct Billing programme for a number of buildings in the neighborhood.
4. The appointment of a Crime Prevention Officer for the Precinct.
5. The upgrading of the old restaurant and an adjacent prefabricated building within Joubert Park to be used by an Early Childhood Development project with a strong emphasis on Children's Rights and on using art and culture as a tool for the healing of families traumatised by past injustices.
6. The establishing of an Environmental Center within Joubert Park to be run under the auspices of Earthlife Africa.

The GJMC entered into an agreement with an NGO (The Interfaith Community Development Association) to:

1. Develop a model for precinct management in the Joubert Park area, to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of precinct management and to establish whether such a system may have general applicability elsewhere in the greater metropolitan area.
2. Establish a localised municipal facility that disseminates information and provides support services to residents and other city users such as:
  - The determination and payment of municipal rates and services charges
    - Public transport
    - Housing and health
    - Tourism and culture
    - Any other relevant matter relating to municipal governance that is added from time to time.
3. Provide advice and referral services on:
  - Landlord and tenant issues
  - By-laws
  - Crime prevention, reporting of criminal and unlawful acts and support of the South African Police Service.
4. Provide user paid business and technology facilities in the form of:
  - A Tele-center (telephone and fax services)
  - Public Internet access.
5. Establish mechanisms for effective community participation and liaison with stakeholders in the development process in local areas.
6. Promote government campaigns, such as Operation Masakhane, which are intended to contribute to improved service delivery and quality of life in the neighborhood.

The GJMC made R438 000.00 available between March 1999 and December 2000 for this project.

### ***The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative***

The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative (HBRI) focuses on developing systems and skills, which will enable the City of

Johannesburg to effectively engage citizens in local governance processes. The City of Johannesburg is committed to working with residents and other stakeholders to improve the living environment and develop a sense of community in Hillbrow and Berea, through a planning process which results in a vision and local area action plan.

During the 14 months beginning March 2001, we will focus on getting intensive public participation in thinking about the area and its needs, planning together to transform our environment for the better. People from different geographic areas and sectors will be brought together to participate in:

- **Participatory workshops** in which residents are invited to give their input about what are their issues, dreams and concerns for their neighbourhood;
- **Local area groups** in which representative groups of residents will discuss, debate and develop key themes that help us deepen the insights about issues that affect their quality of life;
- **Local Area Action Plans** arising out of extensive workshops/meetings to develop realistic plans for the regeneration of the areas in an integrated way;
- **Launch** events will be developed together early in the process and opportunities for communicating all the developments will be created. Instead of one large event, the Consortium has decided the “launch” should be an ongoing process of bringing people on board over the duration of the project;
- A central **Office** will be established for communications.

## **9.2 Structures**

### ***The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre***

Towards the end of 2000, the local government structures changed. This meant that the Inner City Office, the Section 59 Inner City Committee and the Monitoring Committee (set up under the auspices of the Inner City Committee) disappeared.

At local government level, Region 8 (the Central Region) has a Memorandum of

Understanding with the newly-established Joubert Park Neighbourhood Development Association (an Association incorporated under Section 21), covering the following points:

1. The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Development Association continues to offer the services that the JPNC currently offers.
2. That the existing JPNC is retained to house at least some of the offered services and that relocation from the Centre is subject to approval by the GJMC.
3. That Joubert Park Neighbourhood Development Association convenes regular meetings of the Joubert Park Co-ordinating Forum.
4. That regular progress report on activities is provided to the GJMC, through the Director of the Central Region or his/her nominee.
5. That full co-operation is given to the GJMC, should the latter make a decision to operate a call Centre in the existing JPNC.

The Joubert Park Co-ordinating Forum brings together representatives from various government departments, NGOs and CBOs and other institutions such as the faith communities and the local Ward Councillor to explore together how they can build a better neighbourhood.

On the one hand this has been a very helpful process that assisted in bringing together a number of stakeholders in the neighbourhood. We are also working in a much more consolidated area with a central focus, i.e. Joubert Park.

What has not assisted us has been the following:

- The competitiveness amongst community groups, especially with regard to funding.
- The need to honour the autonomy of local groups whilst having to continue to fund the running costs of the Centre.
- New groups that have begun to work in the area and have not been through the process of trust building.
- A failure to be aware of the impact of the new local government structures, i.e.

building towards a local Ward Committee.

- Local government ending funding in the middle of a financial year without any provision for further funding until July 2001, and that only for capital expenditure;
- The Johannesburg Inner City Community Forum represented “the community” on the Section 59 Committee. The JICCF failed to obtain the total involvement of the Co-ordinating Forum.

### ***The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative***

We hope to improve on the Joubert Park pilot project in the following ways:

- a) Working more closely with the Ward Councillors (three in total) and taking into account the political boundaries so as to form the beginning of local Ward Committees;
- b) Using art and culture as a means to wider consultation and thus greater participation of local communities beyond the existing party political structures. This is also a tool to deal with the mobility of a much more extensive area of operation;
- c) The appointment of an Advisory Panel that will meet monthly to assist with setting of criteria for establishing a centrally located neighbourhood office, selecting and appointing office staff and field workers, advising, monitoring and evaluating the consultative process, and ensuring communication with as many organisations and community groups as possible;
- d) A much more integrated approach with members of the City of Johannesburg’s Planning Department present at the monthly and quarterly meetings of the Consortium. One of the planning staff is responsible for the Western Joubert Park Precinct Pilot Project as well as the HBRI;
- e) A highly experienced team of Consultants to facilitate the process.

It is too early to assess whether or not these changes will have the desired effect.

### 9.3 Planning Processes

#### *The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre*

The decision to undertake the environmental upgrade was made whilst the Co-ordinating Forum was still in its infancy. This resulted in the Forum not being intimately involved in the planning/consultative process. There was a delay in completing the proposed urban upgrade due to be handed over in December 2000. It is still incomplete. There was also a delay in bringing the local community on board.

The Central Johannesburg Partnership has only recently been given the contract to conduct a feasibility study into the setting up a Central Improvement District. Consultation has been ad hoc. The WJPPP was a project within the Inner City Office, which in turn fell under the office of the Chief Executive Officer. Parts of the neighbourhood fell under different substructures, each with its own planning procedures.

It is based on perceived notions of “returning the streets to the residents” and removing the long distance taxis. There is an expectation that “the community” will take responsibility for managing public areas. No funding has been made available for staff and other running costs of the JPNC.

#### *The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative*

The City of Johannesburg is using this process to test the assumptions underlying the LIDP. The new Central District structure will be integrated into the project office, i.e. housing, social development, sport and recreation, health, etc.

Planning is for capital expenditure only. This has already been cut from a notional R10 million to R6 million! In developing local area action plans, the consortium will be mindful of what can be undertaken by the community, what can be undertaken by the community with assistance from local government, and what needs to be undertaken by local government with priorities set by the community.

We are using workshops that will feed into the Advisory Panel as well as arts and culture activities to obtain greater involvement in finalising the local area action plans. The process begins with community members sharing their vision for their neighbourhood.

### 9.4 Funding Flows

#### *The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre*

The local communities had no say in how the planning related to the budget, nor were they consulted at any stage. Funds were not allocated to the local community. Those funds that were made available were spent within the restraints of the original agreement between the GJMC and ICDA. In the extension that was granted in March 2001, funds were available only for staff and running costs of the Centre.

As much effort was expended in building the network of local NGOs and CBOs there was very little time to empower the local community to take the initiative.

#### *The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative*

Again, funds are held by the City of Johannesburg. The only funds made available for the consultative process are to be spent within the restraints of the USAID-provided funds. The intention is to involve the local communities in prioritising the capital expenditure within their neighbourhoods.

### 9.5 Relationship of community structures to community-based planning

#### *The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre*

The understanding of the neighbourhood Centre was very limited in the original plan. We are organising in a very mobile neighbourhood, with extremes of poverty and very few assets. The community is still very transient with much of their time taken up by attempting to resolve issues with landlords. Although very successful in suburbia, the Provincial Housing Board was not very effective in its attempts to resolve landlord/tenant issues in the inner city.

Professionals from outside of the area lead the majority of NGOs working in the neighbourhood. Although necessary to get the projects off the ground, this has resulted in there being a large time gap before local residents were convinced of the need to become involved in the projects.

The projects are not seen as benefiting individuals (housing, unemployment, etc). Although we have been successful in bringing in volunteer workers, there is a need to provide a basic stipend to cover meals, etc. This is a highly residential area and the local businesses are small enterprises. The only major employer in the neighbourhood is Pick 'n' Pay.

### ***The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative***

The task of the facilitators, Imbewu, is to bring all stakeholders into an integrated relationship. This will hopefully result in a more representative structure at the end of the process that will be able (empowered) to continue to interact with government at all its levels. Hopefully by then agreement will have been reached on the setting up of Ward Committees.

The use of local residents as fieldworkers and local community theatre groups, musicians, artists, etc will hopefully bring more residents into the consultative process. This should lead to the establishing of strong, representative Ward Committees with a shared vision as to what needs to be done in their respective neighbourhoods.

## **9.6 Involvement of stakeholders**

### ***The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre***

Lapeng (a child and family resource service) has begun to mobilise local and provincial government departments in the improvement of services to children and families. A pilot project to involve local residents in undertaking the cleaning of Joubert Park and its three toilets has had limited success.

The Joubert Park Project hopefully will provide the basis for establishing a tourist Centre that not only highlights the history of the area but also the current histories of residents and the neighbourhood. The

neighbourhood includes the Johannesburg Art Gallery and the Drill Hall (home to over 1 000 homeless people and damaged by fire this past weekend).

The area has a large number of street traders and the Rotary Literacy House ABET project is planning to work with them in providing business skills training. Rotary Literacy House is also exploring the possibility of training local tour guides. Once the Drill Hall is demolished, we hope to create a small trading area that could attract tourists.

### ***The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative***

The opportunity to develop SMMEs will be explored as part of this project. We have contacted the University of the Witwatersrand to become involved in this area of the project. We still have to engage with the business community. Although several large banks have withdrawn, Standard Bank, First National Bank and the African Bank continue to operate as does Shoprite/Checkers and SPAR/Fontana.

The City is establishing a linear market in the area. This has not been done with much consultation. Although they consulted with the Hawker's Association, many of them do not live in the affected area. The closure of part of Quartz Street has led to a near-riot amongst local residents.

## **9.7 Following up the plan**

### ***The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre***

The Co-ordinating Forum is seeking greater involvement from local and provincial government in improving service delivery. We await the result of negotiations with Region 8 as to the level of funding they will make available to the JPNC, especially with regard to the management of the public areas.

The establishing of "peoples centres" is in the early stages of planning. Local and provincial government need to make funds available for the training/capacitating of local residents and structures. We need to see how the local Ward Committee develops as the new Ward Councillor is inexperienced.

***The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative***

As this is a new project, we will continue to monitor and evaluate the process

**9.8 Structures and linkages required*****The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre***

The Co-ordinating Forum needs to develop a strategy more closely aligned to the expectations of the City as well as the needs of the local community. The criteria for establishing Ward Committees need to be developed.

***The Hillbrow/Berea Regeneration Initiative***

The Advisory Panel needs to be formalised. The criteria for establishing Ward Committees (including an overlap with surrounding areas such as Yeoville) need to be developed.

**9.9 Training and support needs**

In both projects these areas there is a need to build capacity in local NGOs and CBOs. There is also a need to recognise the difference between mobilising and mass-based community organising

We are committed to mentoring staff drawn from the neighbourhood as well as local government officials. In all our workshops we attempt to recognise the resources that already exist and to build on them.

Consultants need to “model” the process in their own working environment. Further education and discussion are needed on the developmental role of local government.

It is proposed to use the service learning programme at the University of the Witwatersrand and the Technikon Witwatersrand. Integration of other departments of government is needed at all levels, eg housing, health, safety & liaison, poverty alleviation and job creation.

**9.10 Summary of learnings to date*****The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre***

I believe it was significant that the GJMC appointed a community-based organisation to manage the process, and that they in turn appointed as Precinct Manager a person with many years of experience of community development, much of which had been gained in the inner city of Johannesburg. This resulted in a commitment to building on the networks that already existed, and to a process of consultation with all community structures. Not only did the GJMC make provision for capital expenditure, but also committed funds for administration and salaries (at least in the early stages of the project).

Networking is important, but needs to include every community structure. This is a time-consuming process. Consultation is more than meeting with “representatives” of organisations.

Decentralization has costs other than capital expenditure. These include the adequate staffing of local neighbourhood centres, as well as running costs and the cost of staff development and training

Another learning is the importance of art and culture as a development tool and that if one creates an environment that is child-friendly, it is also adult-friendly!

## 10 DIEPSLOOT

### 10.1 Introduction

Diepsloot is a residential area situated approximately 50 km north of city centre. The settlement started as a reception area in 1995 with most of the original inhabitants coming from Alexandra, Soweto and some neighbouring farms.

Today, Diepsloot consists of a formal township with approximately 4000 formal houses and informal settlements with approximately 16 000 people. There are some improvements in the area, which will be the main subject of this presentation. The improvements include some basic infrastructure (roads some of which are tarred, a combination of communal taps and house connections for water, some sewerage system, some electricity in some parts) there are also some primary and high schools and a clinic.

### 10.2 Stakeholders

The development of Diepsloot was identified as a Presidential project and various stakeholders, including various government sectors worked together to develop the project.

### 10.3 Role of Planact (Non-governmental organisation)

The role of Planact was to mobilise the community to participate in the development of Diepsloot and the housing project in particular. It started by encouraging different organisations operating within the community to set aside their differences and work together towards achieving a common goal, which was the development of Diepsloot for the benefit of all residents. This culminated with the setting of the Community Development Forum, which became the representative of the community in the planning of the project.

Planact also led the capacity building of the community to enable effective community participation. This involved empowering the community with various technical and social issues that were required for the effective participation.

Planact also assisted the Community Development Forum in monitoring the project and ensuring that it adhered to the plans agreed upon by the stakeholders.

### 10.4 Community participation

Community participation started at a minimal level in the early stages of settlement development. However, it improved as the community became stabilised in their new habitat. The communities' involvement began in a fragmented way, where people participated in social, economic, political and developmental issues in an uncoordinated way.

Planact became actively involved in co-ordinating the various community efforts into a unified vision for the development of Diepsloot. This co-ordination culminated in the formation of the Community Development Forum (CDF), which became the communities' representative in the housing development, which was identified as a priority for development by the community as well as by provincial and local governments. The housing project is therefore the focus of this presentation.

Through the assistance of Planact, the CDF and the community of Diepsloot became involved in the development of the project in various ways. First, meetings were held once every week where the community through the CDF interacted with the local government and the developer in planning the project. These meetings were used to make inputs into the project plan as well as to get feedback on the progress of the project from the local government and the developer. The community was also able to discuss and approve plan at these meetings.

Secondly the CDF set up a labour desk, which was used to recruit community members who would do the work on the implementation of the project. Local builders were also identified and sub contracted to carry out specific tasks according to their expertise and training.

Thirdly, the Community Development Forum identified the beneficiaries.

Fourth, the community was given the authority to monitor the project especially the quality of the end product. Special forms were developed to enable the community to identify and capture all areas that could be monitored. Information from the monitoring process was then given to the developer who then had to rectify any faults that were identified within three months of completion of each housing unit.

### **10.5 Role of government**

The need for the formation of Community Development Forums was identified by the government after the first democratic elections in 1994. This indicated their vision of community involvement in social and development issues. The CDF of Diepsloot was initiated as an extension of the government's vision.

The development of Diepsloot was identified as a Premier's project thus indicating the government's involvement at the provincial level. The government's main aim was to reduce density in the area and improve services. Diepsloot was proclaimed a township in 1997. The local authority then committed itself to the provision of bulk infrastructure as part of their contribution to the project. Another role that the government had was to approve the project and the plans that were being developed.

The department of housing and engineering services in the Northern Metropolitan Council were given the task of leading the project. The local office through its Masakhane office invited Planact to assist in the development of Diepsloot. This then marked the beginning of the partnership between the local authority, Planact and the community of Diepsloot.

### **10.6 Role of developer (Elcon)**

Elcon Pty Ltd was appointed by the local council to be the developer for the project. They bought the land and laid the services. They also served as the main contractor and subcontracted to local builders to deliver the housing units.

Elcon also assisted the beneficiaries in applying for subsidies.

### **10.7 Funding flows**

The Diepsloot housing project was funded from the Provincial Department of Local Government and Housing, which had the original plan. The funds were then held at local council level. The community however has a significant input into the budgetary process and worked together on projects that have an overall benefit for the communities in which they live.

Another lesson that can be shared by all stakeholders especially government and private developers is that involving communities in project planning and development does not necessarily imply extra costs and time delays. Instead the end product becomes more acceptable by the ultimate beneficiaries.

Stakeholders in development must stop undermining people's capacity and believe that there is a wealth of experience and knowledge within all communities, which can be harnessed for the benefit of various projects. Where there is not enough capacity for particular activities, training and information dissemination will inevitably build upon the knowledge that already exists within the community. Training and capacity building provided in one project can always be utilised in some way in other activities that the communities and individuals may engage with at later stages in life. The experience in Diepsloot has advanced certain aspects of the constitution of South Africa such as rights to education housing and various services. These have been achieved in a democratic manner where various stakeholders with various objectives participated well to achieve an end product that is acceptable to all.

The project also demonstrated how national plans such as Housing, poverty alleviation, access to clean water and other services can be achieved well by involving various stakeholders and initiating community driven projects.

## **11 THE KUYASA CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAMME**

Anton Krone, Built Environment Support Group (BESG)

### **11.1 Features**

The starting point for this project was what contributes best to community-development processes? A one year leadership development programme has been undertaken with four people trained from each community in eight communities with a total of 8 000 households. The four feedback to eight in their structures. There has been a training impact on 92 people

Areas have been selected in terms of need and potential for development. This is underpinned by support to individual areas and implementation of their strategic plans

### **11.2 What the course covered**

The course covered:

- Needs assessment
- Conflict resolution
- Roles and responsibilities
- Project management
- Fundraising management
- Strategic planning
- Mid-way evaluation
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation
- Ward committees and integrated development planning
- Study tour

### **11.3 Some outputs**

A Ward 20 Development Forum has been established. The ward councillors were elected from a leadership pool under training. There have been improved relations between council and communities. The support for Ward 20 led to a historic agreement between landowners and tenants, Edendale was prioritised for development, an area of some 60 000 tenants that was previously unable to access state resources.

### **11.4 Support to farmworkers in Cramond**

This was an area prioritised by the district council as a pilot land reform project. The methodology was participative, leadership focused, a mix of training, action and planning, organic/ pragmatic. An engagement strategy was developed.

Some observations were that there was a strong training emphasis linked to needs, an emphasis on participative development paradigm and on engagement with authorities.

The city scale is conducive to engagement, which is short on self-reliance. There is a support and dependency 'dance' between service agencies and community. This is resource intensive, action and process based, but not based on joint planning. This illustrates the tendency to a fragmented local state and non-participative planning, planning without transformation nor a cohesive vision, and which has not delivered more than plans.

### **11.5 Conclusions**

There will still be a need for this type of work, a need for partnership building and a co-ordinated (state-civil society) approach would add more value in the future.

## **PART 4: GROUP WORK**

### **12 GROUP WORK**

#### **12.1 Themes**

At the end of day one the workshop divided into six groups to discuss and determine the most important issues facing community based planning in SA today.

The themes included:

1. Involvement of different stakeholders in planning at different levels (including business);
2. What linkages are needed between CBP and planning of different spheres of government and what are the gaps;
3. Building capacity and commitment to support CBP (both in service providers and the community);
4. Participation;
5. The financing of development plans.

The task for the groups was to determine practical recommendations and the principles upon which these would be based.

#### **12.2 Involvement of different stakeholders in planning at different levels (including business)**

##### ***Existing practice***

Existing practice is consultation through community meetings, workshops, mass meetings whatever, but consultative rather than genuine participation. Submissions are made from lobby groups, NGOs, CBOs, parties. NGOs and CBOs are planning separately from local government – often with direct funding from donors.

##### ***Principles***

- Make local government system work but guarantee that CBP is attained;
- Identify stakeholders to see what level should be involved. These include: community, CBOs/NGOs, traditional leaders, Councils and committees, ward committees, service providers, bus, individuals;

In dealing with the vastness of a ward of 8-20 000 people we should use village committee/street committee area committees. However, capacity and resources are a problem.

Council should have an outreach programme/policy to augment the role of NGOs/CBOs. Synergy at lower level should be managed at ward committee level. Traditional leaders should contribute and participate at ward level and council as observers. The ward committee holds both committee and extended public meeting and stakeholder meetings. The ward councillor would take resolution to ward forum, with all needs, suggestions. Strategic crosscutting programmes should be addressed at council level.

##### ***Discussion***

The system of government is not working – we need ward committees as consultation is not working at present eg councillors are not necessarily consulting effectively. There needs to be participation below ward level.

NGOs/CBOs should be active at the lowest level, but the challenge is how to develop this capacity. Many depend on international donors. Government needs to agree with NGOs on the importance of synergy. They also need to recognise that they must make some sort of profits, acquiring work/projects to include running costs and core costs.

**Table 12.3: Linkages**

<b>Principles</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Effective co-ordination, communication and decision making	Simplify government procedures and communication Set out clear decision-making processes Budget allocated for effective communication eg newsletters
Role and function clarification – clearly defined.	Through IDP Rep Forum and workshops (strategy – local)
Establishment of appropriate structures, support functions and activities	Need to audit structures and align to roles and responsibilities – IDPF, Ward committees, Development committee
Recognition by government of community capabilities capacities, activities	Skills audit, activities. Meaningful facilitation and consultation.
Appropriate financial and technical capacity support by government (budget for participatory planning)	Delegated budget based on monitoring and capacity
Ongoing M&E	Design appropriate indicators (qualitative and quantitative) and reporting mechanisms. <i>Ad hoc</i> M&E. Link to performance management system
Alignment of budgeting and timeframes	District level workshop. Municipality-community workshop.

### 12.3 What linkages are needed between CBP and planning of different spheres of government

We need to review legislation, policies and guidelines as they are not necessarily friendly to CBP. Some legislation and guidelines exist but may not be being implemented. National legislation places a lot of responsibility on municipalities to develop systems. We need to look at developing guidelines.

We need to ensure alignment of individual projects to CB plans. The IDP approach needs to communicate effectively to communities – and there needs to be training, capacity-building and marketing. There should be further clarification of the nature, type, of local level structures (at community level). The relationship between local structures needs to be clarified, including the role of ward committees, and to ensure a gender perspective (see table 12.3).

### 12.4 Building capacity and commitment to support CBP (both service providers and community)

The best way to build this capacity is training workshops on leadership skills, financial management, fund-raising, and business plans. We should use available skills in the community where possible, such as doctors or builders. Also people need communication skills, and information flow regarding policies and their interpretation. We need to take the cultural background into account in the way we communicate, using simple language, and the local language. Conflict resolution skills are needed, to foster good group relationships, and relationships with government and other stakeholders.

- Examples – Diepsloot is a living example, needs were identified and leadership trained;
- Mangaung has customer care services in the township.

#### **Principles**

Must be needs driven so can identify needs and analyse.

**Gaps**

We talk about empowerment of communities but also need to empower Council.

**Mangaung**

Must get support from provincial government

Principle	Recommendations	Justification
Strengths and opportunities – focused	Identify strengths, opportunities, and needs	Training must be relevant
Participatory	Communities must drive/own process	Ownership
Sustainable	Should be replicated (use available skills)	So can be continuous
Needs to be prioritised		

## 12.5 Methodology and Processes (especially at community level)

**Principles** (see table 12.5)

- Mentoring is critical;
- Sectoral or inter-sectoral subcommittees – it was felt these must be inter-sectoral;
- Communication must be inclusive, eg use of Xhosa and types of words used. Must include people who are not literate;
- Appreciative enquiry should be starting point, not needs-based. What do people care about, resources, livelihoods – looking

at assets, visioning, then needs.

- Certification – needs to recognise what people put into the process (towards community-based planning certificate).

**Further exploring**

- Need guidelines or a model contract for working with consultants. If the ward councillor is to become a facilitator, it shouldn't be the consultant who sets the standards, and contracts need to be performance-related;
- Need pictorial way of depicting what we are doing so people can immediately see without having to negotiate difficult concepts, and can use this as a tool;
- Simplify guidelines for planning process – what do we do;
- Contact people in all departments for advice, and can become almost an information centre. If they can answer questions at planning meetings, this is empowering.

**Discussion**

Facilitation skills are critical. There is a need for capacity development nationally. The challenge is how to replicate. Can use training courses, eg UNISA, or University of Natal, which have developed facilitation courses.

**Table 12.5 Principles, recommendations and justifications related to methodology**

Guiding principle	Recommendations	Justification
Need to develop community profile and dynamics, strengths identification, what they can do on own	Budget for community survey as part of the planning	Use livelihoods analysis, strengths etc
Identify stakeholders for funding	Identify roles and obtain buy-in and commitment	Maximise resources available
Community mobilisation	Use an external facilitator	To facilitate objectivity
Empowerment – funding should be geared to this, including for the participative process	Provide funding, training for the particular process	Ensure local ownership of process
Sustainability of financial investment	Develop multiyear budget and practice (MTEF)	Ensure continuity, monitoring, accountability
Centralised approach to funding i.e. pooling of resources/integration at local level, eg Trust	Inter-sectoral structures at local level – government, private sector, NGOs etc	To ensure maximum funding
Stakeholder involvement		
Needs based	LAP to determine allocation	Obvious

## 12.6 Financing of development plans

We need to look at the category of municipalities, eg category A (metro) is strong compared to B (local municipality), or C (district municipality). In the weak there there is a need for provincial interventions as they lack capacity. We need to take the IDP/Local Action Plan (LAP) model into account. What ideally should the conceptual framework be?

There is a complexity of issues and groups must be formed around common interest and then find innovative ways to finance them. At time others have no access. Money is flowing from national level to councils and to consultants. We need to extract information from plans and structures to use for IDPs and LAPs.

Community empowerment often gets lost. Other initiatives sprang up to build schools without the help of councils. People produce plans without key information and produce wish lists in terms of resources.

### Gaps

- Weak local/district/national interface
- Need to explore ways of development and maintenance of community enthusiasm
- In roles of external funders donors need to support planning processes

## PART 5: WAY FORWARD

### 13 WAY FORWARD

#### 13.1 Workshop report

The report will include details of the process, presentations, learnings, and an address list. It will be distributed by email to all participants. The SA review report will contain more analysis.

#### 13.2 The overall CBP 4 country Project

A similar process (review and workshop) is taking place in the 3 other countries. On 30 July the 4 countries (Zimbabwe, Ghana, SA and Uganda) will come together to share experience, identify learnings and gaps. There will be a study visit to India (Sept) and Bolivia (Feb 2002) with 3 people from each country (plus Khanya). The final workshop will be in about June 2002.

#### 13.3 Learning network

Khanya will create a page on their website which will include all CBP reports. Individuals need to take responsibility for extending the network. Khanya will email the SL newsletter on CBP, and will observe the response and see if it is possible to mainstream later in DPLG. Perhaps we should have another event in September/October to feedback on how things are going.

#### 13.4 Integrated Development Plans

All should create direct linkages within municipalities to see how we can influence to include community-based planning. The process needs to be located in the IDP process.

#### 13.5 Gaps – what next?

There needs to be a detailed process of investigating the gaps. We should form a national steering committee and consider the design of a handbook. We need to look at funding of process to fund these gaps, after piloting.

### **13.6 Pilots**

We need to do pilot exercises so that planning and learning are linked with implementation. Ideally we should have 3-4 pilots in specific areas, aligned with the IDP process. We should

design a pilot and come up with a proposal, perhaps for DPLG funding. Then other municipalities could learn from and implement. There needs to be criteria for pilots. There is interest in KZN in Zululand, from Mangaung, and potentially from the Eastern Cape.

**Annexure 1: Objectives and Programme**Workshop on Community-based Planning and IDPs, 19-20<sup>th</sup> June, Durban**Programme**Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> June

<i>Chair</i>		<i>Sithole Mbanga, LOGOSUL</i>
09.00	Welcome	Sithole Mbanga
09.10	Official opening	Councillor Lesoma, Durban Metro
09.20	Objectives and programme	James Carnegie, Khanya
09.30	Introductions	
09.45	Introduction to the community-based planning project	
	Introduction to Decentralised Development Planning (DDP)	Yusuf Patel
	Introduction to LOGOSUL	Sithole Mbanga
10.15	Local government in 2010 – our vision and the structures and systems we are developing	Esme Magwaza, DPLG
10.45	Discussion	JJ Matlole, Mangaung Municipality

*11.00 Tea/coffee*

<i>Chair</i>	<i>Yusuf Patel</i>	
11.30	Report back on concerns and expectations for CBP	James Carnegie
11.40	Overview of Community-based Planning	Ian Goldman, Khanya
12.00	The IDP process and community participation	Yusuf Patel
12.15	Experiences with participatory planning in QwaQwa	Mathilda Roos, Green Zebra
12.30	Pietermaritzburg	Anton Krone, Built Environment Support group
12.45	Discussion	

*13.00 Lunch*

<i>Chair</i>		<i>Nellie Agingu, Foundation for Contemporary Research</i>
14.00	Mvula – experience	Mbongiseni Buthelezi
14.15	EDA Matatiele – community tourism	Zandile Ntombela, EDA
14.30	Hillbrow	Vernon Openshaw
14.45	Discussion	Nellie Agingu
<i>Chair</i>		<i>Malikhang Masia, Khanya</i>
15.00	Planact – involving communities in planning housing	Councillor Sarafina Molautsi
15.15	Provision of services	Mosa Molapo, Director, DPLG KZN
15.30	Discussion	

*15.45 Tea*

16.15	Buzz groups on problems and opportunities for community-based planning	James Carnegie, Khanya
17.00	Video on Hermanus IDP journey	Foundation for Contemporary research
17.30	Close	

Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> June

08.30	Summary of issues raised in presentations	Ian Goldman
08.45	Feedback on buzz groups	James Carnegie
08.55	Introduction to groups	James Carnegie
09.05	Group work	

*10.45 Tea/coffee*

<i>Chair</i>		<i>Penny Ward, CARE</i>
11.15	Report backs	
12.30	Discussion	
<i>13.00 Lunch</i>		
14.00	Way forward	James Carnegie
14.50	Closing	Councillor Zumane, Mangaung Municipality
15.00	Tea and depart	

**Annexure 2: List of Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Phone</b>
Ian Goldman	Khanya-managing rural change FS	082 550 8460
Malikhang Masia	Khanya –managing rural change FS	082 693 9295
Elaine Kela	Director: Department Welfare FS	051 405 5201
Tsiliso Tamasane	Khanya –managing rural change FS	082 499 5497
James Carnegie	Khanya –managing rural change FS	083 555 5053
Mare Tsiki	Director: Economic Affairs FS	051 405 4212
JJ Matlole	Mangaung District Municipality FS	051 405 8621
ZA Zumane	Mangaung District Municipality FS	051 405 8142
Nonceba Mbali-Majeng	Amatole District Municipality EC	082 774 3713
J Ramokgoase	FRELOGA FS	082 772 7607
Venon Openshaw	Consultant GP	083 415 2807
Yusuf Patel	Director Development Planning	012 334 0802
Theo Rauch	GTZGP	012 334 0802
Esme Magwasa	Director Development Planning	012 334 0823
Penny Ward	CARESA	011 403 3288
Mathilda Roos	Green Zebra FS	083 254 3143
Nelli Agingu	Foundation for Contemporary Research	021 418 4175
Sarafina Molautsi	Planact	011 403 6291
Anton Krone	Built Environment Support Group	031 260 2267
Mbongiseni Buthelezi	Mvula Trust KZN	082 576 3288
Isaak Memani	Amatole District Municipality EC	043 7014000
German Ramathebane	Motheo District Municipality FS	051 447 9571
N Mohapi	Motheo District Municipality FS	051 447 9571
D Matolo	Motheo District Municipality FS	051 447 9571
Sithole Mbanga	LOGOSUL	082 782 8676
S.P. Mthetwa	Umhlambuyalengana DM KZN	082 342 5259
L.E. Ngubane	Umhlambuyalengana DM KZN	082 807 7017
Harold Terreblanche	Provincial Gov. FS	051 405 4417
Mosa Molapo	Department of LG& Housing KZN	033 395 2111
Walter ?	Shabisa District Municipality	083 245 8594
Zandile Ntombela	EDA Eastern Cape	
John Allwood	Depart. Agriculture EC	040 609 3473
Lungile Baloyi	Office of the Premier KZN	082 956 1079
Councillor Lesoma	Durban Unicity- Service Unit	
Estelle Gericke	Durban Unicity- Service Unit	
Thokozani Mchunu	Durban Unicity- Service Unit	
Sibongiseni Mbongwe	Durban Unicity- Service Unit	
Khanyisile Khumalo	Durban Unicity- Service Unit	
Sidney Lockett	University of Natal	
Thembinkosi Ngcobo	Durban Unicity- Service Unit	083 255 1517