ESTABLISHING CITIZENSHIP ACADEMIES TO CULTIVATE 'CUNNING INTELLIGENCE' AND 'PRACTICAL WISDOM' IN LOCAL GOVERNANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

By: Tristan Görgens, Pamela Masiko-Kambala and Mirjam van Donk - Isandla Institute

There is a fundamental problem with the quality of democracy and governance in South Africa's system of local governance. Various government assessments detail the governance deficit in the system that gives rise to persistent community-based protests.[1] Central to the problem is the reality that, generally, the existing public participation structures and forums at local government level are not functioning well and do not achieve the expected outcomes. Substantive decision-making about 'the nature, pace, sequencing and location of development are taken in "closed spaces" […], which are impermeable to local citizens and communities' (van Donk 2012: 13). Compounding this is the dissatisfaction with the pace of development since the advent of democracy.

PHOTO: HOUSINGISAHUMANRIGHT

FURTHERMORE, the current fractured state of investments (in both physical infrastructure and social programmes) prevents the benefits of such investments being maximised. As outlined in Chapter 1, the on-going structural (and spatial) marginalisation of the majority of the urban poor from the formal economy and substantive job opportunities make the ineffectiveness of these investments even direr. More effective planning and decision-making at a neighbourhood level is a key mechanism through which state interventions could be made in a more integrated and sustainable fashion.

As van Donk (2012) details in her description of the 'governance deficit' in local participatory governance in South Africa, an array of recent political and policy signals indicate that new strategies for addressing the dissatisfaction of communities are a priority. For one, the emerging discourse is that, in general, "people" have been the missing constituent in the government-driven development and the government-dominated governance processes. The *National Development Plan* (NDP) of South Africa launched in 2012 and the *Recommendations of the African National Congress's National Policy Conference* (held in June 2012) concur with this perspective. Both documents call for a paradigm shift, one that should be centred on three things: a capable and developmental state, active citizenry and strong leadership.

Expanding the opportunities for citizens to become involved in formal participation and increasing the recognition of citizen-created spaces of mobilisation and engagement are important. However, another recognised core missing element is a mechanism through which citizens are equipped to become more meaningfully involved in their development. A huge part of this requires a simultaneous action of citizens 'learning by doing' and 'learning by deliberation' (Cornwall et al. 2008: 34). Thus the focus moves beyond initiatives that equip communities with the *hard* skills that they need to become involved in governance processes (although these are vital). What is required is to create collaborative spaces that enable both communities and officials to recognise the complexity of poor communities and develop responses that are grounded, realistic and sustainable. Citizenship is a process of becoming – the result of involvement in the give-and-take, rough and tumble of governance processes over a period of time. It is about building recognition of what your rights are, and how they can be mobilised in different ways to make concrete changes to the lives of individuals and communities.

What is required is to create collaborative spaces that enable both communities and officials to recognise the complexity of poor communities and develop responses that are grounded, realistic and sustainable.

Before outlining the essential building blocks of such an approach, this paper reviews some of the state's current efforts to cultivate these forms of citizenship in poor communities. A core argument of this paper is that the creation of an institutional mechanism provides a successful model to promote capacitated individuals able to function as "system integrators". This paper has adopted the terminology used in the 2011 draft of the NDP for such an institutional mechanism – 'a citizenship academy'. These collaborative spaces also seek to enable the emergence of "communities of practice" between officials and community groups, which are able to collaborate on producing more socially relevant and sustainable solutions to jointly identified problems.

PROMINENT RESPONSES THUS FAR

Various state-created programmes and structures are intended to draw community involvement beyond the political sphere. The most prominent of these are the ward committees, the Community Development Workers (CDWs) programme and the Community Work Programme (CWP), but serious conceptual and practical barriers prevent these structures operating as intended.

- Often considered as the hallmark of participatory local government in the country, ward committees were established through the Local Government: Municipal Structures Act (1998) and have therefore been set up in many municipalities across the country. However, these committees have been marred by many problems, as detailed in various government assessments.[2] Essentially, ward

committees were meant to be apolitical structures but are now 'often merely extensions of political party structures and do not encompass the full range of interests within communities' (Qwabe and Mdaka 2011: 71). The ANC, the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA) and the Presidency have made proposals to revamp the ward committee system. These include expanding the mandate and broadening the representation of members, changing legislation to curb politicians from being members (e.g. ward councillors will no longer be chairpersons) and providing additional financing.[3] While these recommendations (notably from the ANC and the Presidency) begin to acknowledge previously identified limitations and related scale issues, less detail is provided about the institutional and programmatic implications of the suggestions. A critical and unresolved issue is whether providing defunct and highly politicised structures with more resources and planning functions will overcome the current problems besetting ward committees.

- Initiated in 2003 by former President Mbeki, the CDWs programme is estimated to have ±400 000 participants.[4] The programme cuts across, and is coordinated by, a number of different departments from all three spheres of government. CDWs are meant to be specially trained public servants who assist citizens in accessing a number of services such as health, welfare, housing, etc., and their duties include (CoGTA 2006: 8):
  - Assisting in the removal of development deadlocks;
  - Strengthening the democratic social contract;
  - Advocating an organised voice for the poor; and
  - Improved government community network.

  The programme experienced operational problems, especially coordination within the intergovernmental system because of the "silo mentality" of government structures. Other issues included problems with recruiting and training beneficiaries who would be efficient in their jobs.[5]

- Initiated in 2009, the CWP is managed by CoGTA and is part of the Expanded Public Works Programme. The CWP is an area-based programme aimed at providing more than one million beneficiaries, spread across 228 municipalities, with a minimum of two days regular work over 100 days a year by 2014/15 (Phillip 2009). This alternative has political backing but may be bedevilled by similar problems, such as its relationship to existing government structures, the relationship between civil society organisations and the community, tensions between political and technocratic authorities, and problems with structuring capacity building and on-going learning.[6]

It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a detailed analysis of these programmes and structures. However, the critical points are that these programmes have inadequate systems of accountability, especially towards local communities, and have weak systems for encouraging on-going learning and the cultivation of a community of practice among development practitioners, local politicians and officials.

However, the critical points are that these programmes have inadequate systems of accountability, especially towards local communities, and have weak systems for encouraging on-going learning and the cultivation of a community of practice among development practitioners, local politicians and officials.

The draft NDP had recommended that 'every municipality should promote citizenship education and training to strengthen community organisation, planning and project management skills and competencies, perhaps through some kind of "citizenship academy" run by a nongovernmental organisation or educational institution' (The Presidency/NPC 2011: 258). Although the specific reference to a 'citizenship academy' was subsequently dropped in the 2012 final draft, the analysis and most of the component parts are retained. We believe that this idea is worth revisiting, especially in light of the NDP's strong recommendation that the state should support and incentivise other forms of public participation and social mobilisation outside of state structures. Increased citizen participation in democratic decision-making ("active citizenship") and a capable state that is able to act responsively will not occur in a vacuum. Institutional mechanisms, akin to citizenship academies, are imperative to generate and sustain such participation.

A FEW CONCEPTUAL SIGNPOSTS

As outlined systematically in Chapter 1, a key challenge in South Africa lies at the interface between the state, at local government level, and poor communities. While a range of legislation and policies require this interface, in practice appropriate and sustainable state-driven initiatives in poorer and marginal communities are highly dependent on understanding the needs, priorities and interests operating in these communities. Put simply, state officials and the policy architects are often poorly positioned to understand what is important in the lives of specific communities. Furthermore, using generic, abstract criteria to plan and make decisions is inappropriate given the divergent needs and interests within different communities and the complex dynamics within individual communities.

In his well-known account *Seeing like a State: Why Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, James C. Scott shows that these difficulties associated with applying bureaucratic rationalities to processes of development are a common (if not almost intrinsic) aspect of the functioning of the modern nation state (Scott 1995). He suggests that an explicit focus on *métis*, or local knowledge, may be a way of addressing key issues in city (and human) development. He suggests the following 'rules of thumb' for government officials and those involved in development (cited in Smith and Khokhong 2011: 8):

- Be aware that every intervention has the potential to be an intrusion and is likely to raise strong feelings among the experts who live where you are attempting to plan;
- Assume you start from ignorance; turn up as a curious learner;
- The next 25 years are uncertain, so work accordingly and embrace this uncertainty;
- Take small steps based on embodied knowledge (e.g. Japanese water engineers will live by a water course for a year or two before making any attempt to work on it);
- Make sure your actions are reversible without too much damage;
- The first law of tinkering is to keep all the parts!
- Expect surprises and change; and
- Make so that people can improvise on your intentions or, better still, fully engage them from the beginning, so they have the chance to reject your

While a range of legislation and policies require this interface, in practice appropriate and sustainable state-driven initiatives in poorer and marginal communities are highly dependent on understanding the needs, priorities and interests operating in these communities.

ideas and come up with something more suitable for their lives.

The underpinning logic of this approach is the need to respect the 'wide array of practical skills and acquired intelligence in responding to a constantly changing natural and human environment' (Scott 1995: 5). That is, if the information written in books represents 'objective' data, then the concept of *métis* involves knowing when to 'throw away the book and improvise' (Scott 1995: 314). Détienne and Vernant (1991), who are largely responsible for the reintroduction of *métis* into academic discourse, described the English translation of this concept as a form of 'cunning intelligence'.[7]

These two sets of literature emphasise strong commonalities. The underpinning thrust is that the complexity of planning and decision-making, particularly when working with communities who have little access to the formal circuits of power in society, requires state authorities to have humility, patience and a *collaborative spirit.*

In a parallel but slightly different line of thought, a number of planners emphasise the notion of *phronesis*. Brent Flyvbjerg (2004), a proponent of applying this concept to social sciences and planning, suggests that this term is useful because it helps to differentiate between three fields of knowledge: *episteme*, scientific knowledge that is context independent (which he also characterises as 'know why'); *techne*, the context-dependent art/craft of pursuing particular conscious goals using an instrumental rationality ('know how') and *phronesis*, the ability to engage in context-dependent deliberation about values with a reference to praxis[8]. Therefore, when embarking on a project, *episteme* would consist of the general best practice rules that you would draw upon to make sure you are taking advantage of lessons learnt around the world; the *techne* would be the knowledge of how to apply these lessons to the specific context (recognising issues that might emerge because of the specificity of the local context) and get stuff done; and *phronesis* is the ability to understand the moral, ethical and social implications of doing things a particular way. Without this third type of knowledge projects may be well designed and managed but still fail because they are not adequately grounded in the social and moral realities on the ground. Forester (1999) suggests that the idea of *phronesis*, which he translates as 'practical wisdom', is useful because it incorporates the notions of political judgement, moral vision and emotional sensitivity.

These two sets of literature emphasise strong commonalities. The underpinning thrust is that the complexity of planning and decision-making, particularly when working with communities who have little access to the formal circuits of power in society, requires state authorities to have humility, patience and a *collaborative spirit.* As argued previously, this requires a shift in expectations about how knowledge is produced and used (Masiko-Kambala et al. 2012). Essentially, a shift is required: from the instrumental rationalities underpinning the ideas of the "knowledge elites" (those who are in the know) and "learning elites" (those who learn from/about), which still largely characterise state action, to fostering communities of practice that attempt to partner with communities to learn *with* them about how to tackle social problems.

On the other side of the equation, as outlined above, communities have largely become disenchanted by the existing local governance framework because of its inaccessibility, the foreign and inappropriately rigid procedures that characterise participatory spaces, and the intrusion of party politics and corrupt behaviour that perverts these spaces from their original intent to expand opportunities for democratic voice (Smith and de Visser 2009; Ramjee and van Donk 2011). In response, communities have adopted various strategies to attract

political or technocratic attention and compel action, but these remain largely reactive (insofar as they revolve around contesting or co-opting existing local power coalitions) and do not seek to transform wider patterns of investment or engagement with poor communities (von Holdt et al. 2011). This form of 'insurgent citizenship' is therefore limited in its ability to convert dissatisfaction and community involvement into a wider set of demands that can shape the development patterns across a particular municipality (von Holdt et al. 2011: 32). To do this, communities need the opportunity and skills to cohere their demands into a format that can be inserted meaningfully into participatory governance processes (or activism targeted at politicians and technocrats).

Writing from an anarchist's perspective on participatory planning in the Latin American experience, De Souza (2006: 335; original emphasis) outlines the danger of co-option through contact with state structures and processes. However, he continues:

> Be that as it may: there is no reasonable alternative to involvement with institutionalized participatory channels—*provided they are really consistent[,] the material and politico-pedagogical gains for the population can be substantial.* The classical anarchist point of view ("direct action" despite and against the state, but never any kind of "partnership" with the state) does not seem to be very realistic nowadays […] Taking part in institutionalized, state-led participatory processes is a "risky business", and the more the ruling party (or parties) is efficient in providing effective participatory channels and forums, the bigger is the risk for social movements. However, it can be worth-while under certain conditions to combine institutional and "direct action" practices for tactical reasons: not only because of material gains (access to public funds, for instance), but also for political–pedagogical purposes (participatory arenas as "direct democracy schools").

For De Souza, the key is who produces knowledge and how it influences the actions of the state and the wider society (De Souza 2006: 330):

> *Since "knowledge is power", even oppressed groups can exert some kind of power on the basis of their knowledge […] For social movements it means that the more they use their "local knowledge" (knowledge of the space, of people's needs and "language") in terms of planning by means of combining it with the technical knowledge produced by the state apparatus and universities (in order both to criticize some aspects of this knowledge and to "recycle" and use some other ones), the more strategic can be the way they think and act. This kind of knowledge (and of power) should not be underestimated, even if social movements obviously do not (and cannot) "plan" the city as the state apparatus does it.*

This requires new and creative thinking about the kinds of capabilities needed to engage in local governance processes (by both communities and the state) and the way in which these capabilities are built.

Therefore, a cross-cutting concern for both officials and communities is the building of the *métis* and *phronesis* needed to improve local democracy. What is needed is to (re-)claim the mixture of cunning intelligence and practical wisdom, rooted in the voices of marginalised communities, that enables on-going, robust engagements between stakeholders and looks to create opportunities for increased collaboration and the co-production of solutions. It is about assembling the technical skills (*episteme + techne*) required to tackle the practical problems facing communities, while ensuring that they are combined with local knowledge, political judgement, moral vision and emotional sensitivity to produce more strategic, equitable and sustainable

solutions. This requires new and creative thinking about the kinds of capabilities needed to engage in local governance processes (by both communities and the state) and the way in which these capabilities are built. Therefore, the notion of citizenship academies – as structured institutional spaces tasked with fostering communities of practice able to build this form of capability – should be re-examined.

WHAT WOULD A CITIZENSHIP ACADEMY DO?

In this paper, citizenship academies are conceptualised as deliberative and learning spaces initiated by a municipality in partnership with a local civil society or learning institution. The intention is to create structured spaces where community groups, civil society organisations, state officials, politicians and progressive professionals can be equipped with the relevant skills and information and have the opportunity to debate possible solutions to social and technical problems, thereby deepening their understanding of the motivations and positions of other stakeholders. In the short-term, the primary aim of such spaces is to produce individuals, from both within the state and in communities, who are able to function as system integrators – people who understand community dynamics and the state's systems well enough to unlock additional opportunities and knit together existing initiatives. Over time these spaces are intended to produce communities of practice that have built sufficient trust to enable the emergence of new forms of collaboration and coproduction.[9]

The intention is to create structured spaces where community groups, civil society organisations, state officials, politicians and progressive professionals can be equipped with the relevant skills and information and have the opportunity to debate possible solutions to social and technical problems, thereby deepening their understanding of the motivations and positions of other stakeholders.

As described in the 2011 draft NDP, community members and civil society groups need to be given the opportunity to participate in 'citizenship education and training to strengthen community organisation, planning and project management skills and competencies' (The Presidency/NPC 2011: 258). One aspect of these spaces is their ability to build the skills and capacities needed to improve planning and management processes at neighbourhood level. The key to this is capacitated and engaged communities who are able to make meaningful inputs (or advance persuasive proposals) into the systems of governance to influence patterns of development, public infrastructure investment and the creation of local economic opportunities. Pieterse (2012) suggests that the key elements of such a skill set would be the ability to (1) conduct neighbourhood-level visioning and planning processes that are able to aggregate the voices and perspectives of communities; (2) prioritise and leverage (public) investment to operationalise these plans; (3) maintain, improve and grow the assets of neighbourhoods; and (4) ensure the accountability of the state and community representatives. Neighbourhood-level planning has the potential to both invigorate and focus the activity of communities, enabling them to organise and satisfy their own needs ('beyond the state', to use Mitlin's (2008) term) while simultaneously strengthening their ability to engage meaningfully with local democratic 'invited spaces'.[10]

Community members can receive training in a range of practical skills – a "curriculum" of community-based planning tools, democratic accountability mechanisms and strategies (e.g. budgetary oversight), and organisational/project management skills. As previous *State of Local Government* publications show, many NGOs across South Africa have past and current experience with equipping communities with these

skills. An aspect of this skill set that perhaps remains under-explored in South Africa is the cultivation of "spatial literacy" among community members and civil society groups. This essential element allows the integration in space of different fields of knowledge and priority-setting processes, thereby revealing any implied complementarities and trade-offs. These skills are an important part of building the legitimacy of such spaces in the eyes of community members. Participants from impoverished or marginalised communities are provided with practical and transferable skills that simultaneously strengthen their ability to play enhanced leadership roles within their community. Linking these individuals and their newly acquired skills to an expansion of the CWP (as proposed in Chapter 1) could be the backbone of a substantive shift in democratising the investment of state resources in these communities.

However, as explored in the previous section, the focus on skills is primarily concerned with increasing the *techne* of communities. The second element of these spaces is their potential to deepen the ability of citizens and officials to engage with the complexities, trade-offs and complementarities revealed by neighbourhood-level planning and management. Beyond offering communities the kind of curriculum that can strengthen their ability to self-organise and interact with the state, these spaces will offer structured learning forums in which community members can interact with state officials to identify recurring or crosscutting issues in their communities and begin to debate potential solutions. While establishing a track record of "quick wins" is an important part of strengthening the legitimacy of such learning forums, the emphasis would remain on negotiating and experimenting, to try and identify creative ways to break deadlocks, explicitly balance different priorities or sets of rights, and identify opportunities for the coproduction of individual and collective 'goods' (Mitlin 2008). The cultivation of cunning intelligence and practical wisdom requires individuals from different stakeholder groups to work closely with one another over a period of time. Some of the features of and strategies for establishing spaces intended to foster communities of practice have been explored in the context of 'networked spaces' and 'planning for informality forums' (Görgens and van Donk 2011b; Masiko-Kambala et al. 2012; Isandla Institute 2012). Essentially, it is about citizenship as becoming – citizenship is expressed and developed in the iterative process of engagement, experimentation, reflection and learning.

While establishing a track record of "quick wins" is an important part of strengthening the legitimacy of such learning forums, the emphasis would remain on negotiating and experimenting, to try and identify creative ways to break deadlocks, explicitly balance different priorities or sets of rights, and identify opportunities for the coproduction of individual and collective 'goods' (Mitlin 2008).

THE INSTITUTIONALISATION OF CITIZENSHIP ACADEMIES

The size, scope and spatial scale of citizenship academies depend largely on the resources, size and existing participatory institutions within a particular municipality. Therefore, some key issues will need to be addressed in the roll-out of citizenship academies.

This paper supports the 2011 draft NDP's suggestion that these spaces be publicly financed[11] but managed by NGOs or learning institutions. While these spaces should have the clear backing of the state, their independence from the state would go a long way to strengthen their legitimacy in the eyes of communities and ensure that bureaucratic concerns do not overtake the curriculum and learning forums. The priorities and focus of the bureaucracy has a tendency to be deeply influenced by short-term demands (such as those created by politicians or institutionalised processes/

cycles). The bureaucracy in South Africa also suffers from a 'compliance culture' that favours the most narrow and least complex interpretation of a particular mandate (van Donk 2012). Both of these militate against the ability of state institutions to create spaces that will facilitate the kind of deliberation and collaboration that will produce communities of practice as outlined above. However, the on-going ambiguous attitude displayed by politicians and state officials towards civil society needs to be acknowledged, particularly where these organisations seek to play a role beyond that of augmenting of service delivery (Reitzes 2010; Görgens and van Donk 2011a). A serious threat to the successful implementation of such spaces is the explicit or implicit reservations that politicians and officials may have about the (local) state funding the strengthening of voices of/within civil society and poor communities. Such forums may be perceived to 'make their lives harder' or dilute the power that is currently highly concentrated within the closed circuits of party politics and technocracy (van Donk 2012).

The danger is that such spaces become sites for elite capture because those who already hold power in communities are best able to access and dominate the spaces and/or because community leaders who benefit from these spaces cannot be held accountable to/by their communities.

The danger is that such spaces become sites for elite capture because those who already hold power in communities are best able to access and dominate the spaces and/or because community leaders who benefit from these spaces cannot be held accountable to/by their communities. Yet these dangers are not unique to these spaces (Cornwall 2008) and are a further motivation for their facilitation by external entities, such as NGOs. As described in previous work on 'networked spaces' (Masiko-Kambala et al. 2012), such processes need to be explicitly designed to identify and account for power relations/imbalances within communities and between stakeholder groups. This potentially places NGOs/learning institutions in a difficult position if they are required to exert their independence (e.g. selecting a community leader other than the local, politically connected choice to be a participant) when a political authority (such as the city council or mayoral committee) is likely to hold the purse strings. Nonetheless, this reinforces the argument for such processes being held by an institution that is less susceptible to political influence and more likely to take a principled position when navigating such complex situations.

As noted above, citizenship academies are also intended to strengthen existing structures of governance (such as ward committees). The skills and knowledge base produced by these spaces should enrich and produce nuanced thought that informs planning and decision-making that informs other government planning and decision-making, such as Integrated Development Plans (IDPs). Another possible threat to the successful implementation of such spaces is that they will create resourced opportunities for leaders within poor communities to cultivate new skills and build alliances with other stakeholders groups. This may result in ward councillors and communities perceiving these spaces as a second "centre of power" that either breeds political rivals or facilitates community agitation and dissatisfaction. Therefore, an integrated strategy for the roll-out of citizenship academies into a particular municipality should include awareness-raising processes about the benefits of such spaces to all stakeholder groups (particularly targeting the buy-in of councillors) *and* the explicit identification of opportunities for existing planning processes and governance structures to learn from the priorities, trade-offs and potential solutions being explored in these

spaces. For example, affected ward committees and councillors need to review successful neighbourhood-level processes of planning, which also feed into city level planning (such as IDPs etc.).

CONCLUSION

Recent policy and political signals suggest a window of opportunity to address problems with the quality of democracy and governance in the country. The imperative to place the agency of citizens at the heart of development has now received significant political and technocratic backing. New and innovative strategies and practical wisdom are called for that can address the fault lines in the system, which will help curtail the high levels of dissatisfaction in communities.

This paper advances the notion of citizenship academies and argues for their establishment across the country. These institutions will enable communities of practice to emerge among officials, community groups and other stakeholders that are able to collaborate on producing more socially relevant and sustainable solutions to jointly identified problems. The concept of citizenship academies is markedly different from current state-created institutions because it combines an interest in the hard and soft skills required to influence change with a focus on the local knowledge and priorities of local communities in South Africa. Citizenship academies offer an opportunity to entrench the notion of "citizenship as becoming", simultaneously enabling learning by doing and learning by deliberation.

REFERENCES

African National Congress (2012). Recommendations from the 4th National Policy Conference, June 2012.

CoGTA (Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs) (2006) *A Handbook on Community Development Workers in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Cornwall A (2008) *Democratising Engagement: What the UK Can Learn from International Experience*. London: Demos.

Cornwall A, Romano J and Shankland A (2008) *Brazilian Experiences of Participation and Citizenship: A Critical Look*. IDS Working Paper 389. Brighton: Institute for Development Studies.

De Souza M (2006) Together with the state, despite the state, against the state: social movements as 'critical urban planning' agents. City 10 (3): 327-–342.

Detienne M and Vernant J (1991) *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* (trans. J Lloyd). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Flyvbjerg B (2004) Phronetic planning research: Theoretical and methodological reflections. *Planning Theory and Practice* 5 (3): 283–306.

Forester J (1999) *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Planning Processes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Görgens T and Van Donk M (2011a) Taking stock at the crossroads: reflecting on the role of the NGO sector in enabling and supporting participatory local governance in a time of 'crisis'. In GGLN (Good Governance Learning Network) *Recognising Community Voice and Dissatisfaction. A Civil Society Perspective on Local Governance in South Africa*. Cape Town: GGLN and Isandla Institute.

Görgens T and Van Donk M (2011b) *Exploring the Potential for 'Networked Spaces' to Foster Communities of Practice during the Participatory Upgrading of Informal Settlements*. Paper presented at the National Department of Human Settlements seminar: From Beneficiaries to Citizens: Meaningful Communication with, and Participation of, the Poor in Human Settlement Development, Emperor's Palace (17 November 2011).

Isandla Institute (2012) Planning for Informality: *Exploring the Potential of Collaborative Planning Forums*. Draft Framework, Isandla Institute.

Masiko-Kambala P, Görgens T and van Donk M (2012) Advancing 'networked spaces': making a case for communities of practice to deepen public participation. In GGLN (Good Governance Learning Network) *Putting Participation at the Heart of Development//Putting Development at the Heart of Participation*. Cape Town: GGLN and Isandla Institute.

Mitlin D (2008) With and beyond the state: co-production as the route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organizations. *Environment and Urbanisation* 20: 339-60.

Pieterse E (2012) *Citizenship Academy: Some Working Ideas*. Presentation made at Advancing Active Citizenship: A Citizenship Academy as a Means to Strengthen Local Democracy?, Cape Town (21 June 2012).

Phillip K (2009) *The Community Work Programme in South Africa. The Second Economy Strategy Project: An initiative of the South African Presidency*. Paper presented at Employment Guarantee Policies: Responding to the Current Economic Crisis and Contributing to Long-Term Development, New York (22–23 July 2009).

Qwabe B and Mdaka P (2011) Are ward committees the "voice" of communities? In GGLN (Good Governance Learning Network) *Recognising Community Voice and Dissatisfaction. Recognising Community Voice and Dissatisfaction: A Civil Society Perspective on Local Governance in South Africa*. Cape Town: GGLN and Isandla Institute.

Ramjee M and van Donk M (2011) Recognising community voice and dissatisfaction. In GGLN (Good Governance Learning Network) *Recognising Community Voice and Dissatisfaction: A Civil Society Perspective on Local Governance in South Africa*. Cape Town: GGLN and Isandla Institute.

Reitzes M (2010). *More Continuity than Change? Reconfiguring Relations between ANC and Civil Society Post-Polokwane*. Centre for Policy Studies, Policy Brief 67.

Scott J C (1995) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Smith H and Khokhong E (2011) *Land Use Management and Land Reform: Questions Unanswered by the Draft Bill of 6 May 2011*. Cape Town: Legal Resource Centre.

Smith T and de Visser J (2009) *The Role of Ward Committees in South Africa*. Cape Town: Community Law Centre.

The Presidency (Department of the Presidency, National Planning Commission) (2011) *National Development Plan: Vision 2030* (draft). Pretoria: Government Printer.

Van Donk M (2012) Tackling the 'governance deficit' to reinvigorate participatory local governance. In GGLN (Good Governance Learning Network) *Putting Participation at the Heart of Development//Putting Development at the Heart of Participation*. Cape Town: GGLN and Isandla Institute.

Von Holdt K, Langa M, Molapo S, Mogapi N, Ngubeni K, Dlamini J and Kirsten A (2011) *The Smoke that Calls: Insurgent Citizenship, Collective Violence and the Struggle for a Place in the New South Africa*. Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation and Society, Work and Development Institute.

NOTES

1 See, among others, AGSA (Auditor-General of South Africa) (2012) *Consolidated General Report on the Audit Outcomes of Local Government 2010/2011*. Pretoria: AGSA; National Treasury (2011) *2011 Local Government Budgets and Expenditure Review*. Pretoria: National Treasury; CoGTA (Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs) (2009) *State of Local Government in South Africa*. Pretoria: CoGTA; CoGTA (2009) Local Government Turnaround Strategy. Pretoria: CoGTA.

2 See CoGTA (2009) *State of Local Government in South Africa*. Pretoria: CoGTA.

3 See (among others) ANC (2012) *4th National Policy Conference Recommendations* and The Presidency (2012) *Mid- Term Review of the Priorities of Government*. Pretoria: Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency.

4 The programme was initiated as a result of acute service delivery problems between 1994 and 2004 which was highlighted in a number of government reports. See also paper by Geber H and Mothlake B (2008) *Community Development Workers Programme: Mentoring for Social Transformation in the Public Service in Post-apartheid South Africa*. Johannesburg: Centre for Learning, Teaching and Development, University of Johannesburg.

5 See also Evaluation of the Community Development Worker Programme (2005) conducted by the Human Science Research Council on behalf of the South African Management Development Institute. http://www.hsrc.ac.za/Research_Publication-19450.phtml. Retrieved 12 December 2012.

6 See International Labour Organisation. (nd) *Public Employment in South Africa: Innovation in the Community Works Programme*. http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-new_delhi/documents/presentation/wcms_175275.pdf. Retrieved 12 December 2012.

Also see TIPS (Trade and Industrial Policy Strategies) (2008). *Review of the Community Work Programme*. http://www.tips.org.za/event/review-community-work-programme. Retrieved 12 December 2012.

7 Their extended definition is 'that *metis* is a type of intelligence and of thought, a way of knowing; it implies a complex but very coherent body of mental attitudes and intellectual behaviour which combine flair, wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness, vigilance, opportunism, various skills, and experience acquired over the years. It is applied to situations which are transient, shifting, disconcerting and ambiguous, situations which do not lend themselves to precise measurement, exact calculation or rigorous logic.' (Détienne and Vernant 1991: 3–4)

8 Praxis here refers to the cycle of applying theory or a set of ideas to practice with the intention of further refining and improving both the theory and the practice.

9 The essential ingredients of which are explored using the notion of 'networked spaces' in Masiko-Kambala et al. (2012).

10 A conceptual term used in previous editions of the SoLG to refer to formal state-created spaces for citizen engagement such as ward committees or IDP forums.

11 Ideally this would occur through the creation of a specific grant administered by CoGTA that is made available to municipalities. However, the Municipal Systems Act provides a persuasive rationale that such spaces should be created irrespective of the provision of resources from national government. Flexible grants such as the Urban Settlements Development Grant provide additional opportunities to resource such spaces.