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INTRODUCTION

This study was initiated at the request of the Department of Constitutional Development (DCD) which required recommendations on the promotion of municipal-community partnerships (MCPs) as an alternative service delivery option.

The study focuses on partnerships that help municipalities work with communities to provide quality facilities and services in equitable, efficient, and effective ways for the benefit of local residents.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were to:

- prepare a strategic agenda and an initial programme of action for DCD to promote the implementation of partnerships between municipalities and civil society organisations (CSOs);
- prepare proposals on priority sectors, geographical contexts and pilot projects for MCPs; and
- prepare proposals on engagement and consultation processes, and capacity building requirements.

Framework

This report is a contribution to the evolving discussion and experience on the potential of partnerships with government as an 'alternative delivery strategy'.

The report supports the shift away from the municipality as the sole service provider, to municipality as community representative, leader and facilitator of development, working in collaboration with a multiplicity of partners.

A framework is put forward to assess which delivery and governance roles MCPs are potentially well positioned to play vis-à-vis the various delivery strategies. In essence, the findings suggest that MCPs are particularly well positioned to meet developmental needs of poor people, especially where such partnerships are based on interrelationships between strengthening democracy, increasing municipal effectiveness and extending basic services.

Approach

The strategic agenda is based on an organising framework, developed through a series of base studies.

These base studies included a survey of municipalities, non-governmental organisations and individuals involved in existing MCPs. Further base studies consisted of a review of local and international literature and policy and international examples.

The organising framework, which lays the basis for the strategic agenda, is made up of:

- the characteristics of competitive partnerships
• the characteristics of an enabling environment for MCPs

• strategic interventions to support partnerships in priority municipal service sectors and to facilitate the development of an enabling environment for MCPs.

SURVEY OF NEEDS AND CAPABILITIES

METHODOLOGY

Analysis of NGO and municipality needs and capabilities

The needs and capabilities of municipalities and civil society organisations were considered in terms of three categories:

• Sector: referring to a particular municipal service such as housing, water and sanitation.

• Activity: referring to particular activities within the sector, such as capacity building or project management.

• Context: referring to the geographical area such as rural or urban.

Analysing the data across these categories helped expose the primary interests and needs of municipalities and NGOs, thereby helping to identify strategic choices.

The findings of this survey are discussed under the following headings:

• Stakeholder experience reviews the experiences of and attitudes to MCPs as well as factors motivating the attitudes and needs of the different stakeholder.

• Needs and capabilities analysis compares the needs of municipalities with the capabilities of service providers and identifies areas of divergence and convergence.

• Barriers and assistance sets out the stakeholders' views on factors that help or hinder MCPs.

Research sample

The research sample consisted of 22 municipalities, 29 civil society organisations and 25 case study surveys. The total sample of 78 was spread across all nine provinces and covered metropolitan areas, rural areas, and towns and cities. Further details on the research sample can be found in Appendix 3.

The study uses the terms civil society organisation (CSO), non-governmental organisation (NGO) and community based organisation (CBO) to differentiate between the types of organisations, with NGOs and CBOs being sub-sets of a far broader category of CSO.

One important limitation of the survey is its concentration on NGOs rather than a general spread of CSOs. This was due to the scope of the study and is certainly a limitation of its findings.

STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCE AND INTEREST IN MCPs

All municipalities are positive about the potential of MCPs. However, apart from the metros which have a greater exposure to NGOs and community partnerships, the positive attitudes are generally greater than the actual experience and understanding of such partnerships. Outside the metros, MCPs are often confused with community participation and employment programmes. Nevertheless, there is a greater degree of openness to MCPs where officials and politicians are beginning to question traditional service delivery strategies.
MOTIVATING FACTORS
A range of factors motivate the establishment of MCPs for municipalities and service providers, and within existing MCPs.
There is widespread consensus that the main factors motivating MCPs are their potential to supplement capacity, create financial sustainability and promote efficient and cost-effective service delivery.
The potential for MCPs to enhance accountability, empowerment and community 'ownership' of projects are additional motivating factors. However, these did not feature as prominently as might have been anticipated.

**Municipal perspective**

From a municipal perspective, the primary motivation for the establishment of MCPs is to supplement capacity or enhance the cost-effectiveness of services.

Municipalities show some interest in the potential of MCPs to support job creation and economic empowerment. However, community contact and improved services are not priority reasons to pursue MCPs.

**NGO perspective**

NGOs are primarily motivated by the benefits of pooling resources and the need for financial sustainability.

They are also motivated by the potential of MCPs to empower communities.

**Existing MCP perspective**

Motivating factors arising from existing MCPs are that they provide mechanisms for more effective communication and the resolution of development deadlocks.

They also enable cooperation, facilitate new understanding about roles, responsibilities, duties and obligations in service provision, and aid the pooling of resources.

**DESIRED SECTORS FOR PARTNERSHIP**

Municipalities and NGOs seldom want partnerships in the same sectors.

Municipalities are interested in particularly labour intensive sectors such as refuse collection, water and sanitation, environmental maintenance and roads. NGOs are most interested in planning.
economic development and housing sectors.

**Desired sectors for partnership**

### Municipal perspective

- Environmental Management
- Environmental Maintenance
- Roads
- Economic Development
- Housing
- Refuse
- Water & Sanitation

### NGO perspective

- Planning
- Environmental Management
- Environmental Maintenance
- Economic Development
- Housing
- Refuse
- Water & Sanitation

Environmental Management

**DESIRED ACTIVITIES FOR PARTNERSHIP**
Municipalities favour service delivery whilst NGOs favour training and capacity building.

There is, however, significant convergence around the demand for MCPs focused on project design and management.

It is interesting to note that there is least interest, from all surveys, in public participation.

**NEEDS AND CAPABILITIES ANALYSIS**

This section analyses and compares the perceptions of the needs of municipalities with the capabilities of NGOs and identifies the areas of greatest convergence.

To achieve this, possible MCPs were identified on the basis of sector and activity. For example the housing sector emphasises training, project management and monitoring activities.

These MCPs were then reviewed in their different contexts, that is rural, urban and metro, and the greatest areas of convergence were identified. In this way, the sectors, activities and contexts in which MCPs are most in demand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Preferred activity (NGO perspective)</th>
<th>Preferred activity of service provider (municipal perspective)</th>
<th>Preferred activity (case studies)</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Additional activity service provider should undertake (municipal perspective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (1)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (1)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td>Policy and research (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental maintenance</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economic development</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation (1)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and research (1)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (2)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (2)</td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance (2)</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural areas: Matching municipal needs with NGO capabilities

In rural areas there is a strong alignment between municipalities and NGOs for partnerships in the water and sanitation sectors, particularly in the activities of service delivery, capacity building, project management and technical assistance.

In addition, municipalities have a moderate preference for partnerships in the refuse, roads and environmental maintenance sectors, while NGOs have a strong preference for partnerships in the planning, energy and housing sectors.

The study recommends that, given the strong alignment in the water and sanitation sector, that this sector should be the initial target for MCPs in rural areas.
Towns and cities: Matching municipal needs with NGO capabilities

In the towns and cities surveyed, there is no strong alignment between municipalities and NGOs for partnerships.

Municipalities have a strong preference for MCPs in the refuse sector, particularly service delivery and project management. They also have a moderate preference in the water and sanitation, roads, social services and housing sectors. In these contexts, municipalities display a general preference for MCPs that support service delivery and project management activities.

NGOs on the other hand display a stronger desire to participate in MCPs that include project management and policy research as their main activities. In the urban context, NGOs display a strong preference for MCPs in the planning sector, and a moderate preference for MCPs in the energy and health sectors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Preferred activity (NGO perspective)</th>
<th>Preferred activity of service provider (municipal perspective)</th>
<th>Preferred activity (case studies)</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Additional activity service provider should undertake (municipal perspective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Train/capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental maintenance</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Policy and research (1)</td>
<td>Policy and research (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and research (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The numbers represent survey respondents.*
# Metropolitan areas: Matching municipal needs with NGO capabilities

## Metropolitan areas: Municipal and NGO needs and capabilities survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Preferred activity (NGO perspective)</th>
<th>Preferred activity of service provider (municipal perspective)</th>
<th>Preferred activity (case studies)</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Additional activity service provider should undertake (municipal perspective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity Public participation (2) Public participation (1) Design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Management (1)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance (2)</td>
<td>Design and Management (2)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Train/capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td>Public participation (1)</td>
<td>Design and Management (1)</td>
<td>Design and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and research (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (3)</td>
<td>Design and Management (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (2)</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (2)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (3)</td>
<td>Public participation (1)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance (2)</td>
<td>Design and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery (2)</td>
<td>Design and Management (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economic development</td>
<td>Train/capacity (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (3)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance (2)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance (2)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Design and Management (1)</td>
<td>Design and Management (1)</td>
<td>Design and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery (2)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>Train/capacity (2)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>Train/capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Assistance (1)</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (2)</td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td>Design and management (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Train/capacity (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity (4)</td>
<td>Policy and research (2)</td>
<td>Train/capacity</td>
<td>Policy and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>Train/capacity (4)</td>
<td>Public participation (1)</td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td>Public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring (1)</td>
<td>Design and management (3)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>Design and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>Train/capacity (1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note: The numbers represent survey respondents.**

In the metropolitan areas, there is no strong alignment between municipalities and NGOs for partnerships. Municipalities looked for NGO involvement in service delivery whilst NGOs emphasised capacity building and project management.

Refuse was the highest priority for municipalities, especially in the activities of training, project management and service delivery. Water and sanitation, environmental maintenance and local economic development got far lower rankings.

On the other hand, NGOs had a strong preference for partnerships in the housing and planning sectors, including training, research and project management as the preferred activities. There was a moderate alignment of preferences in the roads, housing and health sectors.
BARRIERS AND ENABLERS

This section summarises the attitudes of stakeholders to the key factors that help or hinder the establishment of MCPs.

Barriers to establishing community partnerships

Municipalities
Municipalities listed the following as barriers to establishing community partnerships:

- Lack of capacity in municipalities to put appropriate regulations, service standards and contracts in place and to monitor the outputs of MCPs. This is an area where municipalities require support.
- Poor service organisation capacity in many towns and rural areas. Either there are no service providers and community organisations are weak or existing service providers lack the financial and management capacity needed to engage in partnerships.
- Notwithstanding the movement of service providers towards service delivery, many are unable to make the paradigm shift to becoming local government service delivery agents.
- There is a tendency for service providers to rely on strong individuals thereby
jeopardising the sustainability of the partnerships.

- Community partnerships are often not possible because of political divisions or conflicts within communities.
- Many officials and councillors have limited knowledge about the transformation agenda and alternative service delivery methods and strategies. In some cases officials and councillors are not interested in transformation and adopt a 'business as usual' approach to service delivery.
- Many officials are resistant to engaging with service providers because of a lack of exposure or negative experiences.

**Non-governmental organisations**

Non-governmental organisations listed the following as barriers to establishing community partnerships:

- Local government in many areas lack the appropriate technical and managerial capacity to initiate and sustain MCPs and do not have the ability to identify, design, manage and monitor the outputs of partnerships.
- NGOs and municipalities have differing organisational and work ethos. Municipalities are perceived as being overly bureaucratic, response time to community proposals is long and many staff are not committed to engaging with service providers on alternative delivery strategies in a sustained way.
- Municipal officials and politicians are not always sensitive to the complexity of social and economic processes within communities, particularly around the multiple survival and livelihood strategies of households and communities. They often have a shallow understanding of how to undertake community-institutional development.
- Officials do not always fully engage with communities and their representatives thereby forgoing valuable opportunities to generating the trust, goodwill and mutual respect which is critical to sustainable MCPs.
- Different municipal departments work in isolated and non-integrated ways and there is poor integration of MCP projects into overall development plans for specific areas.

**Existing MCP case studies**

The view of those involved in existing MCPs is that the dominant barrier to successful MCPs in South Africa is municipal capability. Other barriers are:

- Local government capacity to engage meaningfully in MCPs is hampered by limited skills and expertise and commitment to MCPs is not matched by adequate administrative and financial resources.
- Poor coordination and integration across departments at planning and operational levels.
- Differences between the organisational and operational ethos of partners which are not easily reconciled. This explains the many misunderstandings, divisions and mistrust in interactions and exchanges between CSOs and municipalities.
- Officials and politicians do not always fully engage in processes. Case studies suggest that MCPs work well where there is more openness to engage with service providers and communities, and where there is a clear understanding of alternative delivery strategies.
- The ad hoc nature of community partnerships. Municipalities often tend to 'projectise' development and once the project is over, community participation and
engagement ceases.

- The 'small scale' nature of projects. Councils encourage partnerships in areas that require minimum internal administrative restructuring. These are often confined to areas of service delivery that are not contentious, for example, cutting of grass verges or refuse removal as against projects that are capital and technical intensive.

### Key barriers to partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Bar Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable community participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance of LG officials to engage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate ethos in LG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of integration in IDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor coordination within LG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government capacity &amp; commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assistance required to support partnerships**

This section summarises the perceived assistance required by stakeholders to support the establishment and maintenance of MCPs.

**Municipal perspective**
Nearly all municipalities interviewed indicated that information on MCPs would be extremely useful, as there were significant differences between these and other types of partnerships. Five municipalities indicated that guidelines for MCPs would be useful in the preparation of contracts and the definition of the respective roles and responsibilities of municipalities and community partners.

Rural municipalities identified the need for the dissemination of information on best practice and facilitation services, while metros placed an emphasis on the dissemination of information on best practice. Rural municipalities, which struggle with tremendous service backlogs and little capacity, were also the most vocal on the need for start-up funding. This would be used to help service providers form partnerships and would subsidise them for an initial period.

**NGO perspective**

Most respondents cited financial support as their most overwhelming need. In particular, payment for services rendered, and increased funding to hire more staff were rated as key support areas. Reforming the tax regime did not feature as prominently.
required by local government and service providers in existing MCPs.

**Key support areas for local government**

Organisational support to municipalities to improve inter-departmental coordination and cooperation featured most prominently and was cited by 30% of the respondents.

The need for councillors and officials to recognise that community-institutional development takes time and that resources need to be carefully deployed to avoid conflict was the next most cited area of support.
This was followed closely by the need for municipalities to become more sensitive to community dynamics and processes (23%).

The revision of municipal procedures, protocols, and conventions to fast track decision-making and release project finances was cited by 18% of the respondents. The creation of appropriate forums for the airing of concerns and problems within project cycles was identified by 9% of respondents.

**Key support areas for service providers**

The speedy release of funding for projects by donors and local government was the most commonly cited area of support required for service providers because of its impact on their financial sustainability. The need to attract skilled staff and to appoint more community development workers requires financial support, which was listed as a priority by almost a third of respondents.

Financial sustainability of service providers is also a concern. In this regard, the formalisation of contracts, operational arrangements and payment of invoices was listed by 17% of respondents. The same number listed office space and infrastructure in municipal offices as being important to enhance communication between stakeholders and in building trust.

Tax reform, particularly regarding exemptions and deductions, did not feature as an important area of support for service providers and many of the concerns are being addressed by the Katz Commission.

Civil society organisations (CSOs) is used as the generic term for civil society, community based and non-governmental organisations. This study tends to divide CSOs into non-governmental organisations and community based organisations. Community-based organisations (CBOs) are normally based within communities, have broadly representative governance structures staffed by community leaders who may be directly elected and/or nominated by the community. Community based organisations focus their activities on single or multiple issues that (in)directly concern and impact on the local community. Community based activity is issue-base and demand-driven (improving access to basic services, for example) and is heavily influenced by the level of community consciousness, level of material development and the extent of inclusivity/exclusivity of official channels of power. Community based organisations are membership organisations and are independent of the state. As membership organisations, risks, costs and benefits are shared among members, and leadership may be called to account by members. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are normally legally constituted entities (although the level of legality varies) that produce and sell services of a collective interest. They have a high degree of managerial autonomy from other public and private bodies but rely on the former for material and financial support (foreign and local donors in the public and private sector). NGOs are staffed by professionals and semi-professionals and are frequently not based within communities. They are independent of the state and undertake a range of activities in order to further their development objectives. Their main functions relate to giving voice to established and marginalised sectors through advocacy and policy work, research and monitoring, technical assistance to other organisations, and direct service delivery.

**Supplement capacity** - Service provider provides assistance to municipal staff to deliver services by way of contribution of finance, technical expertise, project facilitation, programme design and management, project implementation and direct service delivery.

**Pooling resources** - The mobilisation of the distinct skills, expertise, competencies and assets of different stakeholders (community, service providers, local government) around a common development project
wherein the whole is greater than the sum of the separate contributions.

<<Environmental maintenance includes such services as the maintenance of parks and other recreational facilities, cutting grass verges; street cleansing, etc. It is a subset of environmental management.

<<Planning includes the facilitation and formulation of integrated development plans, business plans and institutional frameworks. The planning category includes rural land due to land NGOs' arguments that the land sector was fundamentally about planning.

<<Local economic development refers to the formulation and design of programmes for economic development that enhance the availability and improves the distribution of financial, physical, human and social capital. It recognises the interdependence of neighbourhood, city and region in the national and international economy.

<<Environmental management includes broader environmental issues relating to policies and legislation for protecting the environment, regulating development and promoting environmentally sound and sustainable development.

<<Health refers to municipal health facilities and services, AIDS education workshops, etc.

<<Social services refers to childcare facilities and welfare services.

<<Energy refers to electricity reticulation and distribution.

LITERATURE AND POLICY REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

This section describes the reasons for and approaches to MCPs. It is based on an international literature review and an overview of current South African policy. Drawing on these resources, we review the context, challenges and emerging ideas within which local government has to operate. We look at new approaches and the South African approach and distil these ideas into a strategic or organising framework for MCPs in South Africa.

The context

As a result of complex forces and changes in the global, national and local environments, levels of poverty are on the increase and growing numbers of people are excluded from the formal economy. Governments are finding it more difficult to fulfil their traditional roles and meet basic needs, and poor people have no choice but to rely on informal survival strategies.

To meet the challenges of an increasingly globalised economy and the persistence of international debt, countries are being forced to implement austerity measures which impact on the allocation of state resources.

At a national level, democratisation and economic restructuring have introduced dramatic changes to the social, institutional and economic fabric of nations. At local levels, the combination of rapid urban growth, increased violence, the demise of urban formal economies and growing informalisation, the decline of real
incomes and the social costs of adjustment have produced suffering and hardship.

Widening and deepening income and social inequalities have spawned complex survival strategies at individual and household levels. The power wielded by elites and other vested interests often makes it difficult for these survival strategies to include support from formal institutions.

The state has been unable to exercise its authority in a very complex environment. This is characterised by its inability to play a meaningful role in providing services and administration to large sections of society. Problems in effecting social compromises and breaking development deadlocks hinder the state's ability to provide for the poor, as does the erosion of overarching norms and values.

**CHALLENGES AND TRENDS**

The legitimacy, fiscal and management crisis of the state provides societies with very complex challenges. Out of these challenges, new ideas and contemporary trends have emerged.

The greatest challenge is the formulation and implementation of sustainable service delivery strategies that meet the needs of citizens in the context of limited administrative capacity, inequitable and inefficient settlement patterns, and extremely high and increasing levels of poverty and inequality. There is also a need for clearly defined institutional frameworks that promote efficiency, equity and responsiveness, within a developmental approach to cooperative governance.

The final challenge for the state is the strengthening of the democratic social contract through promoting accessibility, enhancing representivity, strengthening accountability and responsiveness.

**Emerging ideas**

New ideas are emerging on ways in which the state and development agencies can deal with these challenges. These are:

- **International development agencies** have shifted the development agenda from targeted 'development' projects to municipal management to 'good governance'. In this context, local governments act as facilitators and enablers.
- **The scholarly community** is encouraging the state to lead development initiatives at community level, build the social economy and promote collaboration and partnerships.
- **Government and the community of professional practitioners** have developed new approaches to public management. These include a catalytic approach to development rather than acting as sole deliverer; steering development processes rather than rowing; empowering operational managers and developing greater responsiveness to the needs of citizens.

**Contemporary trends**

The literature already tracks some contemporary trends in the ways in which the state and development agencies are dealing with the new environment. These are:

- **Within government**, a major trend is decentralisation which involves changes in
inter-government relations. This recognises the role of lower levels of government in development initiatives and sees local government as a critical tier in ensuring effective and efficient service provision. It also places a greater emphasis on disaggregated strategies to target different types of poverty and localities.

- Within the economy, macro-economic reform, privatisation, deregulation and liberalisation are the major trends. The state and market are viewed as complementary and offering the potential of partnership, with the state facilitating an enabling development.

- Within social relations, major contemporary trends emerge in changes in the mode of social regulation and encouragement of new forms of state-civil society engagement. For example, mobilising social capital, building governance capability across and within sectors and promoting local self-governance.

There is widespread agreement among policy-makers, academics and decision-makers that the future third world city will be planned, financed, built and shaped by people with low incomes: garbage collectors or scavengers, shoemakers, those making clothes, foods and crafts in their homes, low-paid government clerks and factory workers, market sellers and so on. These people provide the cheap labour and cheap goods and services on which much of the city's economy depends. A large part of the development of the city will be financed by residents' savings, informal loans and self-help efforts in building, maintaining or expanding their dwellings. Employment patterns, houses and settlements will reveal the inventiveness, resilience and ingenuity or hundreds of millions of poor people, whose main skills are their capacity to survive under very difficult circumstances. Campos Guimaraes, "Planning for resource-poor regions in a globalising world" (1998)

NEW APPROACHES

Enablement: a growing consensus

There is growing consensus around the view that government should concentrate more on taking steps to facilitate and enable service delivery and enablement.

The UN view on 'enablement'

The UN General Assembly adopted a strategy in December 1988 which acknowledged the fact that despite governments' efforts to provide services, a growing proportion of urban and rural populations, especially in developing countries, were living in slum and squatter settlements.

Conventional methods of government service delivery where recognised to have become incapable and inappropriate in providing adequate solutions.

The strategy stressed the need for governments to make fundamental changes in their approaches to development and stated that they should concentrate less on direct implementation, and more on the creation of incentives and facilitating measures to enable services and development to be provided by householders themselves, community organisations, NGOs, and the private sector.

In this way the full potential of all the actors involved in development and services would be mobilised.

Adapted from Helmsing, B., van de Bos, L., "Enablement: a literature survey" (January 1998)

Contesting the meaning of enablement
Notwithstanding the consensus, there are different perspectives on 'enablement'. In practice, government and other stakeholders borrow from both perspectives depending on local needs and priorities and the balance of social forces.

**The conservative perspective**

Entrepreneurial local government and pro-growth coalitions assume centre stage in conservative perspectives. The pursuit of economic growth is viewed with paramount importance, and local development is determined by external factors.

Conservative development initiatives tend to relegate distribution issues to secondary status and interventions are normally devoid of systematic approaches to addressing structural poverty.

The municipality is understood as a facilitator and enabler within the context of minimising the control and direct delivery function of the state. Key policy platforms and instruments include deregulation, privatisation, and flexibility.

**The democratic perspective**

This strategic outlook of the democratic perspective entails bringing the state back into the art of governance and building governance capability across and within sectors. Sustainable development is not confined to market initiatives alone, it is also dependent on government intervention and national development frameworks.

Local development is oriented towards meeting basic needs. It is enacted by people concerned, on the basis of their own knowledge, experience and culture, rather than being imposed from outside. It is achieved largely through the mobilisation of local resources to meet perceived local needs. It is ecologically sound and strives towards redressing power relations.

The role of local government extends beyond facilitation and enablement, encompassing leadership and strategic guidance.

**Municipal-community partnerships**

Both conservative and democratic perspectives on enablement emphasise the need to promote new forms of engagement between state, civil society and the private sector. These are normally understood to be partnerships.

Municipal-community partnerships (MCPs) are one type of partnership which assume different forms and entail different levels of complexity depending on resource endowments, institutional capabilities and capacities and development priorities.

Globally, civil society organisations (CSOs) partner with government to:

- Support participatory approaches in service delivery and infrastructure provision. This is the traditionally recognised role of NGOs, especially in projects funded by international organisations.
- Facilitate large-scale government programmes which may include programme
conceptualisation, implementation, service delivery and monitoring and evaluation.
- Contribute to policy formulation and socially responsive development interventions through structured and unstructured interactions.
- Institutionalise alternative delivery systems where considerable coverage has been achieved through such systems. Implementation and management usually involve a new organisation positioned outside typical government structures. Government contributes by assisting in resource mobilisation and facilitating policies through participation on governing boards.
- Improve access of the poor to goods and services and effect both incremental change in municipal policies and procedures and substantive change in rules, norms and values so that there is a fundamental change in favour of the poor.

SOUTH AFRICAN POLICY

Policy framework

The South African government's motivation for partnerships with civil society organisations stems from the recognition of its own human, financial and technical constraints in delivering development.

In common with other countries, a central and critical element of South Africa's policies is the notion of partnerships to foster cost-effective and participatory service delivery.

To regulate interactions between the state and civil society, government creates policies and legislation and puts mechanisms in place to create an enabling environment. These actions are at various stages of implementation and include:

Macro-economic reform

The Growth, Employment and Redistribution strategy (Gear) makes provision for a social compact (wage, price and productivity agreement) and emphasises partnerships as a vehicle for service delivery and economic growth. Both of these impact on the way local government organises its activities and discharges its duties.

Reconstruction and development

The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) places the empowerment of institutions of civil society as a fundamental aim of government's development approach. Structured consultation processes at all levels of government will be introduced to ensure participation in policy making, planning and project implementation. In this way, government will draw on the creative energy of communities.

Restructuring of the welfare system

The National Department of Welfare has established a directorate responsible for the macro design and implementation of partnerships with CSOs. It sets norms and targets, while provincial and local governments disburse funds.

Competition policy

A competition policy makes provision for the removal of barriers to entry in an accountable and transparent
way through a public forum and an independent tribunal. The decisions of the Competition Board will impact on local governments' LED programmes and the type of support provided by CSOs.

**Skills development and National Qualifications Framework (NQF)**

Provision is made for inclusive sector-based training and education structures which are underpinned by partnerships between government and accredited training providers (including CSOs). This is likely to influence the nature of Local Economic Development strategies and the support that municipalities will need from CSOs.

**Community-Based Public Works Programme (CBPWP)**

Judged as one of the "best public works programme by all international standards" (ILO/Case), the CBPWP treats NGOs and local authorities as implementing agencies and programme managers. MCPs are set to play an important role in community-based PWP.

**Restructuring of state assets**

Participation by organised labour and employees of relevant enterprises in restructuring of public enterprises and service delivery is guided by the Batho Pele principles, amongst others. Partnerships in these instances range in their objectives from building institutions, to blurring boundaries, to shifting the balance between state and market (from internal reform to privatisation).

**A national infrastructure plan**

The Consolidated Municipal Infrastructure Programme (CMIP) provides grants to local authorities for the provision of bulk and connector infrastructure to poor households. Each municipality, in consultation with the 'beneficiary', determines the package and level of services required.

The programme also includes capacity building projects that are undertaken at community level. These projects will include training programmes for previously disadvantaged enterprises and individuals. Funds are channelled through the use of SMMEs in the construction process and by using labour-intensive construction methods.

Partnerships between municipalities and civil society have thus far been unstructured, but the CMIP has potential for the establishment of very dynamic MCPs.

**Non-profit Organisations Act**

The Non-profit Organisations Act, which establishes the National Development Agency (NDA), recognises the independence of the sector and the need for a cooperative relationship between civil society and government.

The primary objective of the NDA is to contribute towards the eradication of poverty by granting funds to CSOs to carry out projects and programmes; to strengthen their capacity in direct service provision; and to promote dialogue between CSOs and relevant organs of state.

The NDA falls under the Ministry of Finance and reports to the minister but will enjoy independent status.
The NDA is run by a board appointed by the minister on the basis of public nominations.

**The Katz Commission on taxation**

The Katz Commission sub-committee on taxation for non-profit organisations is reviewing the expansion of organisations eligible for tax exemptions and tax deductions for donors, both of which should impact on the financial sustainability of CSOs.

**Municipal services partnership policy**

The Department of Constitutional Development's Municipal Services Partnership (MSP) policy framework is a very pragmatic approach to service delivery.

In terms of this policy, partnerships are not intended to substitute traditional methods of direct service delivery, nor should they be viewed as alternatives to ongoing municipal efforts to improve public sector efficiency and accountability.

Instead, the form of partnerships and the type of contractual arrangements entered into is guided and informed by the aims and objectives of the integrated development plan. This ensures that development objectives are socially negotiated and institutional technologies for service delivery are developmentally driven.

The MSP Policy gives municipalities and CSOs maximum flexibility in the degree of formality of the partnership which is itself determined by mutual agreement. In terms of the MSP policy:

- The DCD will not impose constraints on municipalities and CSOs regarding the degree of formality of the service provider before entering into an MSP. The DCD will, however, produce guidelines on MCPs.
- Municipalities and CSOs will determine, by mutual agreement, whether a condition for the MSP is that the CSO must be organised as a legal entity.
- As a minimum, the service provider should have a written constitution describing its purposes, decision-making structure, qualifications for membership, and stating that its assets and revenues will be used only to further its stated purposes.
- If it is decided, by mutual agreement, that the service provider should be a legal entity, the organisation must meet the requirements for registration as set out in the Non-profit Organisation Act (71/1997).
- Registration of a service provider in terms of the Act, and a review of its constitution, would provide a municipality with the assurance that the organisation has the decision-making structure, powers, and obligations needed to engage in MCPs.
TOWARDS A STRATEGIC PERSPECTIVE

A review of the international literature, and the South African experience, has exposed the following motivating, success and constraining factors to the establishment of successful MCPs.

Motivating factors

The factors motivating organisations to forge partnerships differ according to their objectives, values and priorities, but it is generally agreed among all stakeholders that partnerships allow diverse strengths to be combined and individual weaknesses to be addressed.

Municipality perspective

The major motivations for municipalities to enter into partnerships with CSOs is based on their ability to meet the following three objectives:

- **Cost-effective service delivery**
  Partnerships provide better value-for-money alternatives to direct service provision. This is generally achieved through service delivery targeted at the poor. The municipality normally adopts a market-oriented and commercial view of the engagement with the voluntary sector, and CSOs tend to enhance cost effectiveness through enabling a community contribution to delivery or targeted service delivery based on responsiveness to real needs.

- **Deepening democracy**
  Partnerships are perceived as essential in cultivating a participative ethos which enhances democratic relations through community based development and advocacy processes.

- **Supplementing capacity or extending service delivery**
  Partnerships supplement their capacity to deliver services and fill gaps. Municipalities typically allocate a specific sum of money to support voluntary bodies. Internationally, there is a close relationship between this perspective and the traditional service provider role of municipalities.
CSO perspective

CSOs enter into partnerships with local government for a host of reasons. Some CSOs work with existing municipal structures, procedures and protocols, while others strive to effect change in municipal rules and values. With regard to the latter, partnerships are normally forged to institutionalise alternative service delivery strategies such that there is a fundamental change in favour of the poor. According to the literature and local practice, CSO perspectives of partnerships with local government are usually aimed at innovation, sustainable service delivery to improve access to services, community empowerment, monitoring and advocacy.

- **Innovation**
  CSOs are often motivated by the potential to innovate through working in partnerships. Alternative approaches can demonstrate options that are not generally considered or adopted.

- **Sustainable service delivery to improve access to services**
  Partnerships to encourage more efficient and effective use of scarce financial resources with a view to ensuring that development resources do reach targeted groups. Partnerships focus on existing opportunities to secure and improve access to goods and services for the poor. Often CSOs, either in collaboration with or with financial support from local government, carry out service functions (delivery, improvements and maintenance) to fill gaps left by state provision.

- **Community empowerment**
  Representation of the interests and needs of the poor in decision making processes and structures of governance. This includes the opening of opportunities to lobby for or test preferred policies.

- **Monitoring and advocacy**
  Partnerships to monitor progress in meeting basic service needs, to ensure policy is implemented and promote transparency.

Success factors

The literature, case studies, and surveys suggest some general features of successful partnerships.

- **Simple, focused proposals**
  Effective partnerships are normally forged around simple, focused ideas for initially small-scale projects which are widely understood and accepted. As the project 'matures' and capacity is built, interventions are scaled-up and coverage increased.

- **Sustainability**
  At all stages of the 'project', the issue of sustainability guides and frames action. Ensuring sustainability requires efforts on multiple fronts, including:
  - Developing entrepreneurship and moving away from a traditional welfare approach.
  - Ensuring well managed and independent organisational structures with participation of stakeholders in governing boards.
  - Encouraging enterprising leadership.

- **Mature participatory frameworks**
  Participatory structures oversee policy formulation and implementation and create an environment where municipalities can work in respectful and supportive ways with CSOs, listening to citizens and assisting decision making processes with information and
resources.

- **Formal contracts**
  Partnerships with community organisations work best when working arrangements and contracts are formalised.

- **Flexible municipal rules and procedures**
  Flexible rules and procedures help fast track decision-making and release project finances rapidly, and enable participatory and transparent problem solving.

- **Officials capable of working with CSOs**
  Municipal staff capable of working with CSOs are able to respond sensitively to community dynamics and the complexity of community-institutional building. They also support and empower CSOs proactively and work closely with the community (ideally in interdepartmental local area teams).

- **Competitive determination of grant allocation and 'matching grants' to CSOs**
  Accountability and performance increases when CSOs compete for contracts with defined service outputs. Matching grants can elicit commitment from communities and competition for matching grants encourages greater participation and dedication in designing a feasible project and making it work.

- **Information production and dissemination promotes innovation**
  Supporting research and the documentation and dissemination of information on successful partnerships promotes innovation and the replication of good ideas. Information clearing houses and resource centres help exchange knowledge and experiences.

- **Learning capability**
  Partnerships need to be able to learn from experience and adapt appropriately to ensure ongoing improvement.

**Constraining factors**

- **Conflicts and divisions within communities**
  Interventions in communities needs to extend beyond brick-and-mortar and should encompass conflict mediation and dispute resolution activities.

- **'Them and us' syndrome**
  Effective engagement between municipalities and CSOs is hampered when municipalities and CSOs perceive each other as 'competitors' rather than as 'partners'.

- **'Business as usual' approach**
  Many officials and politicians are insufficiently attuned to the new realities of governing under complex conditions. Accordingly, they adopt a very narrow and traditional view of service delivery. Prospects for dynamic engagement with CSOs that hold out the potential for cost-effective and responsive service delivery are foregone when a 'business as usual' approach predominates.

- **Absence of a common vocabulary**
  The organisational and operational ethos of partners differs substantially, and there is a need to develop a common language and understanding. Without this, partnerships are likely to be fraught with conflict, mistrust and misunderstandings.

- **Poor systems and capacity**
  CSOs are often unable to make the shift towards an output orientation, entrepreneurial practices and 'hard' service delivery. Furthermore, they do not have the financial resources to attract and retain skilled staff. Municipalities, on the other hand, often lack capacity and continuity because of frequent transfers and high staff turnovers.

- **Neglect of supportive legislation**
  Both local government and CSOs do not adequately exploit existing supportive legislation to the advantage of MCPs.
• **Shortage of management skills**

There is a shortage of strategic management skills to sustain MCPs. This impacts negatively on the ability to identify, design, manage and monitor the partnerships.

**An organising framework**

Two sets of characteristic are put forward to guide the development of the MCP strategic agenda. These are:

- The characteristics of competitive MCPs.
- The characteristics of an enabling environment within which MCPs can best operate.

**Characteristics of competitive MCPs**

Successful MCPs are understood as service delivery and governance mechanisms which include three key elements:

- Organisational effectiveness.
- Extending basic services to address areas of greatest unmet needs and poverty.
- Community empowerment and deepening of the democratic contract at a local level.

While MCPs can fulfill a broad range of needs, at present, the overriding objective is for these alternative service delivery strategies to help reduce poverty levels and empower communities.

![Characteristics of competitive MCPs](image)

The focus is on MCPs which support service delivery and/or governance processes wherein all three
elements are present and (potentially) strong. Such municipal-community partnerships will generally have a competitive advantage over other service delivery options.

Thus the three elements can be used as criteria to help determine the competitiveness of MCP delivery strategies.

**Characteristics of an enabling environment**

The enabling environment refers to the extent to which the external environment can facilitate or constrain the effectiveness of MCPs. The following issues, drawn from the research results, detail key characteristics of an environment conducive to successful MCPs.

**The underlying policy agenda**

- **Policy bias**
  The organising framework is based on a business strategy approach to MCPs in the context of a policy framework. In other words, it attempts to ensure that the actual strategy, while underpinned by a policy agenda, will be viable and workable at an operational level.

  The policy agenda is based on the Local Government White Paper published in 1998 which has as its starting point the reduction of poverty and democratic empowerment.

  The organising framework involves extending services to:

  - Improve access, strengthen democracy and community empowerment, hence improving levels of community control as well as levels of responsiveness to community needs.
  - Increase the effectiveness of local government through mobilising social
Together, these act to address critical policy objectives set out in the White Paper - to empower communities and promote sustainable livelihoods.

- **Poverty reduction**
  While this study has prioritised MCPs that focus on reducing levels of poverty, the basic principles however apply to any community partnerships operating in any sector of society.

- **Empowerment**
  A meaningful engagement with the approach presented in this study needs to take into account the power imbalances in South African society. This means the strategic framework must ensure that financial and technical provisions are made to help civil society organisations develop the skills required to run effective partnerships. Where necessary, feasibility studies should ensure adequate lead times to allow for CSO skills development.

### A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR MCPs IN SOUTH AFRICA

#### Approach

- MCPs in context
  MCPs are an example of one institutional strategy that can help meet developmental needs at a local level. They should not be seen as vehicles purely for community participation nor as panaceas for extending infrastructural services to poor people. They are a service delivery and governance vehicle which, in the context of meeting developmental needs of poor people with respect to all municipal functions, sometimes demonstrate a competitive advantage over other approaches.

- Municipality needs in the context of CSO capability
  The framework is biased towards the needs of municipalities in fulfilling their service delivery and governance obligations. MCPs are considered in this context and possible scenarios are based on municipal needs given CSO capabilities. Since both needs and capabilities are fluid, the proposed strategic agenda looks at the phasing of national initiatives to promote MCPs.

- Addressing the challenges facing CSOs
  In the context of a growing performance culture and the redirection of donor support, this report raises challenges for the NGO sector. It argues that a viable position can be created by NGOs willing to focus on service needs at actual community level, but it will require working in a context of competition, responsiveness and cost effectiveness.

- Developments already in place
  A meaningful strategy needs to take cognisance of key developments already underway in specific infrastructural sectors. An in-depth scan is beyond the scope of this study and it is proposed that such analysis be conducted on a sector by sector basis in the next phase.

- Promote a strategic agenda to further investigate and promote MCPs
  The report is a starting point to frame further work, consultation processes, the testing of ideas and good practices. It is proposed that government and stakeholders consult on the framework outlined in this report, and analyse the key leverage areas in which the potential and impact of MCPs can be realised and maximised.

- Implementing MCPs
  - Competitive advantage
    The approach targets MCPs that have a competitive advantage over other delivery mechanisms. In this context competitive advantage is understood at two levels. At the macro level MCPs should be seen as competitive relative to other delivery strategies. At
the micro level competitiveness is defined in terms of the ability of service providers to compete against each other.

- Competition and cooperation

While a paradigm of competitiveness promotes performance and end-user responsiveness, competition should not be seen in isolation from cooperation which is critical on a number of levels.

Firstly, service delivery partnerships between public, community and private sectors are key to 'reinventing governance'. Secondly, appropriate forms of cooperation between different organisations/competitors plays a valuable role in improving performance for all the organisations across the sector (e.g. professional associations; sector wide research; university faculties; lobbying government). In this sense one critical approach to addressing the crises of governance discussed earlier is a coopetition paradigm which understands the relationship between organisations as both cooperative and competitive.

- Ramping up

Given the embryonic nature of the MCP notion in SA, competitive advantage will be thought of on the basis of potential rather than current reality. MCP policy must take account of the need for the strategy to ramp up over time and be supported and enabled by government if the potential is to be realised.

- Capacity-building

A critical ingredient will be the creation of a capacity building strategy to help CSOs and municipalities develop the necessary skills and capabilities to run MCPs. To ensure efficacy of the MCP approach, such a capacity building strategy will need to be designed on a cost-benefit basis - return on investment in capacity building should be demonstrable.

Roles of NGOs and CBOs Whether the primary partner in an MCP is an NGO or a CBO, it is hypothesised that NGOs will play a key role in providing technical and organisational support (at least in the initial stages) in most MCPs.

For this reason national MCP promotion strategies should aim to work directly with NGOs, while working with CBOs through NGOs. In certain rural/small town contexts, this may not be an option, and then direct engagement with appropriate CBOs would be necessary.

Strategic agenda

The report proposes an organising framework to initiate both analysis and action. On the one hand, this framework is intended to help begin an in-depth policy and strategy process which will include further research and consultation. On the other it is intended to result in actions which promote, support and initiate MCPs. These two processes are interrelated and mutually supportive.

The strategic agenda for the establishment of MCPs in South Africa has two components:

- The characteristics of competitive partnerships across municipal service sectors and contexts.
- The characteristics of the enabling environment which facilitate the establishment of successful MCPs.

TARGETING COMPETITIVE MCPs

Successful MCPs are understood as service delivery and governance mechanisms which include three key elements:
• Organisational effectiveness.
• Extending basic services to address areas of greatest unmet needs and poverty.
• Community empowerment and deepening of the social contract at a local level.

While MCPs can fulfill a broad range of needs, at present, the overriding objective is for alternative service delivery strategies to help reduce poverty levels and empower communities. Thus the focus is on MCPs which support service delivery and/or governance processes wherein all three elements are present and strong. Such partnerships will generally have a competitive advantage over other service delivery options. In this way, these three elements can be used as criteria to help determine the competitiveness of MCP delivery strategies.

Prioritising MCPs
Targeting MCPs which are most likely to succeed is a critical starting point for the promotion of the strategy. The MCPs we have targeted are based on matching municipalities' needs with NGO capabilities in the context of international and current SA policy trends. Targeted MCPs are defined in terms of the municipal service sector (e.g. housing, refuse), context (e.g. metro, urban) and the nature of the activity (e.g. training, project management).
It is suggested that, following sectoral consultation and testing through further analysis, MCPs in the following sectors should be considered as the lead components of an MCP strategy:

• Basic services: water and sanitation, refuse collection, roads and environmental maintenance.
• Social housing in metros, cities and towns.
• Local economic development strategies.
Revenue management. (When cross-checking the findings of this study with the Local Government Transformation Programme - LGTP - assessment of municipal needs, a strong case was made to add MCPs in the area of revenue management. Applications for direct assistance to the LGTP demonstrate significant interest in partnerships for billings and revenue collections. While revenue management was not exposed in the study as a potential area for partnerships, it is probably because finance was not identified as a sector in the survey.)

Such a sector based strategy will require coordination between local government, the DCD and line departments across national and provincial governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Partnership emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic services, i.e., water and sanitation, refuse, roads and environmental maintenance</td>
<td>Rural: water and sanitation, refuse, roads and environmental maintenance. Metros, cities and towns: environmental maintenance and refuse collection</td>
<td>A strong emphasis should be placed on labour-intensive (job creation) strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing</td>
<td>Metros, cities and towns</td>
<td>Alternative tenure and ownership options of an adequate standard. Using collective access to finance. Creating additional value through social capital and community-based networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economic development</td>
<td>All contexts</td>
<td>Develop and pilot local economic strategies which focus on the needs of the poor and job creation, in context of building sustainable strategies and growing local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue management partnerships</td>
<td>All contexts</td>
<td>Enhanced revenue collection through MCPs, integrated into broader 'Masakhane' processes related to improved and affordable service delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promoting MCPs: support to priority sectors
A programme should be kick-started by selecting two or three lead sectors, from those already prioritised. A series of interrelated activities for each of the selected sectors needs to be initiated to give direct support to the establishment of MCPs. These activities include:

- The promotion of partnerships
  It is proposed that initially, two or three 'lead sectors' be selected and that 'sector forums' should be established for each of these.

Building linkages between role-players on the basis of a common agenda is a powerful catalyst for action and helps promote partnerships. This can be done by establishing forums and processes to facilitate
dialogue between stakeholders working in targeted sectors. Bringing together the actual networks of professionals and related and supporting organisations (industry professionals, professional associations, firms, CSOs, training bodies, government departments) to discuss the practicalities of establishing and supporting MCPs in their sector is also likely to catalyse action. Such facilitated engagement also provides opportunities for the sharing of ideas, the setting of common agendas to promote an enabling environment, the running of joint training and capacity building exercises and the formulation of approaches to removing barriers.

- Competitiveness studies
Further testing of the viability and competitiveness of the proposed lead MCP sectors needs to be undertaken through in-depth analyses of the prioritised MCP sectors. The studies would need to assess competitiveness of actual partnerships.

- Pilot projects
Initiate, support and track pilot projects. Use them to test hypotheses and support learning and innovation. It is proposed that some of these pilots be selected on a competitive basis and that matching funds be made available to them.

- Monitor developments and performance
Monitoring and evaluation provides an impetus for ongoing learning and experience to feed into each sector forum. A monitoring system, or a series of indexes, needs to be designed to capture and interpret results.

CREATING AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT
An enabling environment refers to the extent to which external factors can enable or constrain MCPs. The following issues, drawn from the research, detail key characteristics of an environment conducive to enhancing the likelihood of successful MCPs. A number of key cross-cutting activities can be taken to develop such an enabling environment. These include:

- Training and capacity-building programme
In the short-term, programmes such as one day information workshops and publications, can help introduce the MCP concept to a wider range of stakeholders.

In the medium-term, training courses could be conducted that focus on in-depth technical issues that cut across sectors, for example, contracts and contract negotiations, financial modelling, post contract administration and working with CSOs.

In the longer-term, frameworks and mechanisms could be designed to help build CSO and municipal capability to work on MCPs.

- R&D and information dissemination
The availability of information in accessible forms proves to be an effective catalyst for the generation of innovative solutions to governance and delivery problems. To promote this, government and stakeholders can provide support to research and development and the production and dissemination of international and local knowledge and good practice.

- National MSP policy
At present the Municipal Services Partnership policy has focused on public-private-partnerships. The DCD needs to take a decision to integrate other types of partnerships into existing policy, or develop a specific MCPs policy. To do this, and to establish sector based forums, the DCD needs to build capacity, at a national level, to champion the MCP programme.

• MCP fund

The DCD needs to establish a MCP fund to support all of the above, which includes:
  - The establishment of sector-based forums.
  - Research and development and sector based studies.
  - Information production and dissemination.
  - Matching funds for competitive pilots.
  - New priority activities, as and when they arise.

INTERVENTIONS

The combination of support to priority sectors and cross-cutting steps that need to be taken to create an enabling environment, leads us to a set of interventions that the DCD can make, in partnership with civil society organisations and municipalities, to help encourage the establishment of successful municipal-community partnerships.

Next steps

Based on the strategic agenda outlined above, it is suggested that a DCD programme with the following five elements be initiated:

1. Policy development through in-depth consultation on this draft framework and further research. This will require clarity on the relationship of MCP policy and strategy work to broader MSP policy processes.
2. Initiate two or three sector forums each with a programme to initiate in-depth competitiveness studies and pilot projects.
3. Build a national support framework by establishing support capacity in DCD.

4. Establish a research and development programme to look at the differentiation of roles and responsibilities of NGOs and CBOs and establish information sharing and training programmes.

5. Establish an MCP fund.

APPENDIX 1: SOUTH AFRICAN CASE STUDIES
INTRODUCTION

A random sample of 26 MCP initiatives was selected as case studies to be surveyed for the purpose of the study. This appendix summarises each of the case studies.

The case studies are divided into seven sectors:

- Planning (seven case studies).
- Local economic development (seven case studies).
- Environmental management (one case study).
- Environmental maintenance (two case studies).
- Water and sanitation (three case studies).
- Refuse removal (one case study).
- Housing and integrated living environments (five case studies).

The case studies were identified through networking and intensive consultation with local authorities, NGOs and CBOs, consultants, academics, research and policy organisations and institutions. Data was collected through questionnaires and telephonic interviews.

PLANNING

Case 1: Participatory approach to development planning and implementation

Partnership:

The Border Rural Committee, Afesis-corplan, Willowvale Transitional Local Council and Community Development Forums in the Eastern Cape.

Summary:

The partnership is geared to supplement the capacity of the local authority for the purposes of democratising decision-making and resource allocation; building community development structures; fulfilling the municipal mandate in the areas of promoting and supporting local economic development and rural development. The activities of the service provider in the partnership include training and capacity building, public participation, policy and research, technical assistance, programme design and management. The NGOs provide support to both local government and community development structures as the need arises.

Case 2: Formulation of development strategy

Partnership:

Worcester Municipality and Foundation for Contemporary Research in the Western Cape.

Summary:

The strategic focus of this partnership between the research and policy NGO and local government is the
APPENDIX 2: INTERNATIONAL GOOD PRACTICE
SEVEN GOOD PRACTICES FOUND IN EFFECTIVE MCPs

1. Neighbourhood-based, inter-departmental teams of city staff improve responsiveness of service delivery at the local level.
2. Municipal staff are more effective when they receive specialised training on working with community organisations and leaders.
3. Community-based organisations need training and support to help them become better advocates and partners in service delivery.
4. NGO/CBO involvement in service delivery can increase cost-recovery for the service, and also reduce overall costs.
5. Competition for contracts and grants, especially 'matching grants', helps promote commitment and quality. Within this the following practices are recommended:
   - Grant allocation to NGOs/CBOs for service delivery must be competitively determined.
   - Matching grants (grants whereby authorities match contributions made by the community) help ensure commitment from community partners.
6. Partnerships with community organisations work best when formalised with contracts and implementation is overseen by participatory structures.
7. Volunteers are an important resource to extend municipal services.

GOOD PRACTICE 1: NEIGHBOURHOOD-BASED, CROSS-DEPARTMENTAL, SERVICE-DELIVERY TEAMS

Service delivery that is done at the neighbourhood level, rather than the city level, gets better results.

Neighbourhood teams work directly with residents and community-based organisations in identifying and solving problems together. City staff see residents as partners, rather than as passive recipients in service delivery.

Instead of competing with each other, city staff learn from their colleagues in other line departments and understand how different department programs integrate at the local level.

Neighbourhood teams feel more accountable for service delivery to the residents in the area, rather than to the central city departments.

Residents have contact with the human face of city government through neighbourhood based staff. Residents are better able to access information and resources to make city government work for them.

Examples

- Neighbourhood alert centres in Little Rock, Arkansas bring together neighbourhood facilitators, code enforcement officers, rental unit inspectors, and police officers to improve public safety and neighbourhood beautification.
- "Building better neighbourhoods" teams in Indianapolis, Indiana are comprised of officials from departments of parks, public works, capital asset management, police,
zoning, and health.

- Charlotte in the USA reorganised its thirty city departments into nine "business centres" and four "support businesses". One business centre is "neighbourhood development" which combines staff from the former departments of community development, community relations, neighbourhood services, employment, training, and economic development.

**GOOD PRACTICE 2: COMMUNITY SENSITIVITY TRAINING FOR MUNICIPAL STAFF**

Municipal officials need training in how to:

- Think cross-sectorally rather than only according to objectives of their line department.
- Understand the specific local social, economic, and political conditions of the neighbourhood that help define service needs and may impact on delivery.
- Work respectfully with CBOs, i.e., learn to listen to citizens as they express concerns, complaints and propose solutions.
- Identify emerging leaders and help them to become more effective advocates and community mobilises.
- Solicit and maximise support and cooperation from CBOs in addressing a neighbourhood problem.
- Empower neighbourhood groups to take on more implementation responsibilities.

**Example: Liveable neighbourhoods teams - San Diego, California**

For each targeted neighbourhood, the City created an interdepartmental team to work with the community on revitalising activities. Team members were selected from departments such as: planning, economic development, police, library, code enforcement, parks and recreation, arts and culture, community services, redevelopment and housing.

Unlike previous City teams, the Liveable Neighbourhood teams received special training in areas such as team building, collaborative planning, and conflict management.

Teams were empowered to cut through the traditional City hierarchy in order to assemble resources for the local projects from various departments and programmes.

City staff members educate one another about the functions of other city departments, and about the variety of community initiatives happening in the neighbourhood.

**GOOD PRACTICE 3: COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT SUPPORT FOR CBOs**

Municipal staff recognise that stronger, more effective CBOs make their job easier.

- CBOs’ familiarity with the district and residents helps to identify problems sooner and to prioritise concerns.
- CBOs can contribute volunteer labour to assist in service delivery.
- CBOs often have innovative proposals using non-traditional methods and appropriate technologies, to solve local problems.
- CBOs are effective in exerting peer pressure to support a social behaviour change that impacts on service delivery.

Leadership or active membership in a CBO is a special skill and requires training.

Information clearinghouses and resource centres are important mechanisms for exchanging best practices and approaches to neighbourhood issues.

**Examples**

- Neighbourhood empowerment initiative - Indianapolis, Indiana.
- Neighbourhood partnership teams - Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Training of citizen advisory committee leaders - Nashville, Tennessee.
- Neighbours for better neighbourhoods - Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

**Neighbourhood empowerment initiative - Indianapolis, Indiana**

The City of Indianapolis created the Indianapolis Neighbourhood Resource Centre (INRC) to train neighbourhood leaders to bring about constructive change in their neighbourhoods. INRC provides information and assistance to neighbourhood associations, churches, and community development corporations. Three-quarters of the INRC Board of Directors are neighbourhood leaders themselves.

INRC informs neighbourhood leaders about starting neighbourhood organisations, managing finances, legal issues, recruiting volunteers, and designing action plans. INRC helps neighbourhood organisations create newsletters and brochures. They also provide computer centre support to organisations.

INRC conducts an intensive neighbourhood leadership training program for low-income community organisers who are emerging leaders in their area.

INRC hosts a neighbourhood development summit to discuss common issues of neighbourhood organisations, and sends out a quarterly information newsletter to 900 subscribers.

**Neighbourhood partnership teams - Fort Collins, Colorado**

The Fort Collins Police Department initiated the formation of Neighbourhood Partnership Teams (NPT) to address community policing and environmental management. The NPT's vision was for community groups to use their own resources to solve problems. Through training, coaching, and modelling, the NPT city staff foster neighbourhood group ownership and independence. Over time, the neighbourhood group members take over an increasing number of roles, and NPT involvement decreases until they serve only as liaisons with the central city departments.

Three-four times a year the city offers a free seminar on "Leading a Neighbourhood Group" for leaders, covering topics such as facilitation and problem solving.

Annual "Congress of Neighbourhoods" provides training to neighbourhood groups and citizens.

A neighbourhood resource centre provides information about what communities are doing to solve similar problems.
Training of citizen advisory committee leaders - Nashville, Tennessee

The City of Nashville establishes Neighbourhood Strategy Areas (NSAs) to help involve citizens in targeting needed improvements in the area. The council member for the NSA initially appoints community leaders to assist in the planning and organisation of the NSA. Later, residents of the NSA elect their peers to serve on a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) which identifies needs and supervises implementation of service improvements in the NSA.

CAC members received training from the city in how "block grants" for housing and urban development can be used. They are also educated about city ordinances, and how to obtain assistance and cooperation from city departments. Armed with this knowledge, the CAC leaders meet with their constituents and neighbours to identify the problems they want solved in their NSA (park improvements, exterior home renovations, housing construction).

CAC members also learn to conduct community audits (of housing and environmental code compliance) with forms and guidance from the Metro Beautification and Environment Commission. They are trained to organise community cleanups on a regular basis with the cooperation of local churches, local business, and volunteers.

Neighbours for better neighbourhoods - Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Neighbours for Better Neighbourhoods (NBN) is a citywide program initiated by a local community foundation, and funded through several foundations, city and county government, and corporations. The city uses housing and urban development "block grant" funds to help sponsor NBN.

NBN's goals are to increase citizen awareness and participation, increase the capacity of neighbourhood organisations, and arrange financial assistance for neighbourhood self-help efforts. Thirty-nine neighbourhood leaders representing 18 neighbourhoods participated in a Neighbourhood Leaders School.

Examples of NBN assistance to local neighbourhood associations:

- Capacity development of tenant association that reduced drugs and crime in their housing complex and nearby shopping centre.
- Development of a program to help troubled youth, through providing alternative recreation and education opportunities.
- Sponsorship of meetings to share information about resources and other neighbourhood association success stories.

GOOD PRACTICE 4: NGO/CBO INVOLVEMENT CAN EXTEND SERVICES, INCREASE COST-RECOVERY, AND REDUCE OVERALL COSTS

When community organisations participate in service operations, they have a stake in ensuring there are funds to keep the system going.

Community organisations use peer pressure to encourage residents to pay for services. Neighbourhood residents feel a greater obligation to pay when they, or their neighbours, are involved in the service provision.
NGOs/CBOs often use low-cost technologies and appropriately-skilled labour in public works projects, bringing down construction, operation and maintenance costs.

**Examples**

- Refuse collection - Mymensingh and Sylhet, Bangladesh.
- Urban water associations - Tegucigalpa, Honduras.
- Tricycle scheme - Hyderabad, India.
- Refuse collection - Mymensingh and Sylhet, Bangladesh.

The Local Government Engineering Department leased out municipal equipment and transferred municipal labourers to an NGO to improve the solid-waste management system in the target municipalities.

NGOs pre-qualified to participate in the program, and Shubashati was selected on the basis of organisational strength and financial resources.

The NGO mobilised the community residents to pay their refuse collection fees, and to bring their refuse to the designated points. This had a dramatic impact on the effectiveness of the system.

Shubashati was able to provide better refuse collection and drainage cleaning service at 20-25% of the municipal cost. This was attributed to the NGO's ability to work with the labourers more effectively on a personal level, as well as redesigning the system to be more efficient.

**Urban water Associations - Tegucigalpa, Honduras**

The National Water and Sewerage Service helped low-income urban neighbourhoods set up their own water associations. These associations installed independent water supply systems, which residents pay for and own, and provide a regular supply of water at a cheaper price than private vendors.

UNICEF provided basic materials and equipment, but communities provide low- and semi-skilled labour and local materials for construction of the distribution system. Water associations provide staff to serve as tap attendants, treasurers, and technical operators.

The monthly water tariff is adjusted to cover capital and O&M costs. Funds pay for salaries of association staff. Part of the water tariff is invested in a revolving fund for other community development projects. One community saved $43,000 for a new drainage system.

In four years, 45,000 people in 25 low-income areas received a regular supply of water through the new system.

"**Tricycle scheme" - Hyderabad, India**

The Hyderabad Municipal Health Corporation (MHC) had a daily backlog of 100-500 tonnes of uncollected waste. In response, they developed a scheme using employees of neighbourhood and community-based organisations and waste pickers.

This community-based waste management system serves 100,000 households in middle-upper income
areas, and 190,000 households in slum areas.

The CBO provides unemployed local youth to collect and cart waste on a tricycle from the residential area to one of the municipal garbage dumps. The scheme employs 500 workers.

The MHC pays the CBOs to maintain the system's daily operation. Households pay a membership fee. The CBO system has saved about eight million rupees per year.

Households are encouraged to separate their organic waste which is composted, collected, packaged and marketed by the NGO "Street Children Work Coordination Federation".

**GOOD PRACTICE 5: COMPETITION FOR CONTRACTS AND GRANTS, ESPECIALLY 'MATCHING GRANTS', HELP PROMOTE COMMITMENT, QUALITY AND PARTNERSHIP**

Innovative local governments are using requirements for matching resources to elicit commitment from communities. Competition for these matching grants encourages greater participation and dedication in designing a feasible project and making it work.

Municipalities are using competitive bidding procedures, usually used for private procurement, for allocating grants or contracts to NGO service providers. They also involve stakeholders in the selection process for grant allocation. Accountability and performance increase when NGOs compete for contracts with defined service outputs.

**Examples**

- Matching municipal funds for latrines - Cambe, Brazil.
- Cesspool operations - Bamako, Mali.
- Neighbourhood committees for urban infrastructure - Abdijan, Ivory Coast.
- Slum networking project - Ahmedabad, India.
- Neighbourhood alert centres - Little Rock, Arkansas.
- Community action network (CAN) - Austin and Travis County.
- Safe city initiative - Denver, Colorado.

**Matching municipal funds for latrines - Cambe, Brazil**

A parish priest and the community association leader initiated an agreement with the Mayor to conduct a socio-economic survey of the community in order to better match local government funds with real needs.

The community association assessed the needs of 1,200 families in the area using a 52-question survey. The main priority was better sanitation services.

The municipality applied for federal funds to build 400 latrines. Funds were used to manufacture cement blocks and purchase other construction materials.

The neighbourhood association registered households in need of toilet facilities. They also conducted a
health campaign to show how latrines and vaccinations protect everyone against contagious diseases.

Families contributed the labour of one person to help construct bathrooms. The neighbourhood association did the bulk of construction, supervised by a municipal foreman. They built 350 new bathrooms.

The neighbourhood association also taught recipient families hygienic practices.

**Cesspool operations - Bamako, Mali**

Individual drainage systems in a district of Bamako, Mali, were 90% non-functional. Most residents tipped liquid waste onto the public streets, creating an unhealthy environment.

The NGO "Jigui" proposed that residents be responsible for 37% of the costs of cesspool construction, and that 63% be covered through a government special development fund.

Municipal staff provided technical support on the design of the drainage systems. Jigui played a coordinating role with the community.

The NGO also saves municipal operational expenditures, because Jigui manages the cesspool operations and can do so at 20% of the municipal cost.

One thousand eight hundred cesspools were constructed under the programme.

**Neighbourhood matching fund - Seattle, Washington**

The city sets aside money for neighbourhood projects, but the neighbourhood association has to match the funds with donated time, materials, labour or money.

The Fund has received $20 million in "sweat equity" in exchange for $8 million in city grants.

The programme has funded more than 700 projects in community policing, neighbourhood planning, parks and recreation, job training and education, and arts and culture. The programme awards $1.5 million annually from the city budget.

Neighbourhood associations applying for the grant must show that the project is "self-help" and will bring diverse groups together. In analysing their potential matching contribution, they must identify their own assets (monetary, physical and human resource).

Residents not only come up with the ideas for communities, but they also participate in the committee that reviews applications and chooses those projects eligible for funding.

- Conversion of an unused asphalt area into new parking for school and community members - City grant: $40 554; neighbourhood match: $40 554.
- Development of a children's playground, ballcourt, and picnic area - City grant: $100 000; neighbourhood match: $125 000.
- Expansion of a school computer centre and creation of an after-school tutoring programme to target families with limited computer experience - City grant: $20 000; neighbourhood match: $48 023.
Establishment of a computer learning centre to a low-income housing site to help residents learn new skills - City grant: $9,686; neighbourhood match: $45,509.

Neighbourhood committees for urban infrastructure - Abdijan, Ivory Coast

Neighbourhood committees (CDQs) were established by the Mayor to engage the resources of communities in addressing economic and infrastructure problems. CDQs work with the municipality to improve street/drain cleaning, garbage collection, security services, road maintenance, and street lighting.

- CDQs have collected $120,000 in fees and have mobilised $20,000 for specific projects, including infrastructure development.
- Mobilisation of funds has contributed to 30% of infrastructure project costs. CDQs promoted the hiring of 200 local workers on these projects.
- Municipality leverages public funds through the neighbourhood committees at a ratio of 1 to 6.
- Full and part-time employment has been generated for an estimated 2,000 workers.

Sustainability is achieved as neighbourhood committees are given seed capital, but then required to operate on self-supporting basis.

Slum networking project - Ahmedabad, India

Ahmedabad Parivartan ("Slum Networking Project") is based on the idea that services should only be provided when there is a clear demand for them and a commitment from the community. Parivartan was implemented in the slum of Sanjaynagar on a pilot basis.

The municipality determined that services, including road paving, water supply, underground sewerage link, storm water drainage, street lighting, and solid waste management could be provided at a cost of Rs.6,000 per dwelling.

Households must pay for one-third of the total cost, or Rs.2,000.

Participation in the project requires that a community must also form an association, and indicate its commitment by payment of Rs.2,000 per household for capital costs, and Rs.100 per household for initial maintenance costs.

Implementation of the scheme delivered services to 181 households in Sanjaynagar. Community investments were secured and handled by a well-known union and bank, the Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA).

Neighbourhood alert centres - Little Rock, Arkansas

Neighbourhood alert centres (NAC) are designed to provide focused attention to specific neighbourhoods. They work closely with neighbourhood associations to determine what needs to be done and how.

At first the location of NACs was determined by the city. As the neighbourhood association movement grew, more and more neighbourhoods wanted NACs that bring city services to the local level. Now the establishment of NACs in each neighbourhood is part of a competitive process. Neighbourhood
associations must submit "community partnership proposals" as to how they would partner with the city in support of the NAC.

Community partnership proposals must reflect community in-kind support of NAC in that area (volunteer staff, donated space, collection of funds or "pennies for policemen").

Little Rock City Board of Directors reviews all proposals in determining allocation of funds to finance NAC centres and staff. Following award of the NACs, the neighbourhood association and city negotiate a joint work programme for the NAC.

**Community action network (CAN) - Austin and Travis County**

CAN is a group of social service funders whose purpose is to draw together community resources into a social service delivery system. It is comprised of representatives from the city, county, United Way, school districts, state legislature, and a private industry council. It serves as an advisory body to elected city and county officials.

CAN organises a "community assessment" of social and health conditions in the area to determine priority social service funding areas.

CAN developed a standard application format and process for NGOs in social service delivery. Applications are reviewed by CAN and recommendations made to city and county councils.

Contract award decisions are made in public meetings. NGOs and citizens can comment on award of contracts. CAN advises on award of $11 million social service contracts annually.

Social service NGOs sign performance contracts that hold them accountable to impacting on critical conditions identified in the community assessment.

**Safe city initiative - Denver, Colorado**

Following the 1993 "summer of violence" in Denver, a metro-wide advisory committee was established to plan local training, identify additional needs, evaluate effectiveness of crime-fighting efforts, and determine the standards for allocation of crime prevention grant money. Implementation was managed by the Safe City Office and the Denver police.

Safe City Office annually distributes $1 million to community organisations working to reduce youth crime and gang violence.

A review board and an allocation committee determine, on a competitive basis, finalist proposals which are recommended for funding. Successful applicants contract with the city for defined services.

An independent evaluation firm assists community organisations develop an evaluation plan that specifies precise goals and objectives for performance monitoring of service delivery or activity.

The 1998 programmes served 6 000 youth and 10 000 families. The new system has resulted in 27% decrease in youth crime. In addition, a poor and high crime neighbourhood with the greatest number of
program participants achieved a 40% reduction in juvenile arrests between 1996 and 1996.

GOOD PRACTICE 6: CONTRACTS FACILITATE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Community involvement in strategic planning is an accepted best practice which is widely applied.

Community involvement in implementation of the strategic plan or neighbourhood plan increases the chances of plan realisation.

Community commitment to participate in plan implementation is furthered through contracts or agreements between municipalities, community organisations, CBOs and NGOs.

Community oversight of plan implementation through participatory structures also ensures follow-through on delivery.

Examples

- Plan for Regulation of Special Social Interest Zones - "PREZEIS", Recife, Brazil.
- Urban community water points - Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Neighbourhood action plans - Charlotte, North Carolina.
- Refuse collection and sanitation facilities - Rufisque, Senegal.
- Community management of environmental pollution - Sousse and Kasserine, Tunisia.
- Implementation committee - Lee Summit, Missouri.

Plan for Regulation of Special Social Interest Zones - "PREZEIS", Recife, Brazil

Community mobilisations secured passage of PREZEIS law which protected slum dwellers from arbitrary removal from the area.

Participatory community structures oversaw the development of policies and programs to promote urbanisation in the areas.

A PREZEIS Forum was created to develop appropriate policies on infrastructure development. It is composed of representatives of the city, NGOs, and citizens.

The PREZEIS Municipal Fund is supported by 1,2% of city revenues. The Forum controls the planning and expenditures of the public works improvements financed by the Fund.

Continuous community involvement in the implementation and oversight of public works improvements has positively impacted on 27 000 residents in the area.

Urban community water points - Dhaka, Bangladesh

The project uses a process of NGO intermediation and active community participation to construct, maintain, and pay for shared water points in slum communities of Dhaka.
An NGO, "Dusta Shasthya Kendra" (DSK), contacts leaders in poor settlements to help mobilise households in the area to manage and share the cost of water service. Twenty-thirty groups of five households each comprise a "samity", and form the basis for a community water point.

The group or "samity" elects a 13-member executive committee to work with DSK on site selection for the water point, rules for water access, rates for water use, and financial management, operations and maintenance procedures.

DSK obtains the necessary approvals for the water point from the Dhaka Water Supply and Sewerage Authority (DWASA). DSK and the samity sign a contract for the water point. The samity manages operations of the water point, and repays capital costs to DSK. Rates paid by the community cover DWASA costs. DSK provides management supervision for the samities.

**Neighbourhood action plans - Charlotte, North Carolina**

Charlotte has a "City within a City" (CWAC) program which aims to transform inner-city neighbourhoods into healthy, productive environments.

An initial activity of the CWAC program is to develop a neighbourhood "data book" so that neighbours have a deeper understanding of their socio-economic conditions, and can make comparisons with other Charlotte communities.

Neighbourhood stakeholders and a cross-departmental municipal team develop a "neighbourhood action plan" (NAP) in a 6-8 week period to address their living environment. The NAP is not comprehensive, but instead a focal point for strategic action. All participants sign an agreement to implement the plan, and individuals and associations are assigned specific responsibilities:

- Neighbourhood leader commits to converting vacant lot to a playground.
- Citizens commit to creating and serving on a neighbourhood watch group.
- Neighbourhood association commits to clean up vacant row houses that are site of drug dealing.

**Refuse collection and sanitation facilities - Rufisque, Senegal**

Management committees, comprised of community representatives and municipal technical and health staff, draw up refuse collection contracts with households. A contract is then signed with cart drivers who are supplied with a horse drawn cart.

The NGO "Enda" provides training to cart drivers and to the community representatives who monitor and assess the refuse collection service. This system reached 3,000 new households.

Four hundred and fifty households were provided with private sanitation facilities, of which half are linked to water treatment plants, through a revolving fund guaranteed by local management committees and the Enda.

A contract is drawn up between Enda (the intermediary managing the "community fund for sanitation") and the beneficiary household. The contract is countersigned and monitored by the municipality's Health
Residents co-financed 70% of the sanitation facility. Costs recovered through the program are invested into the revolving fund to allow other residents to receive facilities.

**Community management of environmental pollution - Sousse and Kasserine, Tunisia**

An expanded municipal team (EMT) is formed from municipal technical staff, community associations, and NGO representatives to address urban improvements. The EMT receives special training in community participation techniques, cross-sector team building, and environmental health problems.

The EMT’s conduct "rapid community assessments" through one-on-one interviews with households to identify critical issues. Appropriate interventions and microprojects are designed to address the problems. NGOs administer the funds for each project.

A contract is drawn up between community representatives, NGOs, and municipal staff to formalise implementation of micro-projects, including:

- Clean-up of solid-waste dump and conversion to playground.
- Building small bridge over ravine on path to school.
- Widening wastewater pipes and paving streets.

Municipal officials found that CIMEP saved 20-40% because work was carried out by community members and more appropriate technologies used.

**Implementation committee - Lee Summit, Missouri**

Lee Summit, population: 60 000, was experiencing rapid growth and needed citizen support of ballot initiatives to raise funds for infrastructure improvements. These ballot initiatives were routinely rejected by citizens who did not trust the city government. In response, the city organised an effort to involve citizens in drafting a blueprint for their community to address the service needs arising from accelerated growth.

Through a series of stakeholder meetings, participants reached consensus on a strategic plan, but they did not stop there. City leaders formed an implementation committee comprising of representatives of stakeholder groups to ensure that action would be taken on the plans. The implementation committee met during the implementation process to give guidance and address unforeseen issues or obstacles. This mechanism ensured that citizens and stakeholder groups remained active and responsible partners in the city's strategic plan, rather than only giving input at the "vision" stage.

**BEST PRACTICE 7: VOLUNTEERS EXTEND MUNICIPAL SERVICES**

During periods of cost containment, volunteers help to fill gaps in service that paid staff do not have the time to provide.

Volunteers serve as a knowledge base for citizens in the community about municipal government.
Volunteers act as advocates for programmes, and seek donations of time, money, and materials.

**Examples**

- Volunteers in social services - Health Volunteers in Cambe, Brazil.
- Volunteers in public safety - Kansas City, Missouri.
- Managing volunteer contributions - Hampton, Virginia.

**Volunteers in Social Services - Health Volunteers in Cambe, Brazil**

UNICEF and the Catholic Church selected the neighbourhood to participate in its "Pastoral of the Child" health program because of the community's high level of organization in spite of extreme poverty.

A neighborhood association surveyed 600 families in their area to develop a socio-economic profile of conditions affecting children's health.

Thirty-three women association members volunteered for training as health volunteers. Working without pay, they were trained in five areas: prenatal exams, breast-feeding information, vaccinations, rehydration therapy, and how to monitor the weight and other key medical indicators for children under the age of five.

Six years later, the health volunteers continue to provide these services to their community. The local clinic has documented the improved health of the children of the neighborhood.

**Volunteers in Public Safety - Kansas City, Missouri**

Kansas City has supported the growth and capacity building of effective community groups to improve the stability of neighborhoods. Neighbourhood groups have participated in clean-up, crime prevention, and other efforts.

**Code blitz teams:**

Neighbourhood groups provide volunteers to help code enforcement inspectors check target areas for property maintenance violations. Results include 1,400 environmental violations and 250 structural violations identified. Sixty per cent compliance in remedying these situations was achieved prior to court action.

**Citizen patrol:**

A neighbourhood watch group and city police officers developed a citizens patrol programme to respond with greater efficiency to crime alerts.

**Housing safety:**

Skilled union volunteers, community members and city staff worked to provide electrical, plumbing, furnace and roof repairs to low-income homeowners, particularly the elderly and disabled. Together the volunteers improved the liveability of 1,000 homes in the area.
APPENDIX 3: RESEARCH SAMPLE

The research consisted of municipal, NGO/CBO and case study surveys. The sample was limited and is understood to provide a starting point rather than the definitive truth.

Municipal survey

The municipal needs survey covered 22 municipalities in all nine provinces. Senior officials and administrators were interviewed from three district councils, one regional council, seven rural and urban
transitional local councils and four metros. Interviewees included seven chief executive officers (CEOs), two deputy CEOs, seven directors, two town secretaries, one deputy secretary, one chief administrator and one administrative support. The distribution of the interviewees was 9:7:5 (rural:urban:metro).

**NGO survey**

The service provider survey covered eight provinces with the majority of respondents in the Western Cape (10); Gauteng (five) and KwaZulu-Natal (five). No interviews were conducted in the North West. Service providers interviewed comprised representatives from NGOs (20), CBOs (two), and university policy/research institutes (two). Interviewees included eight programme and project managers, seven directors, two project leaders, one land-use planner, one senior researcher, one policy analyst, one trustee, one fundraiser, one chairperson and one programme coordinator. The areas serviced by the CSOs are diverse and distributed in the ratio of 13:8:14 (rural:urban:metro).

**Case study survey**

The case study survey covers seven provinces with heavy concentration in KwaZulu-Natal (seven); Gauteng and Western Cape (six each). The majority of interviewees (80%) are from the NGO and local government sectors. Two CEOs, one deputy CEO, two directors, 13 programme managers/coordinators/leaders, seven development professionals (includes economists/consultants/researchers) were interviewed. The case studies were distributed across rural:urban:metro areas in the ratio of 14:6:5.
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