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This Master thesis is written in the field of collaborative planning aiming to challenge the collaborative approach on it applicability, especially in the context of the Global South. As a case study it looks on the urban poor community participatory practice, the so called 're-blocking' in Cape Town – an example of insitu informal settlement upgrading. It questions not only to what extent re-blocking displays a successful approach of collaborative planning but also whether it can lead to more inclusive cities in South Africa. The field data was gained through qualitative semi-structured interviews, observations and an analysis of national housing policy documents. The findings evaluate re-blocking as a successful example of collaborative planning in the sense that local communities are truly involved in the process and have a lot of decision making power. Also, re-blocking can be replicable to other cities in South Africa. Yet it faces several risks in community mobilisation and communication and can only be operated on a small scale. Therefore, the thesis concludes that re-blocking itself may not lead to inclusive cities, however as an example of community participation it may change the mindset of the South African society and (local) government towards informal community inclusion.
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## ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>Breaking New Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORC</td>
<td>Community Organisation Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Community Resource Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPLG</td>
<td>Department of Provincial and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Human Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPWP</td>
<td>Expanded Public Works Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDUP</td>
<td>Federation of the Urban Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISN</td>
<td>Informal Settlement Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFMA</td>
<td>Municipal Finance Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDHS</td>
<td>National Department of Human Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHBRC</td>
<td>National Home Builders Registration Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUSP</td>
<td>The National Upgrading Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPHP</td>
<td>Enhanced People's Housing Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI</td>
<td>Shack/ Slum Dwellers International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI SA</td>
<td>South African Shack/ Slum Dwellers International Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UISP</td>
<td>Upgrading of Informal Settlements Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPUU</td>
<td>Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Rapid Urbanisation in the Global South and its impact on urban planning in South Africa

The African continent is going through a rapid urbanisation process. Compared to other major regions, the population is predicted to be the fastest rising until 2100 and the cities are rapidly growing. However, within the continent this process is dispersed. For instance, Lagos and Cairo are predicted to be the most rapidly increasing capitals until 2025, especially South African cities such as Johannesburg and Cape Town are growing comparably modestly with only a few hundred thousand inhabitants per five years (UN-Habitat 2014). Yet, despite this modest growth of South African cities, their share of residents living in, referred to as, informal settlements increases quickly. For instance in Cape Town, the number of informal settlements has raised from 300 to 2600 since 1994 (CORC Annual Report 2014). Even though, these rapidly spreading informal settlements are the major driver of the urbanization processes (Camaren & Taylor 2014), they are often poorly acknowledged by the government. South Africa’s after Apartheid government has started several programmes to fight the increase of informal settlements and ‘provide the poor with decent shelter’ until 2003 (Housing White Paper 1994), yet these goals have not been reached so far. In 1999 South Africa, developed the ‘Cities without Slums’ action plan which became part of the UN-millennium goals ‘to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers’ by 2020.¹

In practise, however, South African municipalities still consider informal settlements as threat towards the society and cities, since local governments have not managed to cope with the situation. Therefore many municipalities run a security driven approach, which in fact means that new informal structures get demolished on a daily base or entire settlements get evicted. Informal settlements are still considered as temporary and their negative aspects are on focus, yet neglecting that these are still homes to millions of people.

In 1994 the democratic South African government launched the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), following the commitment that housing is a human right and therefore should be provided by the government itself (Ley 2009). However, over a decade later when it turned out that the government could neither construct housing fast enough nor provide services such as water and sanitation sufficiently to the urban poor, the referred to as ‘service delivery protest’ broke out. When it became clear that the urban poor needed to get organised to reach their goals for not only services but also participation, the Informal Settlement Network (ISN) was founded in 2009. The ISN is nationally active and became partner of the South African Alliance of Slum/Shack Dwellers International (in the following called SDI SA). SDI is a major multinational grass-root organisations which is gaining internationally more and more recognition (Myers 2011: 195).

Due to the above presented events the national government revised in 2009 its housing policy and included for the first time explicitly the *insitu* upgrading of informal settlements as a solution to the lack of basic services in informal settlements. *Insitu* upgrading means that residents, the commonly named communities, will not be relocated but the upgrading will happen at place. Moreover the new policy in charge, the Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP), requires explicitly the involvement of local communities into the process. Communities may be supported by community resource organisations (CROs) and/ or NGOs. Yet, the implementation of these ambitious upgrading programs faces several struggles on the local level. Governmental officials either have no sufficient mechanisms to apply the programme or practise spatial injustice as they exclude the urban poor from their right to participate in housing development and their right to the city.

So far Cape Town is the only municipality which has taken the UISP seriously and engaged in *insitu* upgrading, in cooperation with the South African Alliance of Slum/Shack Dwellers International (SDI SA). The partners involved are specifically the Informal Settlements Network (ISN) and the NGO Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC) which have improved the upgrading concept of re-blocking as a tool for the inclusion of communities into the planning and implementation of the upgrading process. Re-blocking, which can be used interchangeably with the term, ‘blocking out’ has two foci. It is first of all a ‘mobilisation tool’ for communities to become organised, engaged and educated about their living situation and their opportunities to change. Second, it is the implementation of a design in which the shacks of an informal settlement can be arranged in such a way that there is space for basic services such as water and sanitation. Hence, re-blocking is not only focussing on the exact needs of communities but also on the participation of them into the process, it is a unique practise so far in South Africa.

1.2 Research Problem

Since re-blocking encounters the government's previous unsuccessful top-down planning approaches and explicitly includes local communities into the planning process, re-blocking is especially interesting from a perspective of collaborative planning. Since the 1980s the concept of collaborative/ communicative planning has become internationally popular and represented by authors such as Fainstein (2010), Forester (1999), Healey (1997), Mandelbaum (1996). The collaborative approach shifts away from top-down planning to the involvement of different parties into decision making processes. It raises the question of how to best include diverse project stakeholders and how to seek consensus. However, due to the fact that every time the project environment and stakeholders are different, there can be no clear principles how to succeed in practise. Instead collaborative planning aims to give guidelines which are gained out of (good) practise. Therefore, re-blocking is interesting from a collaborative planning perspective as it can not only learn from these guidelines – but also enrich those with its experience form informal settlement upgrading as an especially difficult planning environment.
Since South Africa is a country which has been characterized by spatial and socio-economic injustice for decades, it is hard to imagine that the very (urban) poor can have negotiation and collaboration with the government. However, renewed housing policies and explicitly the Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP) provide space for collaboration between communities, supporting organisations and the local government and therefore indicate a shift towards collaboration planning in South Africa. Yet as many local governments fail to acknowledge this shift, the urban poor have to not only become mobilized in claiming their rights but also offer collaborative solutions to the government. The Federation of the Urban and Rural Poor (FEDUP), who is a partner of SDI SA, has been engaged in community participative housing projects for over 20 years. As a result they have become confident and experienced with its approach. In contrast, insitu informal settlement upgrading, and especially the practise of re-blocking, are relatively new as so far only three re-blocking project have been completed. Therefore, the focus of this study lies on how re-blocking as a process in which various stakeholders are involved, can display a successful practice of collaborative planning with the specific regards to the fairly new terrain of collaboration between the local government and community participation when it comes to slum upgrading in terms of the UISP.

1.3 Objectives and Research Question

This study aims to analyse the opportunities of collaborative planning in the framework of South African polices for insitu informal settlements upgrading (UISP). Thereby it focusses on the specific tool of re-blocking which is practised by the NGO Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC) and the Informal Settlement Network (ISN), in order to not only upgrade informal settlements but also include communities into the process. Moreover, it aims to identify good practises within the different process steps and learning outcomes of the actors involved. In a next step it discusses the opportunities and limitations of re-blocking, as a contribution towards more inclusive cities in South Africa. Finally, the study aims to contribute towards the discussion about the applicability of collaborative planning into the daily planning sphere.

Research Questions:

1. To what extent can ‘re-blocking’, as a participatory practise of urban poor communities in insitu informal settlement upgrading processes, be evaluated as successful process of collaborative planing?
   • Which specific actors are involved, which position do they take and what is their relation towards each other?
   • Which challenges evolve during the process and how do the actors overcome these?

2. To what extent can the practise of re-blocking contribute towards more inclusive cities and a better implementation of the collaborative housing policies in South Africa?
1.4 Disposition

In Chapter 1, this thesis begins with an introduction into the process of urbanization in South Africa and the research problem. Following this, Chapter 2 presents a literature review of the main ideas of collaborative planning and discusses its practicability in the context of urban planning. Chapter 3 is divided into four parts. First, it defines, the term informal settlement and distinguishes from the South African Townships. Second, it gives an historical overview about spatial planning and discrimination in the South African Apartheid, which will be linked to the emergence of informal settlements. Third, the chapter presents how the national government has been trying to cope with the Aftermath of Apartheid planning and the growing lack of housing. This includes the presentation of national housing policies and case examples of how the local government of Cape Town has failed their implementation in the recent years. The focus lies on those national housing policies which are related to the case of informal settlement upgrading/ re-blocking in Cape Town. Their main rationalities towards upgrading and the inclusion of communities will be pointed out, as well as specific down-sides and specific opportunities and restrictions towards for the actors of re-blocking. Fourth, the chapter ends with a brief overview about cases of successful collaborative planning approaches in the international sphere. In Chapter 4 the methods will be elaborated which have been used to conduct this study. Chapter 5, the analysis, is build upon three pillars. It starts with a description of re-blocking as an optimal process and also included which actors are involved in it. This is followed by the presentation of three re-blocking projects in different communities in order to demonstrate the community settings, specific challenges in those settlements and the actors involved. Thereafter, the chapter discusses results from the case projects as well as overall challenges that emerge in different steps of informal settlement upgrading, and chances for improvements. Chapter 6 firstly addresses the case of re-blocking and the positions of actors from a collaborative planning perspective. Secondly, it will be discussed what can be learned from the specific case of Cape Town for the practise of collaborative planning, as well as to what extent Cape Town's approach can lead to more inclusive cities in South Africa. This Thesis will end with concluding remarks in Chapter 7.
2. A theoretical approach towards collaborative planning

In the 1980s, planning theory turned towards the ‘zeitgeist of global economic restructuring and local responses’, such as helping communities to compete against foreign investment (Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones 2002: 6). In that sense collaborative planning, which is often interchangeably called communicative planning, has developed and dominated the theoretical planning discourse ever since. This planning approach has shifted away from ‘the idea of planning as the product of the autonomous reasoning processes of the expert, to a relational notion of planning in which future-directed action emerges from dialogue and interaction between multiple actors’ (Harrison 2006: 319). Overall, collaborative/communicative planning is process oriented (ibid: 321) which means it is mainly addressing the question of how different stakeholders can be involved into the planning process and how decisions can be made through open and transparent communication, rather than focussing on what the outcome will be. Within the process collaborative planning is concerned with the relations and interactions of actors ‘within formal and informal contexts’ in terms of consensus-building, mediated negotiations, constructing shared discourse, strengthening institutional capacity and actor networks (ibid).

Since the late 20th century many authors have criticized collaborative planning, yet often not in its fundamental ideas but in its uncertainties towards practical implementation, making what Harrison calls a ‘reality check’ (Harrison 2006: 331). However, this criticism has lead to a re-development and improvement rather than a complete neglect of the approach. Thus, the approach has been developed with different foci and with the background of different intellectual schools. For instance Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones speak of ‘mutations’ that have undergone in the communicative planning (2002: 5): ‘planning through debate’ (Healey, 1992), ‘communicative planning’ (Innes 1995), ‘argumentative planning’ (Forester 1993), ‘collaborative planning’ (Healey 1997), ‘consensus building’ (Innes & Boohrer 1999), and ‘deliberative planning’ (Forester 1999). Likewise there is no agreement whether Collaborative Planning should be considered as a theory, (which Healey does not agree on), a ‘strong programme’ (Barnes & Bloore 1982), a ‘world view’ (Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger, 2002) or merely a ‘form of planning’ (Harris 2002: 23), (Brand & Gaffkin 2007: 285).

Due to this ambiguity it is not possible to identify a main author who is dominating the scene, yet Patsy Healey has maybe become the most popular, and often it is referred to her understanding of collaborative planning (such as Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones 2002; Brand & Gaffkin 2007). Due to Healey’s popularity this Thesis mainly looks on her approach and main book published in 1997, and in a second edition in 2006: Collaborative planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies. In this, Healey addresses the modern challenges in planning, which are in her view, neo-liberal policy making, individualisation processes in society but also the expansion of social justice and environmental care (Tag-eldeen 2012: 8).

In the following Healey’s collaborative approach, its intellectual background, main
arguments and critics will be explained. Also the chapter provides discusses further authors in the field of collaborative planning, major criticism and a discussion regarding whether collaborative planning should be applied in the Globals South.

2.1 Collaborative planning – theoretical background and definition

Healey’s collaborative approach is developed contrasting two major obstacles which, according to her, would have developed in the social policy making and planning since the twentieth century. Firstly, the grand ideas of planning, such as Garden Cities, Le Corbusier’s Radiant City, the Berlin Mietskasarme (tenements), or socialist housing are tarnished by a reputation of over-ambition, social injustice and financial disaster in the twentieth century (Healey 2010). Secondly, she sees the growing individualisation and materialistic orientation in society as a problem for policy making. She describes the present social world as diverse and pluralistic in which the idea of a community with common interests and needs has shifted towards fragmented societies which generates multi-sided interest conflicts in which people would fear each other (1997: 32).

However, her approach is clearly distant from adopting the idea of human-beings as in the neo-classical model: self-interested and utility maximizing, driven by material preferences, striving for material advantages and disconnected towards the social sphere (1997: 39-40).2 In her Collaborative Planning approach she does not deny that humans have a more or less materialistic or self-centred thinking, yet she analyses where this kind of habitus results from. Therefore, Healey refers to a social constructivist approach which she uses to question and explain why people act and decide in the way they do. In that sense she claims that social constructivism is crucial to understand a modern differentiated society in order to meet the needs of people in the public policy making process. Also Brand & Gaffkin (2007: 285) address social constructivism a common ground among collaborative planners. In this sense human beings would be political and essentially the product of social interaction (ibid). Consequently, Healey follows not only a constructivist approach but also the communication approach by Habermas (1984) – in which a reflexive dialogue and the power of the better argument will lead to what is ‘right’.

Authors such as Innes and Boheer (1999) do not directly relate to Habermas’ ideal speech and communicative situation, but focus on consensus building as a discipline of communicative planning. They stress that consensus building can produce implementable mutually beneficial agreements among the participants. Also they argue that consensus building can change actors and their actions since they may produce new relationships, new practises and new ideas. Therefore, consensus-building might be effective even it does not accomplish what the participants originally intended (1999: 413). In any case participants would learn, gain new understandings, break through mental and emotional barriers and gain trust (ibid: 421).

---

2 In economic theory the model of the material-self-centred and rational human has been taught for long time even though many findings in economic psychology show that humans make their decisions not at all always rational but are depending on factors such as emotions, memories, imaginations and socio-cultural influences. Healey even argues that ‘this conception was the vigorously projected on other societies and cultures in form of cultural imperialism pursued through economic development strategies in the developing world’ (1997:40).
Regarding Healey's collaborative planning approach is important to notice how individuals gain knowledge or develop preferences according to the outcomes of social interaction and day-to-day practices. Healey then sees planners in the position to question, challenge and even transform those structures. In a similar sense Forester (1993) summarizes the position of planners in collaborative planning as a 'critical friend'. Yet, Healey goes beyond this idea and speaks of planners as 'knowledge mediator and broker' (1997: 309). Brand & Gaffikin agree on the mediating point and position planners as intermediary facilitators, as 'someone who creates the platforms where an interactive and non-hostile discourse among equals can take place' (2007: 291).

The role of planners in collaborative/communicative planning is a crucial point in the discipline since it has not been far-reaching defined, but clearly goes beyond planning for people but also includes critical mediating, mobilising the discourse and involving all stakeholders. According to Healey, planners also 'should have an ethical duty to attend to all stakeholders as the interactive process develops' (2006: 312). This is important to note as the ethical duties and the moral of planners are a critical point that will be discussed in section 2.3.

2.2 Practise of collaborative planning

As collaborative Planning refers to a process in which different stakeholders work together in diverse situations, there can not be explicit instructions of how to manage collaborative planning, as every planning situation will be different due to the specific context of cultural, geographical history and the wishes and needs of the participants: ‘there are no standard answers to the specification of the systemic institutional design of governance systems for inclusionary participatory democratic practise’ (Healey 1997: 294). Also, as collaborative planning is meant as a communicative process in which the focus lies on the different interests and rationalities of the various stakeholders, it can therefore not become too explicit but must remain flexible.

Nonetheless, Healey's approach is not entirely theoretical but she gives some practical guidance of how to work and plan in a collaborative sense (1997: 263-65). Examples for practical collaborative planning are for instance, meetings of stakeholders involved, consultation of public opinions and suggestions of local groups, civil society organisations and expert groups, the development of layout and action plans, long term development strategies, yet even physical construction of buildings and infrastructure such as drainage systems. Therefore, Healey stresses the importance of paying attention to local knowledge and consciousness of the participants, as well as their style of communication. Due to the different cultural and social backgrounds of the participants, they have a different way of expressing themselves. This relates not only to one's mother tongue and possible accent but also refers to the sound of one's voice, metaphors or references which give hints to one's background. Therefore misunderstandings and unwanted power relations may come up.

As Innes & Booher emphasize the importance of equal information and respect among stakeholders to be able to create a discourse that goes beyond adversarial
communication and competitive bargaining of fixed interests but negotiates problem
definition and seeks consensus (Innes & Booher 1999: 418). These approaches reveal
that a certain kind of idealism or dedication, of (political) informed participants is required
to have this kind of discussion, or as Brand & Gaffikin summarize it: 'Collaborative
planning is also characterized by certain ideological assumptions that reflect its
purveyors' idea of how the world ought to be' (2007: 291). This insinuation of a somewhat
unrealistic idealism is often the first criticism towards collaborative planning, whether the
focus lies on communication, consensus-building or collaborative power, and will be
discussed in the following section.

2.3 The discussions about collaborative planning

Collaborative Planning and its practical relevance have been discussed controversial.
Huxley (2000: 369f.) argues for a greater acknowledgement of the relations of power and
inequality. In particular, communicative planning theory would have tended to obscure the
planning problematic in relation to the state, its powers, resources and regulations,
whether or not they are carried out by private corporations, community organizations, or
state planning departments. Beyond that she stresses the difficulty of the actual
communicative process. According to her, 'the literature often appears to suggest that
planners can foster (relatively distortion-free) communication and that such
communication can result in a consensus based on agreement to meanings and
propositions with which no one disagrees' (ibid: 374). Generally, planning would have to
go beyond reaching consensus but identifying the problem and bring it into the context of
governmental application. Moreover, the individualisation in society, which Healey
especially addresses with her approach, would weaken her theory, as it would be naive to
believe inclusive participation would overcome individualisation (ibid).

In 2004 Innes replies to critics that her consensus building approach is not grounded in
Habermas concept of communicative rationality, 'though theorists have found useful
illuminations in his ideas' (2004: 5). This was a wrong assumption towards her approach
and therefore not a valid criticism. Generally critics would neither differentiate between
the various disciplines of communicative planning (2004: 6f.) nor would their claims of
being illusionary be sufficiently based on empirical evidence. Furthermore, Innes stresses
that the consensus-building approach had never promised comprehensive harmony 'but
rather a social order within differences can be discussed and addressed and joint action
can be taken' (2004: 14). Brand & Gaffikin agree on a normative level that 'it was still
feasible to change from a politics of antagonism, where the opponent is perceived as an
adversary to be contested with, within a mutual acknowledgement of the right to differ'

Moreover Innes & Boheer argue that consensus building can be seen as a strategy of
dealing with conflict where other strategies have failed. Also, due to its interactiveness it
can be understood as a part of a societal response to changing conditions in a society
which is increasingly networked and where power and information are widely distributed
but also where the difference and knowledge and values among individuals and
communities are growing (1995: 413).
Healey’s collaborative planning approach is based on the ideal speech situations of Habermas, which itself has been discussed controversially (see for instance Harvey 1996), has obviously been a major criticism. This is because such a democratic conversation is in practise hard to achieve since willingness among planners, and also holders of power positions to open up for participation is not guaranteed. Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones (1998: 1984) reveal: ‘A strong theme of the communicative rationalists’ theory is to deny a central co-ordinating or expert role for the planner in the discourse arena, as it is the planner who is tarnished with the power and administrative trappings of the administrative elite’.

The collaborative theory, assumes that participants are willing to achieve such a consensus, yet governmental authorities and planners may have a different agenda than communities. Even if Healey states different interests shall be included, it is still questionable whether planners for instance want to achieve a consensus that might be contrasting their ideas as professionals. Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones stress this issue clearly (2002: 19): ‘Do planners [public-sector urban planners] actually have a moral obligation, duty and political purpose to enhance community participation?’

Especially Forester sees planners in his work of deliberative planning, in the position of the ‘critical friend’ to seek for participation, democratic rights and the involvement of citizens into the planning process. Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones, however raise two concerns why planners might not be as interested in this position Forester urges for. On the one hand urban planners would often not be educated to hold a position of social mediators who bring interests together but taught as technocrats who encounter problems technically. On the other hand planners have become suspicious against public involvement into the process (Tewdwr-Jones 1999). This is because not only public projects involve competing and often irreconcilable interests but also in the recent years a public reaction against development has developed. As planners are competing among each other and citizens-involved projects are only one type of clients it is a reasonable question to address to what extent planners have an actual interest in this kind of participatory projects.

In the second edition of her book Collaborative Planning (2006), Healey acknowledges the utopian nature of the approach as she is aware of the prevalence of power relations and social order. Despite this, she stresses that there should be a concept which promotes and aims for an opportunity to construct a public sphere in which one can debate and manage the collective concerns of a diverse society (Tag-eldeen: 36). Also, in 1999 she had already noted that her theory is rooted in power recognition and politics and is intended to counteract existing power relations.

Practical critique and experience comes from the authors Brand & Gaffikin who published in 2007 a case study ‘collaborative planning in an uncollaborative world’ on the opportunities of collaborative planning in Northern Ireland. They had chosen to analyse this case as Northern Ireland displays, due to its history and ongoing religious division, an especially challenging place for collaborative planning. Their idea was to approve that if collaborative planning can even succeed in this divided society, it is possible to achieve
in other places as well. The collaborative efforts in Northern Ireland have lead to the Regional Development Strategy, which 'has earned much plaudits from leading exponents of collaborative planning' (Brand & Gaffikin 2007: 282). However, the authors reveal which problems have occurred during the process. According to them, during the negotiations for the regional strategies it would have been problematic to evaluate whose arguments and knowledge should be privileged: the tacit/ experience knowledge of the communities or the formal knowledge of the planning experts involved (ibid: 302f.) 'Expressed differently, there was no analytical framework for constructing a coherent synthesis from a diverse production of knowledge' (ibid). The process would have been overtly value laden which means concepts such as balanced development, equity planning and sustainability, informed and enriched the debates. Fortunately in the end, each others concepts of terms such as of sustainability would have become understood and integrated into the Regional Development Strategy. However, the strategies had not been followed by guidelines for implementation. Moreover, contentious issues had still not been addressed and the voice of the inactive poor remained marginal whereas powerful stakeholders such as landowners, developers, house-builders and leading enterprise still used personal contacts in order to address their interestsl towards the government (ibid: 304). In fact, 'many discussants merely postponed their hostility behind the superficial mask of rhetorical consensus. It thus seems that the idea of consensus-based planning has success- fully trickled into the minds of most planning stakeholders where it remerged as the craft of cosmetic conflict suspension' (ibid). Brand & Gaffikin argue that collaborative planning assumes or requires sophisticated and well informed participant, yet according to their research these criteria were not fulfilled. In contrast the poor groups remained marginalised whereas the rich and influential continued to use their connections towards the government in order to defend their interests.

Gilbert & Ward who studied community action of the urban poor in Latin America, argue that people have false expectation towards community action due to misleading ideologies. Therefore they get easily disappointed form the results since community participation can have highly divergent outcomes. For instance persons with a political right orientation expect from collaborate planing rather capitalist liberal qualities such as increased self-help and self-improvement but less dependency on state services. Whereas the political left sees collaborate planning more as a medium to raise awareness for class divisions and the need for politicians to take action against inequalities (1984a: 769). A case study by Gilbert & Ward on community action in three cities in Southern America, found out that people will often only remain active and united until they have received somewhat satisfying better standards of services. Once reached these services, they become less active which however does not mean that communities would no longer be interested in collaborative efforts, yet they are aware of their limited influence. More effort and community engagement would not payback as further improved conditions as these are more 'depended on favourable government decisions than on community action' (1984b: 919).

In that sense the reach and limits of collaborative planning have to be discussed as well as the practicality of collaborative planning in a fragmented environment, such as in the
case of Northern Ireland. However, the question of practicality becomes even more critical when considering that is still based on intellectual traditions, experiences and social theories of the North, or Occident as formulated by Harrison (2006: 319). These theories, developed by white Western male such as by Weber, Habermas or Foucault may not apply to rationalities and 'life practices' (Chakrabarty 2000: 6) of the Global South. In regards that around two-third of the world population live in rapidly increasing urban agglomerations centred in the Global South, it is crucial to discuss the validity of collaborative approaches for the non-occidental planning sphere.

2.4 Collaborative approaches in the Global South – Sub-Saharan Africa

Huxley & Yichtafel (1998: 336) strongly criticize that even though communicative planning approaches aim to foster cultural sensitivity, openness, and awareness, it 'does not dislodge planning's claims to universal legitimacy. [...] Planning is still portrayed as an unproblematic global activity, adhering to similar logic of communicative rationality wherever it is found.' By this they criticize that communicative planning theories are still anchored in the context of 'Western and specifically Anglo-American theories and practices' (ibid) which can not be rolled out to other cultures and regional settings as it causes major adverse consequences. In fact, planning would have often been misused by national and ethnic elites in order to maintain their status and power position towards peripheral minorities (ibid).

Similarly, Watson argues that current planning theory indeed tries to be more cultural sensitive and aware of differences but still treats world views and value-systems superficially which would lead to a 'conflict of rationalities' (2003: 396). 'This conflict between the rationalities of governing and administration, and rationalities of survival (of those who are poor and marginalised), offers one way of understanding why, so often, sophisticated and 'best practise' planning and policy interventions have unintended outcomes [...]’ (Watson 2002: 2272). Especially as planning work touches the lives and livelihoods of households and communities (2003: 396), this clash becomes especially evident when considering that the livelihoods of an increasing part of the population in the Global South are shaped by what is declared as informality i.e. housing, transport, supply of basic services and waste management. Informal settlements are shaped by the nature of this social and economic fabric in contrast to the saturate frameworks that regulate the formalized city (van Horen 2000: 392). Within informal settlements, the residents define the rules of the game according to the circumstances of practise. Therefore, collaborative planning work should be more self-critical and address that ‘it may only pertain to specific parts of the world where particular academic, professional, institutional, and local circumstances prevail’ (Huxley & Yichtafel 1998: 337).

2.4.1 Criteria for good collaborative planning

However, there have been many examples and cases studies on collaborative and community action in the Global South reporting on different levels of success. Already in the late 1980s Basil van Horen was involved as the project manager of an upgrading project, the re-blocking of Besters Camp an informal settlement in Durban. This project
has a similar approach as re-blocking nowadays in Cape Town as it has aimed to include and let mostly the residents decide on the upgrading plan of their settlements. As the upgrading of Besters Camp had been a precedence case, the project manager Basil van Horen wrote a project report listing learning outcomes for a successful informal settlement upgrading:

- planning must happen literally on the ground, which means that residents must participate on all levels of the process in order to keep up with social and physical change
- planning should evolve out of the process, rather being set from the beginning – a masterplan will set limits right from the beginning will not cope with theses changes
- 'While planning needs to be grounded in an understanding of micro settlement-level dynamics, it must be linked to an understanding of the macro political and economic forces that provide the context for settlement growth' (van Horen 2000: 393).
- cooperative autonomy: indicates that the local decision making structure should be linked with the institution of power in order to ensure that different planning approaches are accepted, though 'the relationship between project decision-making structures and government should allow local autonomy for project decision-making (van Horen 2000: 395).

In their study on community action in Latin America, Gilbert & Ward (1984a: 769) argue similar as von Horen that a good decision making needs a consistent communication and exchange of ideas and opinions between planners and the community. The advantage of community participation is that it modifies the 'overcentralized' bureaucracy of state governance. In this context NGOs and Grassroot Organisations (GRO) play an important role as mediators and organisational forces between the different actors, as authors such as Hellinger (1987) and Watson (2002) have argued. Hellinger also stresses that 'in most situations an open relationship with the government will be productive' (1987: 139). However, the role of NGOs and GROs and their relation towards (large scale) donors and governments is complex and can be challenging. Conflicting is that on the one hand NGOs often work more practical, flexible, close with the target groups and more locally specific (Hellinger 1987: 138) than governmental aid programs. Also many have learned to distribute larger budget and can therefore handle correspondingly large projects. Yet on the other hand NGOs become more dependent on large scale donors and by this depending on their concepts and ideas. Therefore, Edwards & Hulme question the legitimacy of NGOs and GROs in development work as their accountability and relation towards the target groups suffers from bureaucracy (1996: 964).

In this context Vanessa Watson (2002) has focused especially on collaborative planning in the Global South, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa and has thereby as well identified NGOs as main important actors. She gives specific case examples of settings that are required for collaborative/ communicative planning yet do not apply to the Global South,
specifically in Sub-Saharan Africa. Those will be presented in the following and discussed with the help of studies of the above mentioned authors.

Watson firstly argues that collaborative planning approaches are based on the faith that civil society has the mobility to become organised and act democratically. Hence, civil society would need organs that are willing to negotiate with the formal structure of governments, mobilize resources and ‘maintain involvement with processes of implementation’ (Watson 2002: 43). Watson agrees on Hellinger (1987: 135) and sees mainly NGOs and social- and grass-root movements in the position of a strong and organised civil society and especially serving the interests of the poor. However, even though the number of GROs and NGOs have enormously increased the last decades Watson still detects lack of civil organisations in Sub-Saharan Africa. In thin context South Africa however plays an exceptional role. Due to the long history of immigration and colonisation of European settlers as well as the suppression of non-white South Africans through the Apartheid system, the country has been strongly influenced by European decent culture and politics.

Despite this influence of European decent South Africans, Watson points out problems that still apply to the South African society. For example she addresses that NGOs are often financed by donor organizations and development agencies, which makes their duration of finances and lifespan unpredictable (Watson 2002: 37). Second, it should be added that NGOs are in these cases not completely free in their scope of projects but somewhat limited to the funding concepts of their donors. Sanyal argues similarly in his study on NGO, government and donor relations in income generation projects in Bangladesh that donors tend to set regulation which do not meet the local needs. According to this study 'large donors are slow in processing grant requests, that the donors often impose implicit conditions on aid and disbursement, and that some of these conditions have been based, in the past, on changing developmental fads that typically emerge in Western countries' (Sanyal 1991: 1372). Moreover, donors are criticized as they encourage NGOs towards profit making and are therefore seen as collaboratives of the local government in maintaining an oppressive system of structural inequalities that is viewed as the root cause of rural poverty (ibid).

Hence, Watson thirdly argues that the scale of influence of many organisations is often rather small if they neglect to collaborate with the government; due to the above mentioned argument that many NGOs would consider the state as part of the problem. Instead organisations would try to bypass governmental authorities and by that create conflict and competition with the government about resources and funding from donors (ibid). Fourth, especially Sub-Saharan civil societies are described as dysfunctional since many are characterized by social and ethnical fragmentation as well as economical challenges which makes the aim of consensus-seeking extremely difficult, or as Fainstein express it 'not a realistic possibility within seriously divided societies' (1999: 251). Planning practises such as processes of participation and community empowerment would even replicate unequal power relations (Huxley & Yichtafel 1998: 336).
Due to these circumstances, planning theories based on Western social theories and practices may not be applied to regions in the Global South, especially not to divided societies and informality as it triggers unintended outcomes of fostering unequal power relations, conflict between communities and within societies. Alternatives are displayed by authors such as Kamete who stresses that if Western planning approaches do not apply also ‘the desired city, largely inspired by Western notions of modernity, has not been and cannot be realized’ (Kamete: 2013: 17). Instead planning theory needs to learn from the bottom-up and ‘through the eyes of the majority of poor’ (Pieterse 2008: 209). Watson as well argues that planning work needs to shift away from grounding on theories but focussing on concrete empirical case research in order to gain a better understand of cultural and social differences, value systems and the rationalities behind them. In this way planning could actually gain ideas of how to deal with conflicts and diversities and support planners in their work (Watson 2003: 396).

2.4.2 Choice of Theory: Can collaborative planning still be useful for planning in the Global South?

The challenges of Western Planning theories, including communicative planning, applied on the context of Sub-Saharan Africa have been presented in the previous section. It has been remarked that the civil society of Sub-Saharan Africa might be too (ethnically) fragmented and not strongly organized enough to participate in collaborative planning approaches. Yet, the case of SDI shows that participatory approaches and community empowerment can be successful, and even become internationally well-known. Moreover, by stressing those challenges is not to suggest that there should be dual planning theories, such as one for the global North, one for the South, but rather that generally planning needs to re-consider its scope and be more aware towards different rationalities in societies. Watson argues that ‘given what appears to be a growing convergence of urban issues in a globalising world, that conditions of urban life in cities are subject to new forces’ – the contrasting rationalities of survival and of governing (Watson 2009: 2260f). Despite those the challenges, the potential advantage of communicative/collaborative planning approaches still lays in its character focussing on processes instead of solutions. Even though the collaborative approach might not to tackle large scale problems, and it fails to have an impact on an entire society, it can still differentiate in smaller groups and small-scale planning issues. Since, collaborative planning is not based on committing rules but on guidelines, it may be modified and enriched with good practise and therefore displays the most flexible and applicable theory for studies outside the Occident. As been stated by Healey (2006) and Innes (2004) even though an idealised process of communication without power struggle is utopian, there should nonetheless be the opportunity to communicate in a space which acknowledges diversity and free speech. And this should not only be an opportunity for the Global North but also for the Global South. Therefore the approach of collaborative planning has been chosen for analysing this study. Hereby the study aims to challenge the approach and survey to what extent collaborative planning can be applied to planning situations in the Global South and especially to uncollaborative environments such as fragmented societies.
3. An introduction into South Africa’s history of Apartheid spatial planning and its impact on the situation of informal settlements

This chapter displays an important part for the further understanding of the research case far beyond the single practice of re-blocking itself — but the larger scope of why there is a need for informal settlement upgrading in South Africa and why re-blocking is struggling on a political level. As a researcher, I had to go through a long process of collecting and sorting these information in order to be capable to not only understand the scale of re-blocking but also to evaluate it. Therefore, I find it highly necessary to also provide the reader with the following background information of (planning) history in South Africa in order to recognize the full complexity of re-blocking.

3.1 South African Diversity and urban Poverty – Challenges for the planning process

South Africa is often called the rainbow nation, which is due to its cultural and ethnical diversity and its plurality of languages. Elven languages are acknowledged as official national languages, despite many tribal unofficial ones.³ On the one hand this diversity makes the country popular and attractive to tourist and migrants but on the other hand, when it comes to actually governing the country, it brings a major challenge for policy making and planning. The history of the country has been characterized by permanent power struggles⁴, even long before the Apartheid racial segregation system, which was enforced by the National Party government from 1948-1994. After the end of Apartheid, the democratic government of the African National Congress (ANC) and tribal powers such as the Zulu based Inkatha freedom Party were struggling for political domination. Still today the binding between the civil society and the government is rather weak, which is among other things based on the high corruption rate and the assumed corruption on different government levels; or when it comes to the housing sector, patronage and clientelism (Ley 2012: 19). Moreover, even though South Africa is counted as one of the BRICS states, which stands for an emerging economy, and the World Bank ranks the country as on an upper middle income level, the country has been characterized by an increasing income gap.⁵

The number of informal settlements, which include shacks and shanties in the South African case, have increased from 300 to 2600 settlements since 1994 (CORC Annual Report 2014), the end of official racial segregation and oppression. According to the annual report of the non-governmental organisation CORC, these are 1.2 Mio households. Not only in South Africa, yet generally in the Global South informal settlements are a main driver of the urbanization process, yet often not acknowledged as an official part of the city.⁶

³ http://www.southafrica.info/about/people/language.htm#VPCjyOG-2M, last access: 2015-02-27.
⁴ For instance the settlement of the Dutch in the 17th century ans the suppression of the indigenous population, as well the war against the British in the 19th century.
⁵ The Gini-index for instances has increased from 57.8 in 2001 to 65.0 in 2011.
⁶ Estimates assume that about one billion new slum dwellers will be added to the current worldwide slum population of 924 Mio until 2030 (UN Statistics Division 2006).
3.1.1 Defining Informal Settlement and Slums

There is no official internationally accepted definition of the term 'informal settlements' and other terms which are often implied or used interchangeable with it: slums, shacks, shantytowns or in case of South Africa, Townships. In the following the terms and the existing definitions will be discussed, as well, as the history of South African informal settlements and impacts on the present urbanization process.

The UN-Habitat Programme defines informal settlements as the following: ‘i) residential areas where a group of housing units has been constructed on land to which the occupants have no legal claim, or which they occupy illegally; ii) unplanned settlements and areas where housing is not in compliance with current planning and building regulations (unauthorized housing).’

In this definition nothing is explicitly said about the actual quality of housing and access to infrastructure, yet it is implied that as current building regulations are not met and land has been occupied illegally access to public utilities is limited or not available, which then points towards the definition of slum settlements.

The case of South Africa's Townships does however not necessarily include neither self-built shacks nor informality. In fact, many houses in Townships are often built by solid brick stones and facilitated with services and are, since 1994, to a large extent provided by the government. The development of Townships will be elaborated further in the sub-chapter 3.1.2, yet at this point it is important to note that despite the provision of basic services, these areas are still characterized by poverty, criminality and distance towards the city centre and often a mixture of formalized houses and informal shacks. Therefore, even formalized Townships often fall into the category of informal settlements in South Africa, as any settlement that exhibits one or more of the following features defined by the Housing Code of 2012 can be qualified as an informal settlement: (a) Illegality and informality, (b) Inappropriate locations, (c) Restricted public and private sector investment, (d) Poverty and vulnerability and (e) Social stress' (Housing Development Agency Research Report, 2012: 12). In this definition, the constitution of single houses and the living space of the dwellers are not addressed, yet the focus lies on livelihood and environment.

Myers (2011:74) agreeing on this, points out it is ‘given that areas of the city dominated by informal arrangements are typically marginalized and poor […]. Therefore, informal settlements and slums are often used interchangeably as in reality many slums are set up without formal regulation. In this thesis either the term informal settlement will be used, or Township, which refers then to the settlements set up during Apartheid segregation. Besides the controversy of the term informal settlement itself, the reference towards informality implies that there is a formalized, a proper version of settlements. However, as Myers states, many cities grew informally since there was a lack of legal, written rules in the pre-colonial period about housing in many cities. These houses were not seen as slums or squatter housing though. In contrast, ‘formal planning is grounded in the rationality of Western modernity and development’ (Watson 2007: 72). This rationality has been transmitted to post-colonial territories where modernisation and development
came to mean the same thing (Watson 2003). Therefore, the architect and researcher Rahul Mehrotra 7 for instance rather speaks of temporary settlements and economy in order to move beyond the stigmatisation of informality.

In case of East, Central and West African cities up to 60–80% of the inhabitants live in informal housing (World Urbanisation Prospects 2011), which points out informality is the daily reality of a major part of the African urban population. Therefore, it can not be excluded as the other, the ‘B-city’ or the marginalised but has to be included as the daily livelihood of a majority of people. Goethert addresses provocatively that ‘Perhaps it is us, the minority formal sector of development planners that are excluded and irrelevant?’ (Goethert 2005: 18).

Efforts to develop those informal/slum areas are especially challenging due to several factors, such as the high physical density of shacks which limit space for basic services, such as water and sanitation, but also the high rates of poverty, criminality, vandalism and drug abuse as well as other social dynamics that affect planning in unexpected ways. Besides these overall challenges when dealing with informality, South Africa still has to cope with the aftermath of consciously enforced social and economical marginalisation through segregative planning during and even before the Apartheid regime.

3.1.2 A brief introduction into the development of Townships and informal settlements

When South Africa became a Union of the four provinces (Cape, Natal, Orange Free State and Transvaal) in 1910, the population was categorised in races, however each province applied different restrictions in respect of segregation and rights (Township Transformation Timeline 2009: 15). Especially the rights of the coloured population had been handed differently from province to province until the official declare of the Apartheid state. In 1913: The Black Land Act passed which prohibited Black Africans from owning or renting land outside designated reserves (7,6% of the total land area of South Africa). As a result a large part of the black population had to give up farming and sought wages in the cities (ibid).

The first mixed-race Townships emerged within the cities but moved with time increasingly to the cities' outskirts. The government allowed these settlements as they ensured the labour force within the urban areas, yet they were underdeveloped due to limited investment, and affected by extreme poverty and uncontrolled population influx (ibid: 13). From 1923 until the establishment of the Apartheid regime in 1948, the government invested into Townships as it recognized the importance of the settlement in order to facilitate the increased need for non-white cheap labour. However, as investment could not keep up with the increasing migration of people, informal settlements emerged (ibid) until in 1951 the ‘3’ prohibited persons from entering land or remaining there without the owners permission (ibid: 35).

7 He is the principal of architecture firm RMA Architects and is Professor of Urban Design and Planning and Chair of the Department of Urban Planning and Design at the Harvard Graduate School of Design in Cambridge. Further information on the concept of the Kinetic City: http://fsecities.net/media/objects/articles/the-static-and-the-kinetic/en-gb/, last access: 13-04-15.
Moreover, in 1950 the government declared through the ‘Group Areas Act No 41’ four zones for ethnical races and existentially developed Townships (ibid: 35). This in practise meant that the non-white population which had still been living in the city, was evicted from their homes. In Cape Town, many people were relocated to the commonly named Cape Flats, a dry, windy and un-fruitful area outside the city where a major part of informal settlements is located today. The central government developed specific plans for the design of Townships. This did not only include the monotonous arrangement, size and material of houses but also mainly the fact that the settlement should be located on distance from the white areas in an adequate distance and buffered by industries and open areas (ibid: 41). Behind the industries followed zones for Coloured, Indian and Chinese communities which were even separated from black families who were located at the very edges.

Beyond the insufficient development of Townships the influx of squatting and informal settlements still increased, as non-whites were expected to work in the cities but not able or unwilling to commute from the outskirt areas on a daily base (Healey 2010). In Cape Town of 1980 around 120,000 black residents were officially enumerated and around 90,000 illegal squatters were estimated (Myers 2011: 88). The government had established three racially segregated Townships but was not capable to control the increasing number of undocumented migrants.

3.1.3 Demographics and the socio-economics status in Cape Town

Still today the population in informal settlements and Townships can only be estimated. According to the South African census, which is published every three years, approximately 1.9 million South African households live in informal dwellings, such as in shacks or shanties, self made settlements in backyards or other non-formal housing conditions (Statistics SA, 2010). ‘And approximately 4.6 million households were living in Townships across South Africa in 2005. This represents 36% of the total population of South Africa at the time (12.7 million). Of these 2.7 million (60%) live in metropolitan townships’ (Township Transformation Timeline: 8), mainly located in Cape Town and Johannesburg as the main destination of migrants. According to the UN Habitat 'The State of African Cities Report' the population growth for Cape Town is estimated from 3,492million inhabitants in 2010 to 4,096million inhabitants for 2020. This shows a steady yet moderate increase comparing to other African cities, such as rapidly growing Lagos, which is predicted to have around 15million residents by 2020.

A closer look at the dynamics on the local level reveal a more differentiated picture. The census of the Cape Town shows that in the period from 2001 to 2011 the percentage of households in formal, informal and other types of dwellings has largely remained the same. In 2011, 78 % of households in Cape Town lived in formal dwellings which is a drop of only 1% since 2001. As for informal settlements as well, the share has remained around 21% in 2001 and 2011. However, three major changes are visible when looking at the share of ethnic groups in informal settlements and the type of dwellings:

Firstly, in 2011 almost 43% of the black population lived in informal dwellings which is a
decrease of 9% comparing to 2001. The percentage of coloured and asian informal households and other types has slightly increased though. Secondly, the census lists in 2011 the category 'other' of which 17% live in informal /other dwellings. This category is not defined by the census and embraces the cultural diversity of Cape Town which goes beyond the three racial definitions black, coloured or asian. The third major change is that the percentage of informal dwellings in the black population has significantly decreased from 43% to 30%. However, informal dwellings/ shacks in backyards have increased from 8.6% to 12.3%.

The two main aspects that should be noticed here is the growth of informal backyards settlements which is not only a phenomenon in Cape Town, as the report 'The state of African Cities' (2014: 239) displays a growth of 26% of the informal settlements and backyard structure in whole South Africa between 1996 and 2006. Moreover, as the Cape Town census stresses that both in 2001 and 2011, 87% of households living in either informal settlements or informal dwellings in backyards are Black Africans, which clarifies that informal housing is still a racial marginalisation phenomenon and that ethnic and economic segregation has clearly not been overcome yet.

This is even more remarkably, when considering that 38,6% of the population in Cape Town are Black Africans. As indicated in the figures above, the largest population share is Coloured with 42.4%, followed by White persons with 15.7% (Cape Town Census 2011). The main languages spoken in the Western Cape Province are clearly to identify: Afrikaans (48.4%), Xhosa (24.1%) and English (19.7%). In general the population is very young as 43.2% are under 25 years (Cape Town Census 2012).

So far this Chapter has given an introduction into the development of the Apartheid regime, its spatial planning strategies and its impact on current poverty and segregation in Cape Town. The next sections presents some of South Africa's housing development strategies since 1994 in order to tackle it's precarious housing situation. Due to a large diversity of policy and programs in this regard, I only focus on strategies directly related to my field work studies.
3.2 South African policies for coping with increasing poverty and informal settlements

When the Apartheid regime ended in South Africa in 1994 the country was optimistic about reducing poverty and increasing equality among the various ethnical groups in the society. Yet homelessness and landlessness have further increased (CORC Annual Report 2014). The South African National Housing policy has followed the programmatic that the state should create ‘a better life for all’ (Myers 2011: 96) and provide poor people with proper housing structure in planned and serviced areas (Watson). Therefore, ‘[…] the South African Constitution became based upon a strong commitment to housing as a basic human right and the delivery thereof as a responsibility of government itself’ (Ley 2009:18). This top-down delivering state of mind has endured in South Africa until today among housing beneficiaries but also on the different governmental levels even though more participatory approaches have been developed.

In the following, two housing- and development programs by the Department of Humans Settlements (NDHS)\(^8\) will be presented. These are namely:

- RDP – Reconstruction and Development Programme
- UISP – Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme

These are important background information because they are directly linked to the field research of this study in the sense that re-blocking can only be processed in the cooperation with municipalities, which have to follow the National Housing Programmes. Moreover, these four programs shall illustrate which approaches towards the development of informal settlement have been already made in South Africa and why they have not been successful. This is necessary in order to understand the importance of collaboration and community participation in informal settlement upgrading.

3.2.1 Reconstruction and Development Program

In 1994 the African National Congress established the Reconstruction and Development Programme, (RDP), as holistic and very ambitious approach addressing and acknowledging the interconnection of violence, lack of jobs, inadequate education and health care, lack of democracy, a failing economy and lack of housing. As Nelson Mandela stated in 1994 the programs preface: ‘The RDP was not drawn up by experts – although many, many experts have participated in that process – but by the very people that will be part of its implementation. It is a product of consultation, debate and reflection on what we need and what is possible.'\(^8\) Its ambition becomes clear in aims, such as: ‘All homes must have sanitation and refuse collection within two years';\(^9\) or ‘[…] to provide the poor with a decent, well-located and affordable shelter for all by the year 2003’ (White Paper on Housing). These goals have obviously not been reached, as the country is 20 years later still struggling to supply the its population with adequate water,

---

\(^8\) Previously called National Department of Housing.
sanitation and housing.

The RDP housing construction is top-down planning process in the sense that the national and provincial government appoint private construction companies, which build standardized houses on free land outside the core city. The new houses will be allocated to families who are on top of the housing waiting list. This is a list were households who earn less than R3,500 per month are registered with the right towards a free house. This however means that once a family receives a house, it will be disrupted from its neighbourhood, as only individual families/households can qualify for RDP housing but no groups or entire neighbourhoods.

Even though many RDP houses have been built like this, it is not not clear how many people have received a house and how many are still waiting on the list. It is said that until 2014 around 2.8Mio have been constructed for the poor. However, the Socio-Economic Rights Institute of South Africa (SERI 2011: 21) reports about the construction contain several uncertainties: Firstly, records would `not indicate whether the houses were constructed with or without a state subsidy, whilst data on the approval of housing subsidies is incomplete and difficult to match with actual house construction' (SERI, 2011: 31). Second, a substantial proportion of state-subsidised RDP (and later BNG) houses, would not have been registered at all. Hence estimations rank around only 2Mio constructed houses. Also, the report states that between 2001/02 and 2007/08 delivery declined in most provinces, while the allocation from the Integrated Housing and Human Settlement Development (IH-HSD) grant increased (ibid: 30).

Even it may not be clear how many hoses have in fact been built, the Department of Human Settlements addresses that the backlog of people waiting is definitely increasing. As from 1994 to 2010 the backlog has grown from 1.5 million to approximately 2.1 million households which means around 12mio South Africans are still waiting for adequate housing (ibid: 33). Beyond that there is a high but only estimate percentage of persons/families who have received a house but sold it and moved back to their former informal settlement. Also, many built a shack in their backyard move into this and rent out their house. Reasons are attempts of income generation, or problems that come up due to the location of RDP neighbourhoods, which are often characterized by low density and badly connected satellite cities far outside the core city and without job opportunities. As been presented, households which benefit from the programme are generally relocated from their old communities which weakens their social boundaries and their fragile socio-economic situation. Also, many households, especially the unemployed can not afford the costs of home ownership (SERI 2009; Pithouse 2009). Charlton & Kihato (2006: 268) point out that Townships have often been built on land first acquired or zoned for Township development under the Apartheid, which reinforces the spatial segregation of the city. Pithouse criticizes that there has been too little coordination between the government's departments to ensure that services such as public transport, schools, clinics and libraries, etc. would have been provided (2009: 7).

The RDP houses themselves often lack quality and show up cracks and other damages, which are results of struggles with the subsidy allocation but also of corruption among
profit oriented developers (SERI: 62). In 2010 the Minister of Human Settlements announced in the department's budget speech that 10% of its budget, or R1.3 billion would had to be used to rectify badly built RDP houses (Prinsloo 2010).

The following case example illustrates the above described fails of top-down planning and the neglect of community inclusion is the transformation from the informal settlement Macroni Beam in Milnerton Municipality located in the north east of Cape Town:

Macroni Beam11 which existed from the 1960s to the late 1990s (Worcester Polytechnic Institute) as an informal settlement had been demolished in order to develop a low income housing scheme in the area Joe Slovo Park, a middle income neighbourhood. Robins argues that the project was 'meant to be a post-apartheid showcase of how to do integrate multi-class and multi-racial housing development' (Robins 2002: 521). Many dwellers were moved from Marconi Beam into the formal housing of Joe Slovo Park, yet few of them received actual ownership of their houses due to 'issues regarding payment of land taxes, service fees and general disorganisation of the Municipality' (Worcester Polytechnic Institute). As a result the settlement became re-informalized and almost not distinguishable from the original demolished settlement anymore as people started to build up shacks for extending housing and shops. The small 32-40m² houses did not meet the spatial needs for families nor gave them space to run their business. Also, many tried to generate an income by renting out either their house or a shack in the backyard, as despite the formalised housing situation the beneficiaries still relied on informal economies (Robins 2002: 521).

On the one hand cases such as Joe Slovo Park which point out the above addressed down-sides of the RDP housing and on the other hand the estimation that it would take up to 50 years in many municipalities to follow up the backlog and provide the necessary housing, South Africa's housing policy had to go through a thoughtful change. 'The policy went through a dramatic review in 2004, leading to the promulgation of a new housing policy, the Breaking New Ground (BNG)' (Zblim 2013: 8). Since then South African housing policies were planned to be more participatory and flexible towards solutions beyond the construction of RDP houses. However, the BNG has been criticized as too vaguely written and therefore lacking on concrete suggestions and actions. Therefore, not much had changed on the agenda of tackling South Africa's housing backlog until 2009 when the National Housing Policy. At this point, for the first time a clear action plan for the participation of informal settlement communities into decision making processes was formulated. Also the agenda has shifted from the pure delivery of houses towards the upgrading of informal settlements as a new solution. The landmark for this shift has been set within the Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP) which will be elaborated and discussed in the following.

---

11 By locals and CORC/ ISN Macroni Beam is also called 'Cucutown'. Robins uses the name when he specifically refers to the shack section that demolished and whose residents were allocated to the newly constructed scheme of Joe Slovo Park (Robins 2002, 514.).
3.2.5 Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP)

‘The Government of the Republic of South Africa is party to the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, which provide for the significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020’ (Department of Human Settlements 2009a: 9). In order to achieve these goals, the NDHS established in 2006 a partnership with the Cities Alliance, who’s members are important international governmental institutions, NGOs, and Multi-lateral Organisations such as UN-HABITAT, UNICEF and also SDI. Until 2011, South Africa received technical assistance for the design and establishment of the National Upgrading Support Programme (NUSP), provided by the Cities Alliance and also the World Bank Institute (Cities Alliance Webpage). The NUSP then developed two practical tools which is on the one hand the Urban Settlement Development Grant (USDG) and the Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP). Along with the UISP 16 pilot priority projects, including the N2 project in Cape Town, have been appointed which should view and study best practise and should help to develop a detailed upgrading strategy for the whole country (SERI: 92).

The USDG is a consolidated infrastructure grant, for which municipalities apply anytime they want to invest into an informal settlement as for instance in sanitation, roads, bridges etc. This process is defined by the UISP, which is a holistic policy document focusing on the tenure security of informal dwellers and recognizing them as citizens, health and security through infrastructure, as well as the empowerment of communities through their participation into the upgrading process and addressing their broader social needs (Department of Human Settlements 2009a: 13).

In contrast to the RDP the UISP recognises the social and economic fragility of informal settlements and thus focuses on in situ upgrading. Whereas families have often been disrupted from their settlements and relocated to the newly built RDP housing areas, the UISP focus on in situ upgrading which means that whenever it is possible, the settlements shall be upgraded at place. Hence, residents should be able to stay in their structures or move back to them if possible. Also, households should only be relocated in a last resort when the geographical or environmental situation of the land is not suitable or the density of shacks is too high. ‘The programme will only provide funding in respect of informal settlements situated on land suitable for permanent residential development and within an approved IDP of the municipality concerned’12 (Department of Human Settlements 2009a: 14).This also includes that the municipality can only develop on public owned but not on private land. The programme even requires suitable, stand sizes, suitable land and services standards, however without defining a norm, and the tasks of the local government in relation to the provincial.

In contrast to the RDP, ‘Households/persons with a monthly income exceeding the maximum income limit as approved by the Minister from time to time’, ‘persons who have previously received housing assistance ‘and even ’illegal immigrants’ may qualify for assistance (Department of Human Settlements 2009: 39). In this case UISP states that

---

12 IDP stands for the Integrated Development Plan. It defines the participation of communities and will be elaborated in chapter 4.3.
the developer should immediately report the matter to the Department of Home Affairs, which will then investigate the matter and make recommendations how to proceed.

Funding, will be allocated by the provincial Minister of Human Settlement through the USDG on an annual basis. Municipalities may receive progress payments as advanced payments for each phase of an approved project. The upgrading projects are generally divided in four phases which are supposed to follow after each other. Whereas Phase 1-3 'focuses on community participation, supply of basic services and security for all residents', Phase 4 is the Housing consolidation which follows once several settlements have successfully run through the three previous phases (Department of Human Settlements 2009a: 27).

Within Phase 1-3, the Programme even allocates funding for community capacitation. This is defined as, for instance: 'Socio-economic surveying of households; Facilitating community participation; Conflict resolution, where applicable' (Department of Human Settlements 2009a: 31). Even the acquisition of training material and equipment could be required (ibid: 33). The UISP hence clearly states that 3% of the funding is allocated to community capacitation which refers specifically to the work ISN and CORC focus on. Moreover, 'the programme provides for project management fees up to an amount not exceeding 8% of the project cost. The amount must be calculated on the total actual cost of Phases 1 to 3' (ibid: 39) which are the following:

'Phase 1: Application – Municipalities apply for funding at the provincial government through a business plan which should contain the pre-feasibility of the project as well as details about the Housing Consolidation and the participation of the communities through the Integrated Development Plan (IDP).

Phase 2: Project Initiation – The municipalities should receive funding for the acquisition of land, undertaking a socio-economic and demographic profile of the settlement, a geotechnical survey of the allocated land in regards of the environmental impacts and the provision of interim basic services such as water and sanitation. According to the UISP these activities are generally to be undertaken within a time period of 8-12months.

Phase 3: Project Implementation – The municipality should now submit a final business plan which has to be approved by the executive council so that advanced follow up fundings can be paid for: project management capacity, relocation assistance (if necessarily), land rehabilitation, permanent service infrastructure and the construction of social amenities, economic and community facilities.

Phase 4: Housing Consolidation – Once the three previous phases are complemented, houses can be constructed, ownership registration (where appropriate) and any outstanding social amenities will be constructed in order to achieve a formalised living area with solid housing' (ibid 42f).

3.2.6 Summary of the Housing Programs and the UISP in relation to re-blocking

The RDP as the first democratic, yet-top down-planning, housing plan, has fundamentally shaped the development of modern Townships and also caused major, still enduring
problems. Even after Apartheid families were continuously be relocated towards remote areas, disrupted from their social network but without opportunities for jobs and livelihoods. Moreover, the so called RDP houses turned out to be low in quality and not adequate for the needs of poor families. In 2004, ten years later these problems were acknowledged and lead to the Breaking New Ground (BNG) as more participate development plan which also suggested for the first time the upgrading of informal settlements instead of housing development. However the BNG failed to be concrete enough and therefore, in 2009 the National Housing Code was launched with the IDP and UISP. These are more practical guidelines for municipalities how to organize development in collaboration with local organisations and citizens. Especially the national Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme influences directly opportunities for not only municipalities but also communities and supporting NGOs to in which way they can participate in settlement upgrading.

In that sense it is important to note from the UISP, that the municipality is only allowed to provide upgrading on public owned land. Through Phase 1-3 the municipality is responsible for the surveying of suitable land and infrastructure services but not for top-structures which also means that funding will only be allocated for services. Therefore, top-structures, such as shacks in this case, have to be provided by the supporting NGOs and communities. It is important to notice that shacks can only be constructed once the ground structures, such as water pipes and electricity are provided by the municipality. Therefore, all project partners and communities are depending on the delivery and time plan of the municipality. This has to follow the three UISP Phases with its pre-given time frames; for instance Phase 2: Project Initiation, is set for 8-12 month.

Moreover, according to the IDP five years plan, a municipality has to plan and revise its budget annually. For UISP projects this mean that within the financial year, a municipality has to apply for funding for the next project phase, but also has to spend its budget within this time frame for the specific project phase. Otherwise it will receives less funding in the next year and will be cautioned. Phase 2 of the UISP requires a socio-economic and demographic profile of the settlement which in practise means that municipalities will appoint consultants to do develop a study of a community. Beyond that these consultants will often be assessed with the task of community capacitation in which they are however not experienced – in contrast to community supporting organisations such as CORC and ISN. This is because, as stressed before, municipalities are obliged to spend the project budget and fulfill all project phases and appoint a consultant is a relatively easy way to spend money for this challenging work with communities. This aspect and its consequences for the actors of re-blocking will be further elaborated in Chapter 5.

3.2.7 UISP fault lines

Even though the UISP is a well written policy documents with a clearly ambition towards community participation and insitu informal settlement upgrading, it lacks clear definitions and guidance for municipalities how to implement these. Therefore, in practise several UISP projects have failed to acknowledge the needs and participation of communities.
The following section presents one of the most famous and unpopular examples of how the City of Cape Town has handled one of its first UISP projects.

Already the beginning of UISP carried inconsistency towards the programme as of the 16 pilot projects which were supposed to focus on in situ upgrading, only two fulfilled the criteria. According to the National Upgrade Support Programme Assessment Report, funded by the Cities Alliance found that 10 projects were actually Greenfield relocations, four projects, including the N2 project in Cape Town, were mixed greenfield relocation and upgrading and the remaining two in situ projects (2012: 3). Therefore, municipalities are not experienced in best practise so far. A major down-side of the UISP is that is has not been defined yet what 'urgent cases' for relocation are. 'Where relocation is unavoidable, it should be based on the principle of minimal disruption to the affected persons and to relocate the persons to a site as close as possible to the existing settlement' (Department of Human Settlements 2009a: 32).

However in many cases, informal dwellers are located to far distant and poorly connected locations, which are supposed to be temporary but in the end become permanent for the residents. A project that has become unpopular and has been controversial is referred to as the N2 Gateway project along the N2 highway from the airport to the inner city centre of Cape Town. It began as a joint initiative the National Department of Housing, the Western Cape Provincial Department of Local Government and Housing and the City of Cape Town. Several voices have criticized that has been a fast planned 'beautification' project for the 2010 FIFA World Cup tournament, due to its specific location connecting airport and city (Centre of Housing Rights and Eviction, 2009: 2). In order to make space for the project and a mix of higher density subsidised rental housing units, the residents of the informal settlement Joe Slovo\(^\text{13}\) had to be evicted, but promised that 70% of the newly constructed housing would be provided to them. The remaining 30% were promised to backyard dwellers of the neighbouring settlement Langa. During the project implementation the dwellers should be relocated to Delft an area 34km outside the city centre and notorious for its low livelihood and job opportunities but crime. Moreover, already in 2004 it became clear that there would not be sufficient housing for the Joe Slovo settlers in the N2 project and that those houses provided to them would be in the Delft area. Therefore, the dwellers protested which resulted in forced evictions to temporary homes in Delft and also appealed at the Constitutional Court (ibid).

Beyond that, after the Major of Cape Town (Democratic Alliance) raised concerns about the project, the City of Cape Town got suspended from the project in 2006 by the Minister of Housing (ANC). According to the UISP municipalities only have a mandate to build houses if there are accredited. Otherwise they are only in charge of services and infrastructure.

In 2009 the Constitutional Court decided for the eviction of the residents under the conditions that the previously distribution of housing for Joe Slovo and Langa dwellers must be fulfilled and that the government would have to work together with the affected

\(^{13}\) Not to be confused with Joe Slovo Park.
people on a process timeline. In September 2009 the Constitutional Court has suspended the eviction of the Joe Slovo dwellers until further notice, which has not been announced until now. However, many dwellers who had voluntarily moved to Delft still remain in this worse off location with less livelihood opportunities. In this sense, the N2 Gateway project has not only failed on the inclusive approach for communities but also did not respect the aspect that communities should only be evicted as a very last resort. Moreover, it had become a victim of political interests and therefore has to be seen as a failed approach of participation and collaborative planning.

The case example show that the formalization of informal settlements is not a sustainable solution as the long term outcomes can not be predicted. In both cases, the N2 Gateway project and the previously introduced Joe Slovo Park, the living standard needs of the residents were not met as well as their structural problems were not solved, which lead to the re-occurrence of self build houses and criminalisation in the area, as well as the constant threat of forced eviction. Despite the participatory ambition of the UIPS, its implementation struggles due to underlying governance and political challenges, as in the case of the N2 project, the non-adherence to the principles of in situ upgrading, the insufficient community involvement in the upgrading process, and 'the lack of clarity in the criteria for including settlements in municipal Integrated Development Plans' (Ziblim 2013: 43).

In the academic context, Watson argues that even though top-down planning concepts, such as the UISP, aim towards the participation of residents and current planning theory attempts to respond to diversity, difference and multiculturalism, planning is still unable to comprehend the very real clash of different rationalities which emerge of fundamentally different world views and different value-systems among and within societies (2003: 396). This clash is especially revealed when developing or planning projects touch the livelihoods of households and communities, which is the case for the development of informal settlements (ibid). Thus, according to her, planning theory needs to return to concrete case research in order to gain a better understanding of differences and generate ideas and propositions which can more adequately inform the practise of planning (ibid). However, participation in the planning process is also not a guarantee for success because the challenge of involving and explicitly meeting the needs of the residents is extremely difficult. Also is has to be considered that those might change over time. Therefore, the participatory approach has to be created flexible over time and not only balance power relations among the residents but also stakeholders, such as from the government or investors.

3.3 Research Subjects

This study focuses and aims to draw learning outcomes from the practise or re-blocking in Cape Town. This section presents and explains the function of the main actors in the field of re-blocking and their relation towards each other.

Shack/ Slum Dwellers international (SDI) is a growing and intentionally well reputed network fighting for better living conditions and the rights of the poor. They operate not
only in Africa but also in India, South East Asia and Southern America. Main funders are for instance the German (GIZ) and Swedish development agency (SIDA). SDI work on the national level with local partner organisations and NGOs. In the case of South Africa these are the following four: Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC), Informal Settlement Network (ISN), the Federation of the Urban and Rural Poor (FEDUP) and the uTshani Fund. The figure above displays the organisational structure of SDI from the international to the local level in South Africa and the relation the four local partners organisation towards the communities. Communities are as well organized with leadership and committees that are part of ISN and/or FEDUP.

![SDI SA structure and community organisation](image)

Source: Antje Heyer

Community Construction Resource Centre (CORC) is an NGO that supports the social processes of ISN and FEDUP. The professionals (architects, planners, etc.) support the development projects as they as they facilitate i.e. the profiling of settlements, design layouts but also engagement with formal actors such as municipalities. The latest projects have focused on re-blocking. Moreover CORC engages in livelihood and small-scale economical development projects.

After various street protest of the urban poor, the Informal Settlement Network was founded in 2009 when the need became clear to organise towards the government better service delivery and security of tenure. The ISN works on a city wide scale in Cape Town, Johannesburg and eThekwini (Durban), Stellenbosch and Nelson Mandela Bay (Port Elizabeth). It is also organised with an elected municipality provincial committee as well as an elected national leader.
FEDUP has over 20 years experience of uniting, empowering and teaching poor communities. It was founded as the Federation of the South African Homeless People Federation and later transformed into FEDUP. One of their major activities is setting up saving schemes which especially encourage women to save for daily needs, such as for medical costs. Moreover, these saving schemes also invest into large scale projects such as acquiring land and constructing houses – mainly located in the Johannesburg area.

The uTshani Fund (grass-root Fund) is a credit system developed in 1995, to support the technical processes of FEDUP and ISN. uTshani provides especially the loans for FEDUP’s community-led construction of housing and acquisition of land, as well as informal settlement upgrading projects. Nowadays it also funds small-scale upgrading projects for the ISN as well as parts of the re-blocking projects – via the Community Finance Facility (CUFF).

Moreover, much has been written about the increasingly popular (Myers 2011: 195) work of Shack/Slum Dwellers International (see for instance: Pieterse 2008; Satterwaith 2001, Burra et al 2001, D’Cruz, et al 2014). In the case of the South Africa SDI alliance the former South African Homeless People’s Federation, which was founded in 1994 and later transformed into FEDUP – the Federation of the Urban and Rural Poor14 has been in the main focus as it is the oldest Alliance partner (see for instance: Pieterse 2008; Bauman, et al 2004; Huchzermeyer 2001, 2003).

3.3.1 Actors and collaborative planning

It has to be noted that even though the organisational members engage in forms of collaborative planning, they do not explicitly address their work as collaborative planning. Rather they speak of community action and participation, empowerment and communication with different partners. This reveals that they are aware of their position as mediators between different parties and foster the involvement of communities yet they do not explicitly follow the approach of collaborative planning as a theoretical guideline.

---

4. Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The data was gathered by myself as a single researcher in a seven and a half weeks field study in Cape Town, South Africa, from March to April 2015. My research focusses on the work of the SDI Alliance South Africa and especially the role work of the local partner NGO CORc, ISN and FEDUP in Cape Town. Even though the NGO uTshani Fund is also partner of the SA SDI Alliance, their role has not been crucial for my research focus and therefore not been specifically included into this thesis. The local SDI partners engage all over South Africa yet are only well organized and represented in five out of nine provinces. I chose to visit Cape Town because the city is not only located in the strongly ISN organized province Western Cape but also mainly because Cape Town hosts the main offices of SDI and their local partner NGOs. Therefore, the city offered me various opportunities for my research in terms of interview partners and especially transportation and guidance in the informal settlements. The data was collected through qualitative methods, i.e. observations and semi-structured single or group interviews, as well as informal discussions. The following of this chapter aims to explain the choice of methods and case studies as well as it gives deeper insides into the research environment, into challenges while conducting the data, and ethical considerations.

4.2 Choice of case examples

When I firstly arrived to South Africa I planned to not only visit Cape Town, but also Johannesburg and Mossel Bay. The latter is a smaller town in the Easter Cape province. My intention was to find out more about the struggles in this area, as I had heard that after 10 years of ISN work there, only 4 houses have been built so far. Therefore, I wanted to attend a regional community mobilisation meeting hold by the ISN and FEDUP, yet my gatekeeper had to attend an other meeting on short notice and theretofore driving there on my own would have been a logistical and security problem. Furthermore, I was only able to spend four days in Johannesburg, focussing on housing projects by FEDUP and uTshani Fund.

In the end, I decided to exclude the projects in Johannesburg and only present the process of collaborative planning in the case of the SDI Alliance SA at hand of three projects in Cape Town. This is because I needed to give my thesis an over viewable structure but also I had to consider the fact that introducing many communities with a description of their settlement condition, population and social dynamics would have taken too many words when considering the short frame work of this thesis. However, despite those three case examples I still include interviews with local leaders from other communities as they bear information for not only their settlement but the general process and challenges of planning with the community. Moreover, these interviews were recorded in English, and without a translator. Thus, I consider them as valuable first hand information that should not be left out. The interviews with other stakeholders were
targeting the overall planning process and general challenges beyond the level of the case studies.

As mentioned above, I chose Cape Town due to practical reasons of data collection. Also, only Cape Town so far has experienced re-blocking projects a practise of institu settlement upgrading. Re-blocking in short, involves a re-arrangement of shacks in order to create public space and access roads in the settlement which lead to space for fire security, water and sanitation and drainage systems. Often the old shacks will be turn down and displaced by standardised, higher quality material shacks. In order to illustrate this process, I chose one examples of a project which has already been finished and two which are still in the process. My intention was to talk on the one hand to communities which are actively discussing, designing and negotiating their goals which means they are still early in the planning process and do not know the outcome of the project yet. Therefore, they give better insides of communication process but do not have reached yet the full spectrum of challenges they have to overcome. In contrast the community which has finished the project talks from a retro perspective which might alter their view on how the project happened but they have the advantage of providing a bigger variety of data as they gone through all the phases of the process already.

I decided to present one finished example and two ongoing projects. Flamingo Hight (before called Flamingo Cresent) is the most recent re-blocked settlement and described as successful, and therefore proudly presented by SDI and even the City of Cape Town towards the public. Many, communities of other informal settlements visit Flamingo on exchange in order to see what re-blocking could look like. Moreover, the planner in charge has been honoured with the South African Planning Institute’s (SAPI) Young Planner Award\textsuperscript{15} in October 2014 for his work in Flamingo. As unfinished projects I am going to present K2, which is a settlements of 200 residents in Khayelitsha, located in the flatlands of Cape Town that has just started with the design process and therefore no physical re-blocking has taken place so far. I chose this one, as it was the first settlement I had visited and as my gatekeepers from CORC where going there frequently I had the chance to join them, meet the same dwellers more often and follow the development of the project.

The same practical reasons made me also choose to focus on Langrug which part of the Stellenbosch municipality. It represents a large settlement of around 600 people, where re-blocking has already started and sanitation facilities have been built. Yet, many conflicts have developed since then which gives as an example of the multi level socio-economic challenges that can not be solved by only setting up sanitation or houses.

At this point I want to emphasise that once a project is finished and described as successful it does not imply that all challenges would have been overcome and residents would live now on a high living standard, or would have a stable income. As a project is defined by the fact that it is time limited, it has been finished and moreover the goals of the communities were met. This implies for example, one to one sanitation service for

\textsuperscript{15} Documented for instances on: http://sasdialliance.org.za/corc-planner-honoured-with-sapi-young-planner-award/, last access: 2015-04-09. Information from the official SAPI webpage was has not been available due to a remodelling of their page.
each family, if the space allows it, fire improved material for the shacks and important space between the shack as a fire blockade as well as space for children to play safely. The sustainability of the SDI projects in terms of livelihood will be discussed in chapter 5 and 6.

4.3 Collection of Data

Field Material was conducted mainly through observations and semi-structured interviews at all levels of the participatory upgrading process. In fact this includes the Department of Human Settlement of Cape Town, the project partner Habitat for Humanity, several professionals of the local NGO CORC, members of the ISN and FEDUP, local community leaders and a group interview with a community steering committee. Interviews with CORC were a mixture of formal interviews which I recorded and transcribed but also informal discussions after field trips and meetings. I attended several meetings with different regards, such as an introduction of the new project manager of the City of Cape Town into the upgrading process, a meeting of Habitat for Humanity with the Langrug community, the weekly planning meetings of the technical team of CORC and the ISN and the weekly SDI SA Alliance staff meeting. In the end I recorded 15 interviews, including one group discussion, and beyond that many more semi-formal interview were taken but not recorded. The recorded interviews generally took between 30-70 minutes.

My interviewees were either through the 'snowball-effect' recommended to me by former participants or chosen by myself because they turned out to be the main actors in the projects of focus. For instance it was logical to talk to the main architects and planners of CORC as I have been interested in the modified role of planners in participatory projects. The same counts for Langrug where Habitat for Humanity turned out to be project partners and therefore I have choses to include their perspective on re-blocking. However, I could not choose the interview partner myself but was offered an interview by one employee. In the same way I was also sometimes dependent community members and leaders who were willing to talk to me. On the one hand I made a clear choice to interview the community leadership in Flamingo Height, yet I had no influence on the participants who would in the end contribute to the interview.

The interviews generally focused on the challenges that have come up during the projects, which have been diverse and often directly lead to follow up questions. Interviewees mostly reported from work experiences but in some cases those are interconnected to personal experiences due to the fact that many ISN/ FEDUP members live and work at the same space. Moreover, I asked about the quality of communication between the different partners and what could be improved in their work relation. Also I asked explicitly about important learning outcomes and how the interviewees see the future of the projects and partners. Beyond that, interviews also focused on specific parts of the projects, such as mobilisation meetings of FEDUP members, the designing process, the saving schemes or the communication with the municipality, as well as the 'success' of the project and the future of communities in terms of livelihood.
The following list aims to clarify the different actors which have been interviewed:

- Architects, Planners, Policy Experts and Managers of CORC (Interviewees 1-3)
- Project Manager of the City of Cape Town, Department of Housing (Interviewee 4)
- The ISN president (Interviewee 5)
- Project Partner Habitat for Humanity – Policy Researcher (Interviewee 6)
- Local community leaders and Community steering committee - members of the ISN or FEDUP (Interviewee 7-11)

4.4 Choice of Methodology and Analysis

Qualitative methods were clearly chosen over quantitative due to the small scale of the research object and also because this study focusses on the process of re-blocking and the relation of actors involved rather than the physical outcome of re-blocking. The main sources of data have been observations in meetings and semi-structured interviews with one or sometimes more participants. Semi-structured interviews have the advantage of their 'sensitive and people oriented nature' that gives the interviewees space to express experiences in their own words (Valentine 2005: 111). Moreover, the participants are given space to influence the direction of the interview within the research framework (Willis 2006: 144 ff) and thus reveal themes which might have been unknown to the researcher at that point. Therefore, Cloke et al. (2004: 11) call the results of interviews 'co-constructed' by both the interviewer and the interviewee, as the initially developed questions 'become co-owned and co-shaped in the unfolding interactivity of questioning, answering, listening and conversing' (ibid). In this sense, the interviewer can be described in the metaphor of a traveler who is looking for knowledge that is actively created within the interview by the participation, negotiating and interpretation of the interviewee as well as the interviewer (Ritchie et al 2013: 179).

In this study the collected data is analysed through a qualitative Content Analysis. According to Krippendorff a 'Content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the context of their use.' (Krippendorff 2004: 18). The purpose of a content analysis is to give the researcher new insights into a phenomenon and increase the researcher's understanding of it, since as Krippendorff states, text or symbols never stands for themselves but aim to inform someone. This meaning making happens through the analysis of the content but also the context of a document, which not necessarily have to be written text, but may also be art, maps, images, singes, etc. (ibid: 19). The researcher then crystallizes 'core meaning' (Patton, 2002: 453) and themes from the content and looks on how they are presented and in which frequency they occur. In order to analyse context, the researcher might look on the socio-economic or gender roles of the contributor or addressee. However according to Krippendorff, two challenges appear in this process. Firstly, the researcher has a specific background and research question and will therefore look on the material through the a lens most suitable to her/his research, such as for ethnography, psychology or as for this study, urban planning. Therefore, the
researcher also chooses to look at the material's context from a specific point of view and by this automatically excludes other angles and also a variety of meanings which can be drawn from it (Krippendorff 2004: 24). Furthermore, a document can have more than one meaning and can be analysed in several ways. Therefore, he secondly claims that the context as well, is always constructed by someone 'no matter how hard the analysts try to objectify it, as one could not deny the 'analysts interest and conceptual participation in what their analysis reveals' (ibid: 25). Therefore, in order to fulfil the criterium of making a content analysis to be replicable, the analyst must be explicit about the context that guides there inference.

For this study the researcher is looking at the material through a planners perspective and within the context of interviewees telling either professional or personal experiences from living and/ or working in informal settlements. In that sense, when discussing the reliability of this study, it is to the most extend replicable as specific key actors and the process of re-blocking stays to some extend the same. However, when it comes to more individual experiences of communities and their leaders, these might differ due to the challenges on the ground within communities. Nonetheless, I am confident that my research has captured the challenges and interactions beyond the personal level of actors and displays re-blocking from a replicable research perspective. This is because the data from interviews, observations and policy document have been compared whether they enhance or contradict each other and therefore strengthen the findings.

4.5 Research environment and limitations

As about half of the data was collected in informal settlements through observations or semi-structured interviews, I was depending on the alliance members to take me to the settlements since I was for security reasons not able not able to enter them alone. Also, I needed a gatekeeper to introduce me to the communities, as my appearance as a white female, comparably well-off Western European has put me into social distance with the interviewees in the townships, of which many are unemployed and all of them are black or commonly named coloured ethnics. According to Ryen (2011) data collection will always be influenced by the cultural context, despite the skills and methods of the researcher, as the data is collected not only by someone but also with someone.

Therefore, I have met and interviewed the communities members in Cape Town several times, as they tended to need some time to open up to me and speak freely. Many persons also asked questions about me, such as where would I come from, what would I study and what the purpose of my visit was. In the second meeting then I felt more welcomed as people recognized me and got used to me asking them questions. Brydon addresses the short time framework of the most 'development research' (2006) with local communities as a main problem since the researchers would not have enough time to get the nuances of power relations and undercurrents of social organisations by interviewing 'random samples' of local people or focus groups of key categories (ibid.). Since this issue has also accrued in my research, it became even more clear to me that my focus can not only lie on the participation of the communities but also has to embraces the work of the Alliance a mediator in order to give a broader and more
reflected view on the collaborative project work.

Before the interviews with community members I often felt that many of them would have felt uncomfortable if I had recorded the interview. As for example I met with two women in Langrug in a washing facility they were voluntarily taking care of. Despite me there was also a female intern from CORC and a female student from Stellenbosch as well as women using the facilities. Moreover, my interviewees were taking care of two babies during the interview. As all parties were female the atmosphere of the interview was more like a relaxed chatting, even though also I needed the intern as a translator and had explained to the interviewees that I would take notes for my research. However, I wanted to keep this relaxed atmosphere and not stress the women with recording as they needed time to open up to me. In general however, I perceived it as an advantage that I am female as many actors in the communities are women who seem to hold, work and fight together.

Translators were always ISN members or CORC staff, who were also my gatekeepers introducing me to the participants. Brydon (2006: 8) emphasize the ambiguity about translators and gatekeepers. According to them it is crucial to reflect on the gatekeepers' position in the communities as they have their own power relations which have been taken into account. From my observation my gatekeepers and translators did not have a negative influence on the interviewees answering my questions as they know ISN/ CORC as persons who come regularly to the settlements and engage in improving the living conditions. Of course I can not be 100% sure about their relation as don't speak IsiXhosa. However, to the meetings only came those community members who were interested and engaged in the re-blocking anyway. Moreover, I observed that in a meeting of Habitat and the steering committee of Langrug, the exclusively female members were almost silent and only answered questions when they were directly addressed. Yet, after the meeting the women started talking and raising questions and concerns to the CORC architect in charge of the project. He confirmed that this would be a normal habit of the women and the actual discussions would generally start after the formal meeting. Therefore, I am trustful that CORC/ ISN as gatekeepers do not have a remarkably negative influence on the interviewees but rather motivated them to talk to me. However, as Ritchi (et al: 90f.) discuss, gatekeepers may also be problematic in the sense that they may exclude people from the participation or might give the possible interviewees the feeling of being obliged to participate as they might have used services the gatekeepers have aligned. As for my study, it is fact that I could mainly interview persons who my gatekeepers had assigned for an interview since in these have played and important role in the projects. Also, I searched for interview partners myself by looking at the projects' documentations on the SA SDI Alliance official webpage in which specific names and positions had been mentioned.

4.6 Ethical Consideration

After an interview in a settlement, I had been asked what my solution or answer to the problem was that the interviewee had just described to me. My gatekeeper answered for me that I was not able to solve their problems but that my work might be helpful for them,
as I would be making their case more public and thus ‘bring it on the map’. I also explained that I came to learn from the people and projects in South Africa and that I was not able to build houses or toilets. The interviewee seemed to understand but I had the feeling that I had been raising false expectations. Even though, I always introduced myself and my aim before the interviewing in the settlements, it became clear that I had to explain the purpose of my research and my own position more clearly before the next interviews would start. According to Valentine (2005), every interview situation embeds a power relation in which most of the times the interviewer is in charge. This appeared to be re-enforced by the fact that I am a white female from Germany studying in Sweden. These are both countries which are economically better positioned compared to South Africa and especially compared to the participants from the townships and therefore some interviewees might have expected resources from me which I do not have.

Furthermore, within the Alliance I had been asked a view times what the outcome of my thesis and my solution would be. This has set me to some extent under pressure to be successful with my thesis in not only seeking for a good grade but also supporting and improving the Alliance with my work. In the end however, I also have been careful about what I have written as have attended meetings or interviews in which people emphasised that the following would be off record. I have to position myself constructively critical towards Alliance but be careful to not position the different partners against each other.

Moreover, I have to keep their secrecy which is difficult as I can keep the interviewees’ names anonymous but as the number of people I had contact with within the Alliance is rather small I can not guarantee they might not be recognized but other internals. In any case, following the research practise guideline of Ritchie (et al; 2013: 94), I informed the participants before the interview that they could refuse to answer a question, if they were feeling uncomfortable with it. Also, I asked the participants whether they agree on a recoding of the interview. I also promised to keep their names anonymous but asked them to say their name and position at the beginning, which would help me documentation the data correctly. However, as Ritchie (et al; 2013: 89) raise the concern that informing participants right before the recording, also put them into a difficult position to refuse.

In the context the guideline ‘Good research practice’ from the Swedish Research Council’s expert group on ethics states the every research has a negative impact as the study takes time and exposes the participants to a certain amount of risk, even if it was minimal (p.31). The council makes two things clear. This is on the one hand that it is the researcher’s responsibility to design the study in the least harmful way but on the other hand there is a need for research, as individuals and society have the right to scientific knowledge, critical thinking and improved quality of life (p.30). According to Ritichi (et al: 2013) this approach is Utilitarian, which means weighing up the harms and benefits of consequences and action. When it comes to dependencies, expectations and agreements towards the results, the Swedish Research Council recommends to first of all maintain the personal integrity and scientific credibility to all researchers, as well as openness to any kind of dependencies and towards all kind of research results (p.39), which can be in practise a delicate balance. For this thesis, I am as as a single
researcher neither financially depending on funders nor tied into into a collaboration which gives a large freedom in my research and focus. However, as described above there is a certain pressure towards making this thesis successful and useful for the Alliance which has also clearly influenced my style of writing and structuring the results as well as my personal aim to not only report about re-blocking but also contribute towards improvements.
5. Results and analysis of the case studies

With the Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP) the National Department of Human Settlements launched in 2009 a policy document which favours and facilitates the participation of communities into the process of insitu upgrading informal settlements. Even though the UISP gives clear instructions that for the phase of upgrading local communities have to be involved, it does not explain how this shall be done. Therefore, it turned out that many municipalities are either not willing to engage communities nor would know how to manage this, as it has been presented in Chapter 3.

The City of Cape Town however has opened up towards SA SDI Alliance partners, CORC and ISN, who have developed the process of ‘re-blocking’ as their solution towards insitu informal settlement upgrading. In April 2012, the mayor of Cape Town, Patricia de Lille, signed a Memorandum of Understanding with ISN and CORC 22 pilot projects in re-blocking. A MOU is a mutual agreement however not a contract. Yet after successfully completing the first re-blocking project in the settlement of Mshini Wam, the City adopted the re-blocking policy in 2013.16 This means that Cape Town officially holds onto the practise of re-blocking as instruction towards insitu informal settlement upgrading. Besides Mshini Wam, two more projects have been completed: KukuTown and Flamingo Height from which the latter will be presented in this chapter.

The following analysis is divided in three subchapters and will start with an overview about the process of re-blocking. CORC employees have clearly emphasised that the NGO is not only engaged into re-blocking, but many other projects as well and that CORC does not want to be perceived as ‘that NGO, that only does re-blocking’. Moreover, it has to be clear that re-blocking is not a final solution but a temporary one. As described in Chapter 3, a large part of South African Slum Dwellers will be waiting for housing for many years, or even decades. Therefore, re-blocking displays a strategy to improve the living conditions of these dwellers on short term while they are waiting for housing, or other solutions might be found.

Also, re-blocking stands not as a synonym for insitu informal settlement upgrading, yet there are many other ways how to operate upgrading – re-blocking is just one practise. However, in the recent years re-blocking has been Cape Towns major activity in regards to informal settlement upgrading. Therefore, re-blocking will be firstly described in a somewhat idealised project in order to get a better understanding of the process and the actors involved. In a second step the three cases studies will be introduced in order to give a better picture of what re-blocking means in practise for informal settlements, what the situation in those looks like and what kind of impact their situation has on re-blocking. In a third step, the process of re-blocking will be linked with its challenges, opportunities, and the actors take within the process and toward each other.

Furthermore, as it has been mentioned in Chapter 4 already, it is important to note that the analysis does not only include material from interviews regarding re-blocking but also

from interviewees from FEDUP who engage in the construction of houses. The material is included nonetheless, as it brings important information about the mobilisation work of communities. Also some FEDUP members are or have been part of ISN as well or vice versa which sometimes blurs the specific task of single persons but points out how interconnected the several actors are.

5.1 An introduction to re-blocking – a description of the ideal process

Re-blocking, which can be used interchangeably with the term, ‘blocking out’ has two foci. It is first of all a ‘mobilisation tool’ for communities to become organised, engaged and educated about their living situation and their opportunities to change. Second, it is the implementation of a design in which the shacks of an informal settlement can be arranged in such a way that there is space for basic services such as water and sanitation.

It means that the old structures of the settlements will be turned down and replaced by standardised high quality material shacks.¹⁷ The new shacks will be almost the same size as the original ones as in order to sustain equity among the households. This means that a family who had around 20m² before, will get a replacement of 20m². A couple which had maybe 8m² will receive 10m² since this is the minimum size of the standardised replacements. The replacing shacks will however not build up at the exact spot again but in a way that there is more space in the settlement for roads of at least 3m. This shall function as a fire blockade as well as access for (emergency) cars. Also, in best case there will be space for (more) toilets/ taps and special needs of the community, such as open space for children to play, a creche, a community hall, a so called ‘jungle gym’ or spots for trading.

First steps: Identifying needs and mobilisation

A new community is interested in working together and upgrading their settlement with help from the ISN and CORC. There are several ways how communities get into this position. They might be either selected by the municipality, since they have urgent needs and hence qualify for an upgrading, or the ISN knows about their situation and suggests them to work together. Sometimes communities themselves would approach the ISN as they have heard from outsiders about the ISN, would like to join or get some improvement in their settlements. In other cases there might exist already a saving group set up by FEDUP, which means that community members, especially women, save money on a daily base and collect for projects such as upgrading. A national coordinator of FEDUP explains the general process:

‘Sometimes people hear the presentation. Maybe they were invited to a meeting or you go to that certain settlement and invite. Because savings is more bout women driven. So you invite women and talk to them and they tell you: okay fine we will collect other women, even men. So there is no problem, they will organise a community meeting, general meeting. And we will do a presentation. And then people that come out

¹⁷ These are generally provided by the NGO iKhayalami. Further information: http://www.ikhayalami.org/, last access: 27-05-15.
mobilized out of that meeting and say: we want to start a savings group. [...] And then you support them making a construction and opening up a bank account' (Interviewee 8).

In section 5.3, the position of women in savings will be further elaborated. This quote shall rather give an idea how communities are being introduced to the idea of becoming active and mobilized. If the community wants to engage into upgrading, the ISN would visit the settlement, identify the leadership at place and call for a general meeting where the whole community can join and can be informed about the ISN and possible improvements of their settlement.

According to the ISN in most of the communities already exists a leadership structure. This can be a one person or more – who might have been one of the first residents in the settlement, who is one of the oldest persons, or who might be a bit richer than the other dwellers, etc. The definition of a community, however is difficult and may not be generalised. In its Enhanced Peoples Housing Process (EPHP), the Department of Human Settlements states that a: ‘Community is defined either by location (e.g. through living in a particular area) and/or by common interest (for example a household who wants a house and who wants to / is willing to participate in the housing process)’ (Department of Human Settlements 2009b: 19).

Within CORC however, the challenge of defining a community has often been addressed because it is, besides location and common interest, extremely important that individuals in a community work together, stay together, listen to each others needs and respect these in their decisions. A good community leadership should represent the whole community and not only the will of single members.

Once a community is interested in upgrading, some of their members including the leadership go on an exchange to other communities which have already upgraded their settlement in order to see what opportunities they have and inform the rest of their community about it. Visualisation has clearly been pointed out as a necessary tool to inform and convince communities. Clearly it lies to some extent in the human nature to see something before one believes it. Previously the exchanges went to Mshini Wam, as it has been the first re-blocking project. Recently most of the exchanges are organised with the community in Flamingo Height (former called Flamingo Cresent and often just called Flamingo) as it has been the latest finished project which is also the most advanced so far. Through re-blocking all shacks got their own toilet, most of them their own tap, roads have been paved and a multi functional day-care centre for children was built. Seeing this major physical improvements shall inspire communities, convince and mobilise them to work for improvements in their settlement as well.

After the exchange, ISN and CORC explain the process of enumeration and profiling to the community and look for volunteers participating in the process. Enumeration is the process of collecting statistical data of the communities, i.e. all structures, including family shacks, shops and other buildings, for instance a church, will be numbered, measured and the number of household members will be noted down. Information about the social structure of the community will be noted as well, this includes the number of (un-) employed people, the age structure, persons with special needs, etc. Volunteers
from the community, will be advised by the CORC enumeration team to interview the residents with the help of an eight pages questionnaire. This process can take up to three months, depending on the number of shacks in the settlements and the number of volunteers measuring and interviewing. In the meantime the community gets also involved into what is called profiling. Despite its maybe misleading name, profiling it is in fact an open discussion in which the entire community can bring forward its needs and ideas — for instance the prevention of fire or flooding, sanitation and water or maybe a Creche or space for children to play. It is important to not that whereas enumeration focuses on the single households, profiling shall bring the community into an open communication about its status.

**Second step: Designing**

In the next step the technical team of CORC, which includes architects, planners and often interns, meets up with the community in order to discuss their needs and start planning the project in a design workshop. By now the community should not only have a leadership but also formed a volunteering community committee which will represent the interests of the entire community towards CORC. Also they will be constantly engaged into the designing process so that they can teach the remaining community about the process, challenges, tasks and next steps. Nonetheless it is recommended that as many members of the community as possible join the design workshop in order to insure that all voices will be heard and considered in the layout. This is especially important in big settlements of up to 400 community members.

Before re-blocking had started, the City of Cape Town provided one tap for 25 households and one toilet for 3-5 households. Due to the density of structures, toilets had often not been placed inside the settlements but on its edges along the roads. Due to this toilets have not only often been spots of vandalism but also it has been dangerous for the dwellers to use the toilets, especially for women and especially at nights. This is because roads occur to be spots of crime and violence. Therefore re-blocking shall make space in the settlements so that basic services can be provided closer to the dwellings.

For the design workshops, the technical team of CORC brings a large (A1 or A4) map or helicopter- view picture of the settlement to the meeting. This shall help the community to visualise their surrounding and mark on the picture toilets and taps, problem areas, such as spots of flooding, fire, or places of crime. It brings awareness to the community of which services already exist in their settlements and what their needs are. Also, the community marks the doors of the single structures and the structures’ functions. This is
practised in order to get an overview on the map which shacks are living spaces and how many families live in one structure, as well as which structures have other functions.

In a next step the community should identify social structures among the residents – this means families who are friends with each other and like to live next to each other and families or household who rather do not. In a best case the new shacks will be placed with a small open space in between so that people can meet up, and also can watch each others doors and belongings, such as drying laundry. Therefore, it is important to have representatives from each section, corner or other sup-division of the settlement in order place neighbours who will have this kind of cohesion.

To the design workshop the technical team will bring carton board which can be cut out to sample the shacks and place and move them on the map in order to display the possible new design. After the workshop the technical team will work on a proper layout and hand a draft to the community so that they can discuss it and can work on further ideas for the next design workshop. Once the community has decided on a final draft this will be presented to the municipality, which will survey the land in terms of possibilities for drainage and infrastructure. The municipality will give final input and decide on how many toilet boxes and taps can be set up, depending on the space the layout provides as well as on their own financial capacities. In case of Flamingo Height, the municipality was able to provide one and one ratio (1:1) service which means there has been enough space for a standardised toilet box in front of every structure and most of the households also received their own tap.

Third Step: Funding and Implementation

In practise however, it can take up to even one and a half years from the point when the municipality receives the layout by the community and when it finally starts implementing. This because the municipality has to follow certain steps directed by the UISP and time frames directed by the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA).

First the municipality will survey with its engineering team whether the community layout is ready to implement or changes have to be made. After that the municipality can start planning the budget and apply for funding via the UISP and the USDG (Urban Settlements Development Gran). This process as well can take up to several months and once funding has been allocated, the municipality has to make a public tender invite, which is obligatory for projects with a budget of R200,000 or more. A public tender invite is a transparent decision-making process in which possible contractors apply and compete for upgrading the project. The MFMA regulates that the time period of this tendering process can take up six months.

The municipality receives funding for upgrading projects by the USDG, which however is restricted on infrastructure provision, yet it does not fund top-structures, such as shacks or houses. This is because of the three Phase regulations of the UISP which only allows the municipality to invest into top-structures once the service upgrading of Phase 1-3 is completed. Funding for top-structures, has to be provided by CORC and its Community Upgrade Finance Facility (CUFF). Nonetheless, the major project costs are covered by
the municipality. In a rough counting for a shack that cost 6000 Rand, the municipality invest 22,000 Rand for infrastructure and services. For the shack itself however, 20% of the costs are contributed by the community members themselves (for instance R1200 in the case of a R6000 shack) which is a large contribution considering their precarious financial situation. However, experience has shown that once community members have created a sense of ownership for the project and specifically for their own shack, they are motivated to maintain it, work on the process and are less likely to quit the project. This becomes especially clear when remembering the case of RDP which many beneficiaries sell or not maintain well. Beyond that, the concept of contributing is supposed to unite communities, encourage them to become active and organised and by this show not only the government but also possible other funders that their community is worth to invest in. This has for example been the case for Flamingo Height, where Habitat for Humanity funded roof panels and windows for the shacks. Communities do not need to have saved their entire contribution before the construction starts, yet they should have collected a noticeable amount in order to demonstrate their will and engagement. This has been the case in Flamingo Heights where 95% of the adults have been unemployed. Hence, saving has been especially difficult for the community, yet members became creative and started with selling single cigarettes or collecting waste as a source of income. Some of them are still paying back their loans today, even though the project was completed in 2013.18

The above described process can be seen as somewhat optimal course, yet it fact already in seven re-blocking projects communities have been lost in the process and quit. There can be various reasons for this. Some challenges lie in the UISP structures and beyond the reach of the SDI Alliance, whereas some others are created by the difficult social interaction among the communities. In the following, three projects will be presented in order to given an overview of re-blocking in practise and the challenges that come with it. After the presentation of the case examples, the process of re-blocking and its challenges will be further elaborated in relation towards the different stakeholders: communities, ISN, CORC, the government and Habitat for Humanity.

5.2 Case Studies

5.2.1 Flamingo Heights – completed project

Flamingo Heights had been called Flamingo Crescent before but has been renamed by the residents after upgrading. The settlement is located relatively close to the City of Cape Town and situated between industrial hubs and close to a major motorway, which bears a major location advantage comparing to other informal settlements in the city's outskirts. Flamingo Heights is one of the 22 pilot projects the City of Cape Town has agreed to invest in terms of re-blocking.19 The settlement is relatively young and the

18 When it comes to the construction of houses, as it happens with FEDUP and uTshani/ CORC in Johannesburg the communities have to contribute 20% of the costs as well. Also, the municipality only provides services which are however not funded by the UISP but through the EPHP.

Residents were mainly homeless who had moved or been relocated from the surrounding areas to Flamingo. Around 450 people had to share only two taps and 14 chemical toilets of which only seven were in use. Hence, the aim of the project was to reconfigure the spatial layout to make space for services but also the formalisation of roads.

The outcomes of the project are often described as successful in the sense that the new layout made space for electricity and sanitation for every re-blocked household, on a 1:1 ratio which means that every household got its own toilet and most of them their own tap as well. Those who do not, share a tap only with one other household. The old shack themselves have been replaced by new structures with 'fire-retardent klip-lok material', roads across the settlement have been paved and given names, as well as postal addresses for the residents. Also, a multi-purpose community hall has been built.

Many actors have been involved into the project as beyond the regular partners of the City of Cape Town and the SA SDI Alliance with ISN/FEDUP and CORC) and iKhayalami which are specified and on the top-structures' material, as mentioned before, Habitat for Humanity South Africa (HFHSA) funded roof panels and windows.

As successful as the project turned out to be, as difficult was its beginning. The CORC planner in charge reported that on the first day when he entered the settlement a shooting started which forced them to break up the visiting and leave. It had turned out that that at least one resident was deeper involved into criminal business and controlling the community as a so-called slum-lord. It became clear that CORC and ISN had to win this person for upgrading project in order to be safe when entering the settlement.

20 Moreover, the two universities Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) and Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI, USA) participated in enumerating and designing the layout. And as for the planning of an outdoor playground and the multi-purpose hall as a Creche for the community's children, Early Childhood Development Centre (ECDC) got involved.
This step can be criticized as in some sense CORC and ISN were covering the illegal business and got involved with criminals, however it was from their perspective the only way to reach the community safely and provide help to those who were not involved illegality but in need for services.

Moreover, it had turned out to be extremely difficult to convince the residents of participating in the saving scheme, due to the very high unemployment rate of 95%. As a member of ISN/FEDUP reports: ‘Those Mamas" in Flamingo, they were so stubborn, you can’t believe it’. Convincing communities to start saving is a major challenge people tend to be especially suspicious when it comes to money. Considering their level of poverty and lack of cohesion this is an understandable behaviour though. Members of FEDUP/ISN need to be sensitive towards the issue of the single community members, verbally strong and definitely persistent in approaching the community. Often they would have been accused to misuse the money for their own needs, such as ‘you eat our money’ or ‘you want to buy yourself new shoes’ (Interviewee 7). However once the upgrading process started and the first new shacks were built, people gained trust into the project committee and started to save. The committee set up small scale cluster meetings which means they invited a small group of neighbouring shacks, explained them the process and asked them with whom they wanted to be neighbours. This turned out to be successful as in the end all households participated:

‘So each row, they call it a cluster and then they explain to the people, so all of the people of this row they decide together, because in order, it is a nice place to wash your hanging, and it is nice place to come though’ (Interviewee 10).

After finalizing the project still a part of the community does complain or as in the words of and ISN member: ‘moaning and groaning’ (Interviewee 10). They committee and ISN can not exactly explain what the reason for this moaning would be, and on the one hand, they express that some people will always be complaining – not matter what. On the other hand they assume that for many people the change of their living conditions has been something ‘what they couldn’t handle’ as many were sleeping on streets or under bridges before they came to Flamingo where they built shacks, that then have been demolished for the upgrading’ (Interviewee 10).

5.2.2 K2 Section (Khayelitsha) – in process

K2 section is, as well as Flamingo Hights announced as one of the pilot projects for re-blocking by the City of Cape Town. The K2 settlements is part of Khayelitsha, one of Cape Town's largest informal settlements which is located in the Cape Flats, in the surrounding of the international airport. The enumeration results of the settlements were

---

21 The expression is frequently used to address the adult women in the settlement, not only from the outside but experienced that these women would call themselves Mamas.

22 In a meeting regarding a different projects, it was addresses that people who received a house needed a workshop how to maintain as houses. For instance some did not know how to use a toilet as they did not know what could be flushed and used to through their trash into the toilet. This example does not (have to) explicitly relate to the unsatisfied people in Flamingo Height, yet it shows one from the outside one can never know how communities will react as one can not make assumptions about their background and knowledge.
not verified during the time period of my stay but around 400 persons live in the community. Even though the municipality already provided some toilets at an open space in the settlement these are still not sufficient enough for the entire community. Some can not be used anymore and generally their location is hard to reach for some community members, especially at night. Moreover, the community struggles with flooding. Even though a small drainage has been built this is not sufficient enough so that often large parts of the open space are flooded. As this is the same spot where many toilets are located and children use to play, it can be a source of diseases.

Therefore, the community has decided to engage in re-blocking. Yet when it came to the actual design workshops, less and less community members participated. After a while only two members joined. This raised not only the question whether these persons were representative to make decision for the whole settlements but also whether the community was still interested in the project. It turned out that some members could not join the workshops as these were hold during daytime when many members are working or busy in some sense. However, since the workshops were held in a central shack, it was visible that many persons were not specifically busy yet did not participate. It became clear that the community's faith in the project was quit low. This is because in 2012, students of the Cape Peninsula University had already surveyed K2 and written a report. Therefore, the community had participated in interviews etc. before and raised expectations which have not been fulfilled as no action has been taken place since then.

In order to tackle these problems the ISN president called for a general community meeting on a Saturday in order to further investigate the concerns in the settlement. Around 50 members joined the meeting which was hold outside on a hot day. One man became upset about his community members as he revealed they would discuss and complain about the project every day, yet once CORC and ISN would enter the settlement nobody would contribute or say their opinion. In the end around five persons participated in the discussion and it turned out that many members were concerned about the project implementation. A major question was where they would be able to stay once their shacks would be demolished? Regularly the ISN/ CORC operate in the way that only a section of shacks is demolished so that the families and their belongings could be accommodated with their neighbours for one or
two days. When those questioned were answered, the ISN president strongly asked 20 members (five of each corner of the settlement) to participate in the next design workshop in order to represent their section.

Even though the community’s concerns could have been eased, this problem should have not come up as all the information regarding the project process had been shared with the community before. It could have been the case that the information has not been transferred to all members or that the community did not listen to its leadership. Local leaders have stated that it was always easier to convince communities if a person from the outside would talk to them, than a regular member. However, the ISN also concerned to be careful when communicating with communities. ‘They can change you’, which means some communities would make the ISN members promise things they could not hold and later insist on those. Also the ISN and CORC have to be very careful when using numbers and costs, such as the contribution each member would have to make. These data could only be spoken out once they are official.

On a different note, the interns of CORC noticed that community members were hungry during workshops since these often took time during lunch hours. It would not only be difficult to work with people who are hungry but also be burden, and beyond that socially divided the CORC staff from the communities. Hence, it had been addressed whether lunch should be offered or paid since this would also attract volunteers — maybe for the wrong reasons, but at least motivate them to participate. Yet, decision like this can not be made by CORC/ ISN alone but have to be brought to the weekly SA SDI Alliance meeting – which did not happen during the time period of the field study.

5.2.3 Langrug (Stellenbosch) – in process

The upgrading of Langrug, a large settlement in Franschhoek which is part of the Stellenbosch municipality. It is planned by the municipality as a realisation of an UISP insitu upgrading process and has already started years ago and achieved some successes. For instance several toilets and wash facilities have been built, roads are under construction and parts of the settlement have been re-blocked already. Moreover a community owned multi-purpose centre is under construction as well. It will as well contain toilets and wash-facilities but also a (community) meeting hall on top of those.

However the community faces several problems, as the settlement is growing quickly, is
becoming more densely and therefore an easy victim of fire, as it happened in summer 2014 when several shacks burned down. Also, the maintenance of the newly built wash-facilities is not clarified. Several of these facilities are maintained by persons who are getting paid by the municipality which had constructed them. However, an other wash facility which is located in the south of the settlement and often used as a gathering point for community meetings, is maintained by only two volunteering women. According to them they had been three women before, yet one of them moved away as she found employment. In an interview the two women state that they had left the facility in January when they worked temporarily in a wine yards. When they came back after a month the place was not only dirty but also vandalised; even equipment had been stolen.

This shows that there is a clear need for not only maintenance of facilities but also guarding, which can not delivered by only two volunteers. The same problem will come up for the multi-purpose facility as it is community owned and will not be run by the municipality. According to the interviewees, the residents would expect payment as they had previously been paid for six months, by CORC through the EPWP – The Extended Public Works Programme. In this programme community members can be employed for short term during the construction process. These jobs shall motivate communities but mainly create jobs inside the community rather than contracting outsiders for the upgrading projects. For instance, five male teenagers are getting paid for the construction of the multi-purpose community hall.
Leadership:

Similarly as in K2 Section, the participation of the community is difficult. Some members, such as the above described ladies are active, since they are also part of the community committee. These women who were the same who were willing to answer my questions previously in a relaxed meeting in the washing facilities, however tuned out to be quiet and not speaking in larger meetings. In two meetings with the leadership, CORC, ISN and the project partner Habitat for Humanity, these women and the other community committee members did not turn out to be communicative and participate in the discussion. Instead the community leader appeared to be very organised and answered questions. Habitat and ISN/ CORC had to plan very carefully how it would be possible to engage the community (committee) in the process and find out their needs and ideas. The main community leader then suggested that the community should have an internal meeting to discuss the requests and present strategies in the next general meeting. Even though this sounded reasonable, the project partners were not satisfied as these kind of meeting had happened before and did not lead to solutions. Beyond this, the situation would appear that only the leader would speak again and it could not be guaranteed that the will of the entire community was presented. As the large settlement of around 6,000 residents is growing, it is important to keep track on the development and voices from all three sub-areas and its several sub-districts of Langrug.

When it comes to the leadership structure, three persons are the official leaders of Langrug, yet only two are active and mainly addressed as the leaders. One of these persons has been the leader for several years now as he has been re-elected and remained a status of trust and sovereignty. However this leader struggles with sharing power and tasks, as for example he would like to engage more into the current projects of the community hall and the road/ drainage system that is also under construction. According to an interviewee, this leader had offered to take over the construction as he would be finished much early with the work. CORC/ISN also believe that he could be able to do that, however the main goal of these projects is not the finalized project but the process of participating the community in it – in order to educate them and create their sense of ownership and belonging. Otherwise the same mistakes and issues would appear as with the top down-planning of the Reconstruction and Development Programme.

5.3 The practise and challenges of informal settlements upgrading (re-blocking)

The previous sub-chapters have presented three communities in detail: Flamingo Height, K2 Section and Langrug. Moreover the communities Mshini Wam, Kuku Town and Thina Sonke are important to note as they provide background information that is necessary to understand the context of re-blocking and the challenges that evolve with the process. Therefore, Figure 14 provides an overview of all the communities and projects that are mentioned in this study and summarizes project status, challenges and location. Section 5.3 then shall give deeper insights into the process of community mobilising and
settlements upgrading, especially re-blocking, and describe the different tasks of actors, their relations towards each other and challenges. It will follow to most extent the structure of the above described re-blocking process and give detailed praxis of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project status</th>
<th>Struggles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Flamingo Height  | Cape Town                        | completed:  
- open spaces and improving safety within settlement  
- Upgraded structures  
- Upgraded water and sanitation services on a 1:1 basis  
- Settlement wide electrification  
- Paved Access Roads  
- Official Road Names  
- Individual Post Addresses | pre re-blocking:  
- high unemployment rate  
- lack of cohesion  
- dubious leadership  
- lack of services etc.  
- After re-blocking:  
- still lack of job and livelihood Opportunities |
| K2 Section       | Cape Town/ Khayelitsha           | in process: Needs:  
- lack of toilets and tabs  
- toilets and road as spot of danger and criminality  
- flooding | lack of participation in design Workshops  
- lack of interest and trust due to Previous enumeration by CPU  
- community members appear to be Hungry during meetings/ workshops |
| Langrug          | Stellenbosch                     | Partly re-blocked:  
- new wash facilities  
- partly new structures after fire  
- grey water drainage in process:  
- roads and drainage  
- multi-purpose community hall/ wash facility | lack of community maintenance of shared facilities  
- increasing population in unsuitable land  
- Hence:  
- population size unclear  
- community needs and interests unclear  
- Representativeness of leadership unclear  
- difficult relation with local Authorities |
| Tinasonke - will be Mentioned in Sub-chapter 5.3 | Johannesburg | in process/ construction of two ‘show houses’ | lack of cohesion and savings within the community  
- Difficult relation with the provincial government/ municipality  
- lack of land |
| Mshini Wam Kuku Town | Cape Town                      | first completed re-blocking projects | Mshini Wam: eight families could unknowingly get expelled from the community. Lack of proper mapping And project documentation |

Figure 13: Overview of all projects mentioned in this field study
Source: Antje Heyer

5.3.1 Community Issues
Mobilising and Saving
One of the first and most important steps is the mobilisation of communities and the reinforcement of their cohesion. As the above described case examples have already shown there are several factors and challenges which have a crucial impact on the process of re-blocking and upgrading projects in general. Especially the mobilisation of communities at the beginning of projects can be very difficult and time intense, as it is presented in K2 for instance, the community has not been participating in the design workshop because members had basic questions towards the project process and also because they might have been disappointed by the stagnation after the previous engagement of Cape Peninsula University. Also, the lack of cohesion in communities is a
crucial factor that hinders the process. This does not only count for K2, but for communities in general, especially large ones. In fact, due to migration and especially relocation many people would have lost their sense of cohesion as stated by the urban planner of CORC:

‘People overlook the impact of our history in South Africa. And people overlook what movement does to people. [...] And people overlook the challenges of the lack of social cohesion even with people of the same background, the same culture, the same language, the same nationality [...] And yet the background in South Africa has taught us that the issue of relocations that happened, even now, not just history alone, even how development takes place now - that you will qualify your project, RDP or housing project alone, your neighbour will also qualify. But that doesn’t guarantee that you and your neighbour will be neighbours again. Or that you will be developed together as a community right here. You will be relocated elsewhere. So then people somewhere somehow give up on this notion of community’ (Interviewee 1).

As described in Chapter 3, the disruption of people and their relocation has been a problem that is rooted in the Apartheid spatial planning. Yet it negatively affects social cohesion until now and thereby endangers the success of community driven, participatory projects. According to the planner of CORC, a community should interact, talk and do activities with each other. But adults would be mostly busy with other things, so that not much interaction would happen within the communities. Another reasons for the disruption of communities is addressed by a national coordinator of FEDUP, i.e. that lifestyle would have changed towards a ‘Western way’ which has a negative impact:

‘But now that we are in the Western... we are adopting ... the Western ways. You are staying next to someone but there is no more o’mundo! The thing that is called o’mundo - humanity. You don’t even now if she is sick, you don’t even know her name maybe it just: Molo melluan! [Expression in IsiXhosa] - Hello neighbour! And that’s all. But during the saving and the daily collections you go into those houses. You don’t just collect money, you collect lives! How can we help them, why are they suffering and how can we help them - you know, that’s a women’s thing’ (Interviewee 8).

Women are addressed as the major actor in mobilisation and saving schemes. This is on the one hand explained with the socialisation of females as being the helpful and caring. Indeed two women answered about their motivation to engage in savings and community leading positions: ‘Because I like to work with people. Because I love the people. The people they are suffering, and I want to help the people.’ The second one answered for her and her friend: ‘We are active about the people, we like the people’ ( Interviewee 9). On the other hand it is still fact that often women would have more time to engage in the saving groups especially if they are unemployed. Therefore, women would be more home and also run the finances of the household:

‘Because the women are the people that go to do the groceries, and they come back with the change. Even if they don’t know that small [inaudible expression in IsiXhosa] change, is the change that can save their lives. And change their mindsets. (Interviewee 7).
It turns out the small daily savings are very important for the communities, especially considering that many are unemployed or live on a small wage. However, often informal dwellers are not planning for the future, which results out of their financial precarious living situation but also due to the constant risk of eviction. Hence, many persons either do not start saving or quit the schemes. FEDUP leaders therefore need to bring most of all endorsement and social skills in order to convince and motivate communities. And they have developed different strategies convince the communities in order to start saving:

‘So some are saving and they just stop. […]They don’t have the sense of… holding on to this thing. Because we are saving, we are saving, we are saving, there is nothing else. So what do we do? So we have to motivate them. They have to be small projects that you come up with. Small livelihoods projects to keep them busy, not to only thinking about saving. But knowing that if you belong to this savings group, there is other things that you can benefit’ (Interviewee 8).

Another community leader and member of FEDUP tries to trigger the future planning sense in people.

‘The people must save, cause if you don’t save, you don’t get a house’. […] People are struggling, say say: We are not working, we are struggling. But I tell them: People you must save, and in the end of the day you will get a house, and then your children will stay in the house, not stay with a shack like this, because the Winter is coming now. And then we have no wood to make fire. And the paraffin is too expensive’ (Interviewee 9).

However, despite the lack of a future perspectives and income FEDUP and ISN interviewees, stress it as very problematic that communities expect to get free services and housing. A FEDUP member from Flamingo Heights explains that communities would see on TV how organisations giving free care or handing out free equipment in other settlements, but they would not understand the context, for instance that there had been an emergency case after such as a fire. According to the interviewees that this attitude would make communities lazy and depending:

‘They want free things, even food. They want free food. The government must give them free food. But you must do something. These are lazy people, because they don’t listen’ (Interviewee 9).

This attitude in combination with the lack of cohesion makes is very difficult to convince communities that their money will be used trustworthy and only for the intended daily needs or projects.23 This is especially the case for upgrading or housing projects where a large amount of money (20% of the top-structures costs) need to be saved and it takes a long time before visual action happens. Often saving scheme leaders and community committee members get personally accused they would misuse the money such as ‘you eat our money’ or ‘you want to buy yourself new shoes’ (Interviewee 7). As it was the case

---

23 On a side note however, a case has been mentioned where money has been misused by a saving scheme treasurer and it had not been clear yet how this case would have been treated, despite that the persons would have to pay the amount back. Generally cases like this would be discussed in network meetings, so that the communities could learn from each others experiences in cases like this.
in Flamingo. Unfortunately, sometimes people’s anger goes beyond these allegations and working in leading positions can become a stressing burden. One FEDUP member and community leader said that she suffers from high blood pressure since she works with savings, since people would tend to shout at her that they want their money back as soon the project gets delayed. An other interviewee reported how she even got (verbally) threatened:

‘They were angry with me. They made it torture for me and I had to call the police to safe me. Before they saved the money for long time, for this re-blocking, and this re-blocking is not done. […] It is not even a fight it is a war. They come to me, they want to chase me, they want to take my house away. They say oh you are ISN people. This NGO - what is an NGO? They didn’t know the information, what is an NGO, what is ISN, although we go there and mobilise them. The people are stubborn’ (Interviewee 7).

Due to the circumstance that people, generally, become especially confronting when it comes to money issues, mobilisation for upgrading projects normally starts with the mapping and enumeration of the settlement as a provider of trust and participation before communities have to start saving. However FEDUP saving groups operate already for 20 years and are not specifically focuses on upgrading/ housing projects but save for daily needs and loans.

Enumeration

Communities tend to overcome mistrust and also start saving once the first implementation has started, this has been stressed by several interviewees from different settlements. Therefore, it is important to start with physical action as early as possible. Also, the way communities are being mobilized and approached by the different actors outside the community play a major role.

For instance, the ISN pointed out that it would have a positive impact if especially the technical team, the planners and architects of CORC, would engage earlier with the communities. So far, the enumeration team is not the same as the technical team which means that communities have to get involved with several different actors since it takes time to overcome social barriers, build up trust and the willing to co-operate. This challenge could be smoothed if actors would get to know each other earlier.

According to the ISN, the enumeration results are not used sufficiently. So far they would only be used in order to survey the communities for upgrading, yet it would be neglected that it contains important details about economic opportunities within the communities. This could be the share of working age individuals, their occupation but also aspects as their skills and interests. According to the ISN the Enumeration results are a powerful tool that must be made use of, especially since ISN and CORC are more and more considering future perspectives of communities in terms of livelihoods and income generation.24 Generally it had already been discussed among ISN and CORC that the

---

24 The outlook towards further future oriented projects has become an important aspect for the Alliance. The upgrading of the physical housing situation is indeed a major improvement yet many problems remain for the communities.
enumeration results were often not reported back to the communities. Of course these are interested in their results as well, as every household has been interviewed and surveyed, yet if communities are left out of the information they are likely to fee rejected, loose trust and, understandably, also lose interest in continuing with the projects. As described in the case examples, this has been happening in the community of K2 Section.

5.3.2 Communication between Actors

The City of Cape Town and Communities

As it became clear in the previous sections that communication is of course an important factor within the planning process. This has not only been stressed within the collaborative/communication planning approach by authors, such as Innes (2004), but also becomes clear in every day practises in the field. Both case examples, Langrug and K2 Section, face struggles with open communication and therefore it has not been clear what the needs and goals of the communities are. As for Langrug, Habitat for Humanity has been placed in the position to work with the community on its goals.

The former project manager who had been on behalf of the City of Cape Town responsible for the first re-blocking projects, including, gives further insides how he had interacted with the communities in the planning process. Even though there would have been language and social barriers, and he sometimes needed a translator, he thinks that people will always understand each other if they want to.25

'Somehow I think that people by nature, manage to communicate, if not through a translator, the message does get across between the city, the NGO and the communities themselves. I always call these three for a partnership. Between that partnership, we insure that the communication works in one way or another. I generally managed the process through the NGO. I wouldn’t let anyone from the city or the contractors speak to the communities themselves. I would be the interface between the contractor, the community and the NGO. So from the communication and the role and responsibilities point of view that was generally the norm’ (Interviewee 4).

As previously mentioned in the section about K2, as an outsider it can be very challenging to talk to communities, not only due to language barriers but also members would raise demands or force to make promises —as the ISN puts it: ‘communities can change you’ (Interviewee 5). The former project manager has been aware of this and illustrates his experiences with an example:

'When the contractor deals directly with someone in the community, so there is 275 or 235 different structures on site, and each and everyone has their own ideas, after they already decided what the plan is. So when we give the contractor the lists and say: these

---

25 An other interviewee from CORC guessed that with translation around 10% of the information would get lost, yet those 90% that would get transferred would be sufficient enough to understand the message.
are the toilets over here, this where they are going to be placed, and then someone comes to the contractor directly and says: 'I actually want my toilet inside my structure'. That is just one little example. That shouldn’t be communicated on the ground, because the contractor is contractor to the city and not to the communities’ (Interviewee 4).

Through this example it becomes clear that single persons have tried to intervene in the process and take personal advantage, despite the agreements and plan that had been made on the collaborative level. This is a clear action against the community plan and undermines the cohesion. In order to avoid confusion and personal advantages, the project manager should mediate and be the main spokesperson between contractors and communities. Hence, and 'open and honest communication with the communities' is a major factor of a successful project. The project manager was new to the topic of re-blocking as it was a new concept for the city as well. He expressed that he had to learn from the NGO’s how to let communities solve their internal issues themselves, but only guide the communities to come up with a solution. An example he referred to is the allocation of EPWP jobs, which are the short contract jobs during the implementation of the project, as it has been the case for the multi-purpose community hall in Langrug for example. Normally the employment should switch between the community members on an equal base, but to control this, would be the task of the community and not the municipality.

In his reflections about the past projects, the project manager was positive and grateful about the experience to work in the informal settlement environment, and he addressed himself as a person who would stand up and expresses his thoughts and ideas easily. This has been confirmed by interviewees from ISN and Flamingo Heights, who described him as an easy person to communicate with, which was an important aspect for the success of the project.

CORC and ISN

Besides the communication between the city and the communities, the communication and interaction among the different SDI Alliances partners is of course a crucial aspect towards successful project and collaborative action. Whereas FEDUP is mostly engage into saving schemes, CORC and ISN are the main actors in re-blocking. Therefore their relation plays an important role towards the success of projects.

In Cape Town the relation among and within the SDI Alliance partners, and especially CORC and ISN as well as FEDUP, appears to be open and friendly. The communication seems to work well and on a direct base due to the fact that they hold regular meetings, such as the weekly Alliance staff meeting or between the technical Team of CORC and the ISN. They share a large office in which CORC, uTshani, and the SDI secretary find place. Moreover, ISN and FEDUP members visit this office several times the week in order to and work and communicate there. For outsiders it is hard to learn which person works for which team or organisation. Some persons are even members of ISN and FEDUP or have switched after a while. However, some internal persons admitted that it took them a long time to understand the position of each other in the office and find out whom their contact person would be. This has not only been the case between the
Alliance partner organisations but also within CORC for example, as the NGO focusses not only on upgrading projects but also operates on livelihood projects, policy documents and more.

Therefore, the ISN thinks that the communication with CORC could be improved in that sense that the ISN lacks contact person within CORC whom they could generally address. But more importantly this person should present a unified voice towards ISN so that their members would not have to get different input and opinions from different persons, as the situation is now.

Some employees of CORC evaluate the communication between the CORC and ISN very well. A member of the technical team agrees on that but clarifies that the communication works well because the actors do have a good personal interrelation. He thinks that he does not communicate well with the ISN in general, but with specific individuals such as the ISN president an others who are regular in the office. However the ISN is a national network and he would not know ISN members in Johannesburg for instance and therefore he could not do the same work he does in Cape Town somewhere else in the country. He suggested that more national social activities could connect the actors.

In Cape Town there are clear attempts by the ISN president to improve the connection between ISN and CORC, especially as at that time the technical team only contained one planner with longer experience in re-blocking. One person had left the NGO but two new employees and three interns had joined within a few months. Hence, the ISN president engaged the technical team to explain what their part in the process would be and what their goals are. It turned out that this was a useful question as especially the interns had not reflected yet on what the purpose of the their work was beyond daily mappings and layout design. In other meetings as well it turned out that normative questions needed to be clarified, for instances it has has been discussed, what the actors would understand as informal settlement upgrading, what re-blocking means to them, how a project can be described as successful or sustainable and very often someone fro CORC or ISN would remind the other attendees that the main priority of CORC was to mobilise and empower communities, but not offer them upgrading solution.

CORC and ISN are still relatively young organisations who are new to insitu upgrading – which is generally an inexperienced discipline in South Africa. Therefore, the actors still find themselves in a learning process in which they can mostly learn form their own previous projects and mistakes that have been done in top-down planning so far. These aspects will be elaborated further in the following section, with focus on the role of urban planners in participatory projects.

5.3.3. Planning and Implementing

Community participation and the role of planners

When it comes to the actual designing and planning process, it is not deniable that the actors have a different socio-economic background which has an influence on how they are positioned in the projects. As previously mentioned, community members turned out
to be sometimes hungry during meetings and hunger is of course a destabilizer, among other negative factors. Whereas the ISN and FEDUP members come from the informal settlements, especially CORC has been criticized for being too technocratic and professionalized considering the bottom up approach SDI is following. One planner of CORC is (still) living in an informal settlement which is a benefit for the communication as he understands the needs and living situation in settlements on a different level than a person who had never lived in these circumstances. After a meeting in K2 he played cards with the community members in order to gain their trust and a personal relation. Others concerned the disparity towards the communities. An interviewee from CORC reflected that upgrading was just her job, and in the end of the day she would go back to her proper home but for the communities it would be their daily life. Therefore openness towards each other’s ideas and needs is definitively necessary, yet not a grantee for a successful outcome.

The actual designing and planning with communities is according to an interviewee (1) from CORC still a ‘learning by doing’. This is because CORC can only look back on a view years of experience in upgrading, but also planners are generally not taught in their education how to plan with civil participation in projects:

‘You are making mistakes even by not making mistakes in this organisation. By forgetting your elements, principles. Even by coming up with a solution you are making a mistake. So our core principle is, we learn by doing. So we except mistakes by what we are doing. Because we don’t know what we do. If you ask someone what is informal settlement upgrading? It is an improvement, what is this? How does it look like? What is that improvement and how do you measure it? And whose improvement?’ (Interviewee 1).

What he means here is that the biggest mistake one could do in the project was to neglect or leave behind the community in the process but focus on a good design that serves the personal ideas and standards as an architect or planner but forgetting about the principle that the community must run the process is more important than the solution itself:

‘And if we continuing with a system that doesn’t work, where a designer just does something and then gives it to the communities, whether it is good enough for this community, but it doesn’t sell the purpose, that the communities themselves understand, or the community drives the process, then its gonna create challenges again’ (Interviewee 1).

Therefore CORC runs with the help of ISN as ‘a people centred process more than anything else’ (Interviewee 1). And the main task of the planners in this case was to help a community to find out what their members want and reach these goals, instead giving them a solution. And already the mobilisation process, including the mapping of the settlement and the enumeration are trying to prepare the communities for the design process by bringing neighbours in contact (again). Whether the cohesion in the communities increases in the end, would be hard to measure, however, the process must create opportunities for people to interact, ‘the rest is personal choice’. The interviewee
admits that he does not know whether Flamingo Height was a community with increased cohesion now, but at least the opportunity was given for people to interact, since a space was created in which neighbours could keep and eye on each other's belongings and it was to safe to be now, even for outsiders. This is remarkably when considering that Flamingo was before characterized by drug and gang activities. Now residents even engage in gardening projects.

Besides these rather structural and normative questions and result of re-blocking so far, he mentions a major learning outcome was implemented from the upgrading of Mshini Wam, which was the second re-blocking project that could be implemented. In Mshini Wam it happened that eight families had been expelled from the settlement by other community members in favour of outsiders who then became part of the project. This could have several reasons as the new dwellers are maybe friends/relatives of community members or outsiders were simply willing to buy themselves into the project. Sometimes even local leaders would have tried to sell stand sizes to external persons and unnoticeably raise the number of community members. Such incidents could happen as it was not mapped which family lived in which shacks and with how many people. CORC has learned from that and is now strictly mapping this information and also keeps better record of how the settlement looked before and during the upgrading so that now families can not be evicted or added during the demolition of the shacks. 'If you don't have your before (map) you can't really measure what you have done. So the before map is even more important than the after.'

Implementing

From the perspective of the previous project manager for the City of Cape Town (Interviewee 4), who has a background in engineering, re-blocking should be managed with the principles of any other construction project and then it could become successful. The rules that should be followed would be an open and honest communication with communities,' as presented above, clear tasks and roles which the city, the NGOs and the community would take and the process and sensibility towards the personal space, the home of residents. The project would be very much drive by what he calls 'the human factor' for which he gives the example, that in one case it rained for three days and after that the ground was muddy for a week which had the effect that the people who were supposed to move those days could not and the process was delayed. This is because in the time between the demolition of the old shack and the set up of the new ones, people have to live with all their belongings in their neighbours shacks, which is incredibly small space and can not be expected from communities. Moreover, he would have been touched by the poverty and social situation of residents, such as seeing children running around who should be in school and wondering what the reasons would be, and indeed, sometimes feel unsafe, but he followed the principles of project managing which helped to succeed.

In the end, everyone with experiences in (infrastructure) management could do re-blocking by following those principles, and under the condition that the community is strong, organised and has already balanced out internal issues. For the city it would be
important that the community would stick to its layout and not change its plans over and over, which would not only cause personal frustration but has an impact on the project costs and can delay the process.

There is one major improvement that can be made in the process. This is that the City's project management team should involve at an earlier stage with the communities and especially cooperate in the layout design. This could save a lot of time as so far, the municipality mainly engages once it receives the community made layout draft and only then checks whether this will work with services and geological conditions or not and start the UISP application process. If the municipality would engage earlier in the design process a lot of time could be saved, which is a very important aspect considering that the long project period is a major aspect why communities jump off the process and project and can not be finalized.

An other major benefit would be that communities will become more motivated and easier convinced to engage into up-grading once the municipality shows presence. As stated by the ISN, communities tend to rather believe what an outsider says than what they hear from inside the community and their leadership. Thus, it could make a major difference whether members hear from each other verbally that officials will engage or whether officials themselves visit the settlements and explain their plan, requirements and engage in the design. Yet, this engagement would request more qualified human resources by the municipality. Indeed the previous project manager by the City of Cape Town stated that his replacement is working on this aspect as more capacities and staff will be made available in order to engage earlier with the communities. However, it must not be set aside that communicating with communities can be difficult. Officials need to learn expressing themselves in a way that communities understand them and governmental language barriers can be overcome. Also, and this is important to notice, official need to cope with communities having requests and questions that may not be answered right away. Officials need to be prepared that: 'Communities can change you'. Therefore, they have to be aware and trained not make promises they can not hold as this will disrupt the communities.

5.3.4 Negative examples of governmental officials intervening in upgrading

An aspect which gives hope in the case of governmental cooperation with the Alliance partners is the example of Mossel Bay, where it took ten years to convince the municipality to cooperate with FEDUP and finally give the agreement to housing projects. According to an Interviewee from FEDUP, it is important and fruitful to convince governmental officials that they will get positive reputation if project are successfully completed in their legislature. In the end the numbers count of how many houses have been built and how many communities have received access to water/ sanitation. Flamingo Height is a very good example since the project has become public in the national media but also gained reputation among international researchers. This positive reputation has to be transferred to the officials of municipalities in order to get them convinced in favour of participatory projects. Cape Town is running a good example with the new City Funding policy document. This is an official way and an important step in
Cape Town – yet the impacts and quality of the document is to be evaluated once it is published.

However, the Alliance in general has to learn how to make better use the non-formal strategies. This does not mean illegal, but the case of the two ‘show houses’ in the settlement Tinasonke near Johannesburg is a good example. Here FEDUP is building two houses without governmental permission, which is required by the National Housing Code from 2009. Yet by declaring those as ‘show houses’ FEDUP found a way to construct anyway and to convince the provincial government officials of their abilities and trigger them for co-operating. Also, the community of Tinasonke has started saving again and members who had dropped of are now willing to become part of FEDUP again.

A second aspect is to make more access for communities to governmental meetings which they are often excluded from. Here Habitat for Humanity can play an important role as an international well reputed organisation that not only brings public awareness but is also situated professionally and strongly organised in order to break through conservative and exclusive behaviour among governmental officials. Moreover, Habitat also focusses on the education of communities in upgrading policies, which is an important factor for communities once they negotiate with authorities in order to claim their rights. For the case of Langrug, for example ISN/ CORC, Habitat for Humanity and representatives of the community haven repeatedly been excluded from meetings regarding the project design by the local government even though they should be included as project stakeholders.

In contrast it is remarkable that the National Minister of Housing, Lindiwe Sisulu, has emphasised the importance and value of the SA SDI Alliance and community-led development processes in regards to slum prevention. However, as development work is mostly provincial and municipal remit, her approval towards SDI does not have enough influence as it would have a significant impact on the housing situation of the local level. Cases such as Langrug have shown that even the communication with the very local government officials can be challenging. According to the IDP (Integrated Development Plan) it is the task of Ward Councillors to identify the needs of the communities in their Ward, support community participation and establish those needs and project ideas in the municipality’s five year plan. In Langrug this participatory situation is given and the ward councillor could actually profit from the fact that there is a strong leadership and many projects are in process and have been implemented already, as well as the support of ISN, CORC and Habitat for Humanity. Yet nonetheless the Councillor is positioned contradictory towards those actors and the leadership and the reasons for this are however not (officially) clear.
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Housing Projects and the role of local authorities

When it comes to the construction of houses, the EPHP, the Enhanced Peoples Housing Process, defines that communities must (with help of support organisations) submit a business plan for housing projects which must be approved by the province.

'When you submit the business plans, and you are in the negotiations with different stakeholders, the municipality, the councillor, the province, everyone got his own agenda. So you have make sure that you win at least two or all of them. Because in order for them to even consider this business plan you have to have a relationship, like a partnership with the municipality'.

According to the FEDUP national coordinator the ward councillor and municipality must have to approve the plan as well and normally project applications would be transferred by the municipality towards the provincial officials in charge. In many cases this process would be delayed due to several reasons. Fortunately, the official in the Western Cape province offered the interviewee to hand in the applications personally as the municipality was blocking the process.

In most cases the municipalities would not understand EPHP housing process and neglect community participation but instead appoint a developer who constructs a house for the community. However, similarly ad the UiSP, the EPHP intends community participation and now top-down planing. Yet, municipalities would still prefer developer driven houses as those do not follow EPHP restrictions and therefore can construct in shorter time than FEDUP. The municipalities however would have their 'own agenda':

'This Department of Human Settlements, is a very corrupt department - if I can put it like that. Very corrupt, because if they give you that tender they know they've got a slice of cake that you have to give them. So that is why they don't give us [tender]. Each time we come there, we say: we don't have money, we are working with the poorer of the poorest. So we don't have a slice of cake to give you. Because that is why we are building bigger houses because the money of the subsidy is money for the houses and money for us! And it is not money for you' (Interviewee 8).

In another interview the interviewee did not even answer the question whether he would face a lot of corruption in the housing sector but only laughed. However, he stated the many municipalities would work unprofessionally and neither transfer information nor applications. Hence, a lot of processes would be delayed in the bureaucracy of municipalities. Beyond that in the case of Mossel Bay the municipality would have even tried to stir up communities against FEDUP as it would be waisting time to join the Federation which would never be able to build houses. Therefore, people would have applied for subsidies for RDP houses and left FEDUP. However, similarly as it has happened in Tinasonke, now that the first five Federation houses are built in Mossel Bay, those persons who left FEDUP want join again and also continue saving.

These examples illustrate the importance of political will, especially on the local level towards upgrading and housing projects, as otherwise projects will not be approved or get delayed which then can also risk that communities leave the projects. In terms of
community participation Cape Town has shown the most ambition, especially in settlements upgrading. In other parts of South Africa such as Mossel Bay or Johannesburg municipalities still focus on housing projects. However, within the Alliance office in Johannesburg it has been discussed that there is a need to shift towards upgrading as well. This is because housing deliveries would be to slow and re-blocking could improve the situation of more people in shorter time.

Even though Cape Town is most advanced in upgrading projects, the municipality is as well still driving a security approach towards informal settlements. Cape Town established in 2011 the ‘Anti-Land Invasion Unit’ whose task it is to identify new shack and demolish them with 48hours after construction. This because after 48hours the city needs a permission by a law court to turn down those shacks. According to an interviewee the majority of the Department for Informal Settlements of Cape Town would focus on demolishing than developing informal settlements, and drive around on a daily base looking for new shacks. Therefore, Cape Town still runs a dichotomy towards the treatment of informal settlement. Nevertheless, the municipality had identified nine priority projects of which only three have been successfully upgraded, KuKu Town, Mshini Wam and most recently Flamingo Height. In the other cases the communities have caused problems and in once case the topography of the settlement made insitu upgrading impossible. Hence, the community must be relocated and can not be re-blocked.

5.3.5 The impact of funding sources

Despite the core goals of CORC to empower communities, facilitate their interests and to neglect their ideas as professionals, their financial dependency on funding limits their abilities towards their freedom in upgrading. Whereas ISN also received funding from uTshani for small financial projects, processes such as re-blocking can only be realized with the funding organised by CORC and the CUFF (Communities Upgrading Finance Facility). However CORC is depending on donors, which not only imposes a time-limited financial planning schedule but also obligations to fulfill in the sense that CORC has to deliver projects and numbers of beneficiaries per year. This however is complicated as re-blocking projects, and participatory grass-root development projects in general, not only take a lot of time and effort but also are exposed to challenges which can blockade the process easily. CORC is aware of the problem and is working on reorganising their upgrading approaches. This is a very challenging part as they have just gained experience through three successful re-blocking projects, so that now practises can be applied to current projects. Hence, re-blocking is still a fragile system as actors are in a learning process and with every project have to adapt to new conditions in the physical environment but mostly in the socio-economic relations of the community. CORC does however ‘not want to become the NGO that only does re-blocking’ (Interviewee 3) and the employees have to balance between the success, recognition and comfort that comes along with it and the fact that re-blocking is not the solution for every project. ISN and CORC are aware of this, yet due to the exchanges to Flamingo, re-blocking has become
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the upgrading that communities want, without deeper consideration of what their needs and solutions are.

Instead, CORC considers a combination of partly re-blocking but also installing more openly shared community facilities which reach more individuals such as a community hall or a public playground. When only considering the requirements of how many beneficiaries CORC must supply per year in order to maintain their funding, re-blocking does not pay off. Sometimes re-blocking does only happen on a very small scale of settlements with of 50 households, which might imply that only 50-60 individuals have benefitted but according to funders CORC is expected by its main funders to reach 2000 beneficiaries per year. One the one hand, the effort re-blocking requires, makes it impossible to reach these numbers. One the other hand re-blocking is so far the process which improves the livelihoods of individuals most directly and has a greater impact on daily lives than a community hall that can be used by hundreds of people. Also, shared facilities bear the problem of maintenance such as it has been the case in Langrug where it is not clarified who will take care of the washing facilities. Still, CORC has to change its strategy and thus especially the ISN is positioning itself to represent and preserve the interests of the communities and their empowerment and not of financial donors expecting far-fetched numbers. Therefore interviewees from ISN and CORC are thinking of different scenarios to change this situation:

One way to avoid this critical situation is for the ISN to become financially independent on the long run, which would give all actors more freedom to concentrate on a diversity of projects. The second way is for CORC to become financially independent as well and the opportunity to do so lies in the funding allocation of the UISP. As introduced previously 3% or the entire project funding should be provided for community facilitation and organisation, which is exactly what CORC and ISN are doing. Even up to 8% can be provided to the project management. Therefore, CORC and as well ISN have a requirement for this allocation, yet in the planning process of the municipalities this aspect is often overseen or repressed and the funding used inappropriately.

Therefore, a major chance and importance lies in convincing municipalities to allocate this funding to organisations such as CORC/ ISN. Similarly to the selection of contracting developers, this allocation has to happen in an open, public competition according to the requirements of the UISP. Since municipalities however are under time pressure as well in regards of spending their annual budget (IDP), they often allocate this kind of funding to contractors such as consultants surveying the settlements. As the services of consultants are often costly, the budget will be spent however for the communities no changes are made as no implementation takes place. It is difficult to convince municipalities to allocate these 3%/ 8% of budget for community capacitation, especially when considering that many municipalities still run a security driven approach towards informal communities. In fact however, if municipalities allocate the 3% for community capacitation, then it is normally invested into consultants who survey the community, might write a report but do not actual community capacitation work, which NGO's would do. However the appointing of consultants is also regulated through the open tendering process by the MFMA, and according to an interviewee from CORC this excludes NGOs
from the process which are not as competitive as consulting firms. However, for municipalities this would be a good, as public and transparent, way to cope with the pressure of spend their budget in the financial year.

5.3.6 Why re-blocking is not the solution for every community

Flamingo has become the most advanced re-blocking project so far and Cape Town's the previous project manager expressed that its should become the benchmark for the standard of future upgrading projects. As described earlier, communities which participate in exchanges with Flamingo are impressed by the results. This generally makes them decide for re-blocking as well, however without thoughtfully considering their needs and options. This is an understandable reaction for communities when considering that Flamingo's community now benefits from clean, high quality white shacks but also has roads, gardening in front of the settlement, a creche, a children's playground and a toilet for every household.

However many settlements, especially the older ones are extremely dense and contain big shacks up to 50m² which makes it very difficult to install equally services by keeping the size of the large structure. If those shacks will be replaced by equally large ones, roads of 3m and space for sanitation could not be provided. However, as 3m wide roads are a basic requirement for fire security and car accessibility, it has to be considered whether the 'footprint on the ground' of shacks should be reduced. This can either be done by reducing the size of shacks or building new shacks double story. In either way the second major challenges is that households are most likely not able to contribute 20% of the cost – which are related to their shack size. Also CUFF, the funding tool of CORC does only fund structures up to 20m². Hence, CUFF might need to fund a larger share of the new structures and/or the contribution share might have to be lowered to 10%. Even then, it might still be the case that costs are too high for some households. Depending on the size of their shack they would still have to pay up to R3,000. This means that a household/family would either loose either space through re-blocking or would need receive a larger funding –which then would be seen as unfair treatment towards smaller households. In fact it would mean that larger households would be doubled advantaged by having more space and also by paying.

An other critical point appears when communities go on exchange. When it would come out that some communities had to contribute more than others it will create not only jealousy and anger but also decrease the trust towards ISN and CORC. According to an interviewee, the community of Mshini Wam would already feel disadvantaged as they received a lower level of services and believe the reason for this was racial discrimination instead of the fact all project actors have been in a learning process.

5.3.7 Summary of Learning outcomes and improvements

The various different actors who are working on different levels of the upgrading projects developed strategies to cope with their situation but some also see opportunities to improve the process.
FEDUP and ISN who mostly do the groundwork with the communities have to be personally strong and grounded in order to hand allegations and sometimes even threats when people neither want to engage in saving nor want to participate into the designing for upgrading projects – or any other struggles that appears on the ground such as distribution of EPWP contracts, maintenance of facilities or issues of leadership and self-empowerment. These are mainly the task of the ISN and FEDUP, because if communities are not strongly organised they will not reach the next level of physically upgrading their settlements or the project will fail within the process.

The interviewees from FEDUP stated that they try to trigger the future thinking in people but also offer them activities and social inclusion, especially for women who often lack a regular occupation. Moreover, ISN and FEDUP members regularly come together in meetings in order to exchange their experiences and learn from each other, or ask members in higher positions for advise.

The ISN stressed that the results of the community enumerations should be evaluated more and used for the identification of livelihood opportunities. This is not directly involved with housing projects but presents an outlook on future perspectives of CORC and ISN especially when considering that re-blocking and physical upgrading are important steps but not a final solution for the problems of deprived communities.

Also the financial situation of ISN and CORC influences how the partners will operate in future. While CORC has to fulfill requirements from its donors which might shift projects away from only re-blocking towards other options, such as shared community facilities. The ISN needs to maintain the quality of services for communities but mainly foster their empowerment. Therefore, the ISN is working on strategies to become less financially depending in order to provide a greater variety of projects and services.

One option towards this financial independency from donors would be funding allocation of the UISP in which 3% should be provided for the capacitation and facilitation work of communities; and 8% for the management of projects. However in upgrading projects so far, this share has either been spend on consultants who do not engage in community capacitation or it has not been allocated at all. This is not surprising when considering that often municipalities, do not know or want to follow the UISP in its original requirements. Several interviewees have stated that the UISP is a sophisticated document and if upgrading projects would exactly follow the UISP guidelines, they could be successful. However, according to an interviewee from CORC, ‘there is no mechanisms that government has to work with communities. They don’t have community development workers’ (Interviewee 3). Instead UISP projects such as Joe Slovo Park, which has been mentioned in Chapter 3, in the end lead to eviction and the exclusion of communities from their right to the city.

Therefore, CORC has started with regular meetings in which the, so to speak, policy expert of the NGO is discussing the national housing and upgrading policies. It is important for CORC and also ISN to know those documents thoroughly in order to negotiate with the local governments on the legal base about the right of community participation, in situ upgrading and funding. This is extremely important knowledge for
communities and especially their leadership as well in order to negotiate with governments for their rights. Moreover, once communities understand that projects will take time because of governmental processes, they will be less likely to give up on the project and their social cohesion is less endangered. So far Habitat for Humanity specifically focusses on the education of communities and organises policy learning workshops in Langrug.

Section 5.3.4 has presented examples of corruption and political unwillingness by the government to cooperate with communities. An interviewee from FEDUP expressed that ways to convince these governments into cooperating with the Federation was definitely the presentation of (show) houses in order to demonstrate the abilities of FEDUP. As second interesting strategy is to let government officials claim successful projects as an achievement of their period of tenure and earn the prestige.

So far Cape Town has been the only city/municipality engaging into re-blocking, which stands in contrast to the city still being involved in shack eviction through the Anti-Land Invasion Unit. For the next years several re-blocking projects are planned and the city has taken learnings of the completed ones. This is the importance of community ground work and the fact that communities should solve their internal issues self and that the city can only give guidance. Yet the major learning outcome is that the city should join layout designing process as soon as possible in order to save time. So far it had been the case that a community finishes a design and is ready to implement yet this is the point when the city starts, checking that layout, calculating costs, and looks for contractors which could take up one and a half years while the communities are waiting and loosing interest. In order to change this, the City of Cape Town has started capacitate more human resources to interact with communities earlier and guide them in their process.
6. Discussion of re-blocking as a practise of collaborative planning

This chapter discusses to what extent the practise of re-blocking contributes to the field of collaborative planning and what planning theory can learn from this practise. This is important because, as Vanessa Watson (2003: 395f.) strongly argues, planning theory does not meet the clashes of cultural diversity and rationalities in the field, especially when planning work touches the livelihoods of households and communities. If planning theory shall be more helpful for planners in these fields, research has to shift away from grounding on social theorists but use concrete empirical case research in order to gain a better understanding as well as strategies.

This chapter is divided into three parts. It first analyses which elements of the collaborative planning approach applies to the practise of re-blocking and to what extent the approach can be helpful towards improving, re-blocking. Second, it links Watson's (2002) perspective on hinder for collaborative planning in Sub-Saharan Africa with the practise of the SA SDI partners. In a third step, it will be discussed to what extent the practise of re-blocking can contribute to the improvement of the implementation of South Africa's informal settlement upgrading policy and to what extent re-blocking can be evaluated as a successful tool of collaborative planning.

6.1 Re-blocking from a collaborative planning perspective

As presented in Chapter 2, there is neither an overarching definition of collaborative planning nor universal instructions of how to carry out collaborative planning. Instead several aspects had been discussed and further developed which appeared important to the authors of collaborative planning in the broader discipline of communicative planning. These has been: an open and transparent discussion, the language and style of communication between actors, their relation towards each other and their position of power, and the impact of collaborative approaches on the role of planners in the process.

Considering the important aspects and the guidelines that are given in the discussion about collaborative planning, the following section aims to point out in which way the process of re-blocking and the relation of actors involved can be identified as collaborative planning.

Open discussion and style of communication

As presented in Chapter 2, Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones (2002: 10) state the that it is important for “Opening out” discussions to explore their boundaries as they are perceived by different actors is important, as is questioning ‘accepted’ assumptions and ‘truths’ and learning about each others interests, hopes and fears. This kind of opening up discussion can definitely be found between and among the actors. Not only did the ISN president ask the technical team about their goals and position in informal settlement upgrading but also it has often been discussed within CORC what they main goals of the NGO and single staff members are. Therefore, it can be clearly said there is
an open climate in which boundaries and normative aspects, as well personal interest are being discussed. However, it had also been addressed that this good communication is limited on personal relations among actors and in Cape Town but could not be transferred to other locations.

The entire concept of re-blocking is based on an open discussion with the community and tools are given to trigger their interest and opinion, such as through the enumeration, profiling and design workshops. Communities shall come together in internal meetings but also with the other stakeholders and express their upgrading wishes. However, whether communities actually take the chance and participate in these conversation is not guaranteed. The case example Langrug has shown that an open discussion is indeed a very challenging aspect. During this field research, not any meeting of communities with project stakeholders took place in which the community members would have participated openly. Several aspects can be reasons for this. In Langrug, the community committee appeared to be very depending on their leader and too shy to speak in front of bigger discussion circles, involving CORC, ISN, and Habitat for Humanity. Also, languages had been a problem as often community members can not express themselves in English as much as they would need to join a discussion. Therefore, in Langrug the real meeting would take place after the actual meeting, and this was normal, according to the urban planner of CORC. On the other hand if the community holds general meetings without the presence of CORC/ISN and the local leaders presents the outcomes later, these can not always be sure that it was representative for all members – especially in large settlements. In the case of K2, the community avoided confrontation with the ISN/CORC in either small design workshops or general community meetings. It had turned out that the community was generally insecure about how the re-blocking project would work in practise as well what the implications would be for them. The ISN president requested the community should provide representatives for the next design workshop and also figure its internal issues.28

Language and style of communication

However, the successful case of Flamingo has shown that open and transparent communication is possible and according to the former project manager of Cape Town, languages barriers were relatively easy to overcome. If there was a will to communicate, communities would have understood him, otherwise a translator would have helped out. In another case, the interviewee from CORC as well stated that language can be hindering but with translation still 90% of the information would be transferred which would be sufficient enough. In the end, as the project manager expressed, it needs a will to communicate.

Besides the importance of language as a factor, the open and ideal speech situation in terms of Habermas(1984), as well as shared and equal power, has often been criticized in the collaborative planning, especially the approach of Healey (1997). Obviously, and that is not surprising, a power equal discussion can not be reached in the South African

28 Unfortunately during my research I had not been able to find out how communities exactly solve these kind of issues, which is due to language and social barriers, but also a matter of my relatively short stay.
circumstances of spatial injustice since slum dwellers are a largely deprived group which has been excluded from the core city for decades. However, through the ISN a medium has been developed to organize the voices and interests of the informal dwellers and brought power to them. However power relations are still existing and to some extent even necessary, such as in cases when FEDUP and ISN members are fighting with single community members. Two interviewees addressed that if they do not know how to solve a situation they contact a national coordinator, who lives close to them. The interviewees also revealed power struggles and threatenings towards women holding positions in the saving schemes. Healey (2006) and Innes (2004) would argue that their approach of collaboration and consensus seeking would not have promised that the communication would run harmonically without fights and power struggles, but the importance was that a public arena was facilitated in which stakeholders can discuss openly.

Power positions and relations of actors

If FEDUP and ISN want to operate on the national level, they need a strong and structured organisation which automatically merges positions of more or less power in the organisations. This is also stated by Batliwala (2012: 395) who claims that within social movements it was fact that different actors enjoy various levels of power and privilege but also entry into the policy-making arena. Therefore, it has to be distinguished between direct stakeholders 'who are negotiating the adverse impacts of economic changes in their own homes, communities, and lives' and those who are less directly affected (ibid). When considering that the members of social movement such as ISN and FEDUP can not simultaneously represent and engage in every community nationwide, this aspect is not surprising but rather human calculation. Instead, the important aspect is that actors do not play their power or abuse it to make decision against the will of the collective but use the power to guide communities and encourage them to find solutions themselves. In the end the interviewee from Habitat for Humanity expressed that from her experience, projects would need a champion who stands behind the process, would motivate communities and provides stability. This can be confirmed in Langrug where a strong leadership holds the community together, has gained their trust and is willing to constantly engage into construction and meetings. The down-side here is that he has trouble to share tasks and power. The former project manager of Cape Town can also be addressed as this champion type on the governmental level. As the interviewees with FEDUP have shown, local governments can delay and block projects, therefore it is especially important to have the municipality on side and a manger with a positive attitude towards the projects as 'Somebody needs to go and do it!'

The (power) position of planners

Furthermore, the architects and planners of CORC hold a certain share of power as well, as they are in the situation where they could (unconsciously) serve a community with a solution yet exclude the community from the process. As stated by the CORC planner, this is a challenging aspect as they have not been taught to work participatory. This aspect has also been addressed in the discussion about collaborative planning, especially by Allmendinger & Tewdwr-Jones who state that planners are educated as
technocrats who follow their own agenda and do not have a moral obligation to engage in collaborative planning. This stands in contrast to Healey who stated an 'ethical duty' for planners to act adversary and mediate between actors. In the case of CORC a strong will to engage in participatory planning can definitely be assumed, not only for the planners but for the entire staff as otherwise they would not work in this organisation. Challenges rather appear when it comes to meet this goals and let communities participate issues even though solutions could be found easier, as in the case of Langrug where the local leader is willing to do construction work faster and more efficient than the community.

In his deliberative planning approach Forester (1999) calls urban planners to be more reflective on their roles in the political sphere of planning but also to be politically deliberative and translate the idea of participatory planning or communication into political reality. Therefore, planners should learn how to look through a political vision on the facilitation of participatory processes. Indeed CORC is working on this as the staff is having regular meetings in which they discuss the national Housing Policy documents and their impact on the work of CORC. This has been very appreciated by the CORC staff as they registered the importance of thoroughly knowing the restrictions and opportunities of the housing policies in order to negotiate and make demands with the government.

Summary

Collaborative planning as field of communicative planning seeks for census and therefore emphasizes on an open communication and transparency. Efforts and struggles for an open communication are definitely visible in the process of re-blocking and the relation among actors. The approach of collaborative planning has in that sense been a useful framework for analysing the process of re-blocking. Especially aspects 'language and style of communication', transparency and opening out question which seek for a mutual understanding of interests and values are important guidelines when analysing community participation and their relation towards different actors. In that sense the theory of collaborative planning also discusses the altered role of planners which is a significant and critical aspect in the process of re-blocking.

6.2 Challenges for collaborative planning in the Sub-Saharan Africa context

In Chapter 2.4 it has specifically been discussed whether collaborative planning as a Western Planning approach may not be applied in the Global South. Huxley and Yichtafel (1998) argue that practises as community empowerment and participation trigger unintended outcomes such as the reinforcement of unequal power relations. Indeed Pieterse (2008) has analysed the saving scheme approach of the South African Homeless Peoples' Federation (which is now known as FEDUP) and come to the conclusion that 'civil society intervention in slum improvement and prevention is not without dangers' (2008: 56). He points out that:

'When a grassroots methodology is elevated to a generic mode of social intervention, it potentially runs into problems. Elements of the saving-based model do not work in all contexts. Significantly, the model tends to 'impose' a moral regime on the participants in
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the movements that holds the potential of being authoritarian, especially when internal
democratic processes and cultures are still nascent. As a result, the highly disciplined
and ritualistic methodology of these organizations does draw strong lines of inclusion
and exclusion inside the communities where they operate, even though they supposedly
operate on non-sectarian principles’ (ibid: 56). This separation of communities can clearly
be found in Tinsonke were around 100 persons had left the Federation and built up their
own organisations, which let to fights in the community. The situation has calmed down
now since the construction of the two ‘show houses’ because the splinter groups has
regained faith into FEDUP and want to join again. Generally the interviewees have
revealed that many FEDUP/ ISN saving schemes face problems because communities do
not want to save, give up saving or even threat savings group coordinators.

Basil van Horen who had already been involved in upgrading of Besters Camp, an early
up-grading project in Durban in 1987, published an article revealing good practise he has
learned from this early project of re-blocking. In short his main aspects are (2000: 395):

- Planning must happen on the ground and communities must participate on all
  levels
- planning and goals should evolve out of the process rather than follow a
  previously set masterplan
- planning should understand the micro-dynamics on the settlement level but also
  link to the marco-political politics and economic forces
- cooperative autonomy: decision making structures within the settlement should be
  linked with governmental institution in order to ensure that different planning
  approaches and ideas are accepted

Contemporary re-blocking in the Cape Town area is definitely following these guidelines.
Communities are indeed involved in all planning processes and create their own layout
as rather than a top-down master plan, even though the bottom-up process process is
challenged by the altered role of planners and struggles to mobilize communities in
reality. By letting communities decide on layouts, the project goals and also labour
distribution the micro dynamics are in focus yet also acknowledging the communities
need to be mobilized and economically stabilized in order to change their marginalized
position on the long term. Although several actors in the re-blocking process have
revealed that their communication has to be improved, it becomes clear that these
actors are aware of their weaknesses and aiming for improvement. Therefore,
cooperative autonomy in the decision making process is developing in the re-blocking
projects.

Despite these clear success, re-blocking however struggles with four problematics that
especially Watson (2009) points out as main limitations for collaborative/
communicative planning in Sub-Saharan Africa: a dysfunctional society, lack of civic
organisations, small scale interventions of organisations and donor dependencies. These
have indeed been revealed as challenges for the informal settlement upgrading process
of CORC and ISN/ FEDUP and will therefore be discussed in the following.
Watson argues that many Sub-Saharan societies would be dysfunctional as they are fragmented and ethnically divided. This can definitively be seen in South Africa, due to the history of Apartheid and the outcomes of failed its failed spatial planning. And also the recent Xenophobic attacks in Johannesburg and Durban have revealed and underlying clash between migrants and native South Africans in the multicultural country. Moreover, as it has been stated by interviewees, many communities lack social cohesions and are becoming increasingly anonymous. In that sense, Watson's point regarding fragmented societies is not deniable, yet the approach of SA SDI explicitly tackles this lack of cohesion and social fragmentation. Despite several challenges within the communities, the 20 years practise saving scheme practise of FEDUP has approved, that social fragmentation can be overcome.

This success also stands in contrast, to Watson's second argument, the lack of strong grass-root organisations and NGOs in Sub-Saharan Africa. She had formulated her concerns in 2002, yet since then FEDUP has been established and ISN and CORC have been founded. Of course these are not significant examples for the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa as they are limited to South Africa, yet they display successful practise. Moreover, they are part of the increasingly well-known and recognized SDI (Myers 2011: 195) which also bears opportunities to other Sub-Saharan countries, such as Zambia or Tanzania.

Third, Watson points out that many NGOs and grass-root organisations operate only on a small scale as they do not collaborative with the state but try to bypass it. Authors such as Hellinger (1987) and Gilbert and Ward (1984) as well emphasizes the importance of an open relationship between NGOs and governmental organisations in order to increase the scale and acceptance of projects. This collaboration is indeed practised in the process of re-blocking as the SA SDI actors actively seek to work together with the government local, provincial and national government, and have approved to be successful many times. Moreover, due to exchanges between communities within South Africa but also internationally, the impact of the SDI partner organisations is quit large.

However on a local lever, re-blocking's major down-side however is indeed its small scale compared to its time intensiveness. Due to the long mobilisation and designing process, re-blocking takes a lot of effort but can only be implemented in smaller settlements. In Langrug as a large and also growing settlement it is hard to identify what the interests of each section are. The leadership appears not to be representative for the entire community so far and general meetings are hard to organise in the sense that not enough representatives attend, but if they do, a meeting spot and communication is difficult to organise. Smaller re-blocking projects however only have an impact on a very few persons yet require a lot of resources and can therefore be criticized as not sustainable. As presented, this causes also problems for CORC who have to fulfill the requests of their donators who expect large scale impacts. Indeed this has been pointed out by Watson (2002) and other authors such as Hellinger (1987) and Kanyal (2013) as limitation for NGOs operation in Sub-Saharan Africa. Yet CORC and ISN are working on
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strategies to overcome this challenge. The ISN aims to become financially independent from CORC projects and CORC itself aims for funding through the correct allocation UISP regarding community capacitation work.

Beyond these limitations pointed out by Vanessa Watson, collaborative planning in the informal settlement context must also reflect on the fact that actors of different socio-economic backgrounds work together. Also Gilbert and Ward (1984) address that false expectations towards community actions and its opportunities often raise false expectations and cause disappointment. In the case of re-blocking this becomes visible for instance in the case of K2 section. Communities are the most disadvantaged since suffer from poverty and hunger and lack of education. Hence they often have the expectation for free housing and services and it can be difficult for a community to understand and especially except the requirements and time-cost intensiveness re-blocking takes for them. Therefore, the contribution of 20% top-structure cost displays a major challenge for poor communities.

Considering these points it is clear that re-blocking is indeed not a solution for all communities and re-blocking can not be the only way of upgrading informal settlements but one option, among other approaches. For instance the Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) focusses does not invest into single households, but into public space, infrastructure and such as streets light and the re-designing of streets in order to prevent crime and violence.\textsuperscript{30} Hence, the next sup-chapter discusses the impact and future perspectives of re-blocking under consideration of its limitations but also opportunities that have been presented so far.

6.3 In which way can re-blocking contribute towards more inclusive cities?

The previous chapters presented re-blocking as a practise of insitu informal settlement upgrading. Thereby the analysis of re-blocking pointed out which actors are important to the process, which challenges occur and which practises have proven to be helpful. Since re-blocking is a practise of collaborative planning, no clear rules can be defined for successful re-blocking as actors have to adjust to varying project environments and what has been called the 'human factor' by the project manager of Cape Town. From his perspective re-blocking should still be handled with the regular project managing principles in order to be replicated. However, the practise also faces structural disadvantages which raise the question whether it is reasonable to continue with re-blocking as insitu informal settlement upgrading. Therefore this chapter discusses the long term sustainability of re-blocking and the questions in which way it can contribute towards more inclusive cities in South Africa.

\textbf{How participation benefits social cohesion}

Despite the fact that re-blocking can not be implemented in every community, due to cost, time and space limitations, the mobilisation tools still provide options for long term sustainable development and inclusive cities. This is because, as several interviewees

have stated that the 'process is more important than the product'. In that sense the tools profiling, enumeration and mapping shall not only provide data about the size, population and problems of each settlement, but mainly it shall bring communities into interaction. As it has been stated, the cohesion in communities is shrinking due immigration and rural-urban migration, but also due to the disruption of persons from their previous neighbourhoods through spatial planning. Hence, communities have adapted, what has been called, 'western way' which means they do not communicate with their neighbours anymore. As community members are the main actors in mapping and enumeration, they have to collect and exchange information which each other. Also, they have to formulate their problems and wishes together in profiling meetings. Beyond the communication aspect, those tools shall also bring self-awareness about (job-) potentials within their communities. In the end, communication shall revitalise the organisation and cohesion of communities which is the most important condition to take further actions, such as saving and planning. Therefore, it is more important how a community formulates its request towards upgrading than what the solution will be. This does not mean that safe water and sanitation or fire-blocking are not very important upgrades, yet the example of Langrug has shown that even though wash/toilets facilities were built, the community struggles to maintain it. This because no sense of ownership or common responsibility could have been created. Therefore re-blocking clearly aims to distance from designing solution for communities but with them. This the first major strength of re-blocking. The second is the creation of open space which is can be overviewed and shared. This fosters cohesion which leads to a decrease of criminality but brings potential for further development.

The graphic by the SDI SA, which displays the Alliance's tools towards inclusive cities, emphasizes besides women, savings and enumeration & mapping, also the importance of exchanges and partnerships. Beyond the re-vitalisation of social cohesion, the mobilisation tools become especially important when considering that they can create a critical mass of informed and organized urban poor communities which aim to change their marginalised situation in the city.

The combination of those mobilisation tools and collaborative planning, is very crucial in the combination with community education about national upgrading policies, as facilitated by Habitat for Humanity. This is because communities become firstly self-aware, then develop the potential to be more critical and demanding for their rights and in a last step they can motivate other communities through
exchanges. As Baumann et al, formulate it precisely: 'Achieving widespread change requires a critical mass of mobilized poor people both demanding it and demonstrating practical alternatives to the status quo' (Bauman; Bolnick; Miltin: 2004: 32). As indicated in this quote, the organized urban poor must offer well considered solutions to change the mindset of authorities. However, as political situations and authorities change and new threats emerge, communities must not only be organized and confident but actually become innovative and cross immediate boundaries (ibid: 34). This means that at some point, communities must move from the status of being trained to the process of discovering, in order to become independent. Beyond the aspect of dependency, Bauman et al, also stress that poor communities in the end follow different rationalities than formal organisations, since their every day life is surviving strategies are 'systems and processes that are not part of the formal world' (2004: 31). Hence, only the communities can identify strategies for themselves that sustain on the very long term.

Nonetheless, when it comes to negotiations with authorities and politicians, who often do not have the interest to deal with the poor, strong partnerships with organisations such as Habitat for Humanity, but also universities and researcher share a very crucial aspect in order to open doors and put public pressure on authorities. According to Bauman et al, especially 'mid-level bureaucrats' would be receptive for emerging practises, as they would seek new ways of meeting their development targets and a popular constituency. This is because in many post-colonial countries, the 'implementation' of development has failed and been replaced 'by a more gradualist approach in which failure to deliver can be blamed on lack of money rather than will [or on elitist political systems]' (Ibid: 34). This statement applies to the case of South Africa, considering the fail of the RDP and the existing situation of corruption and clientelism. However, in those rather elite systems also spaces emerge in which 'organized communities can advertise their success in meeting their needs using their own systems' (ibid). Indeed, a good example for communities finding their own ways are the informal 'show houses' in Tinasonke which were build in order to demonstrate the abilities of FEDUP towards the provincial government.

Within the City of Cape Town, officials have acknowledged re-blocking and the partnerships with ISN, CORC and communities. The Mayor has not only signed for 22 pilot projects but also capacities for future projects are increasing. Moreover, all partners, including the City of Cape Town present a positive and ambitious picture to the public and therefore, re-blocking has become recognized by the South African. However, re-blocking should not become marked as the project 'that Cape Town does' in order to avoid political struggles. Since Cape Town is currently governed by the Democratic Alliance (DA) it must not be abused as achievement of a political party but of the mobilized South African poor. Furthermore, re-blocking should always be seen in the context of community mobilisation and it should be clear that it is only one solution out of many for participatory informal settlement upgrading. Yet, its growing popularity has the potential to open doors to authorities and new partners. Re-blocking demonstrates that collaborative planning is possible even with poor and marginalized groups, as long as these are strong and mobilized. Even though re-blocking is not a solution for every
settlement, it provides space for the discussion about future ideas based on the tools
community mobilisation and participatory designing, which can be transferred and further
developed in other projects. In that sense re-blocking not only creates opportunities to
includes the urban poor into the city but also it is truly a tool of collaborative planning
(Healey 2006).
7. Concluding Remarks

This study examines the opportunities of re-blocking as a practise of insitu informal settlement upgrading by the SA SDI Alliance partners ISN, CORC and FEDUP in collaboration with the municipality of Cape Town and to some extent Habitat for Humanity as a project partner. The focus lies on the roles of the diverse actors, challenges that emerge during the entire re-blocking process, their solutions as well as learning outcomes that have been made through the practise. Chapter 6 discusses to what extent collaborative planning is a useful concept to analyse re-blocking as a practise of informal settlement upgrading in Sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover, the study investigates to what extent a good practise of re-blocking can not only be replicated to other projects but also to what extent it can have influence on more inclusive cities in South Africa.

The outcomes of the analysis have revealed re-blocking as a successful practise of community participative planning. The major strengths of the process lie in the mobilisation tools for saving, but especially enumeration and mappings, which shall not only re-vitalise the cohesion in (socially) disrupted communities but also make communities more self-aware and critical towards their environment. In that way communities shall become independent and capable of mobilising other communities. The attempt is to gain a critical mass of urban poor communities that is educated and organized enough to take influence on authorities on all governmental levels in order to claim their rights for not only services and housing but also participation as citizens.

From a collaborative planning perspective, re-blocking displays a process in which the theoretical approach of open communication and shared decision making are practically implemented. The theory has been helpful and well applicable to analyse the case study of re-blocking as it emphasizes challenges and concerns that indeed have been addressed by the interviewees. For instance the importance of an open communication and the modified position of urban planners in collaborative action processes have been emphasized in theory as well as in practise. Since the role of planners has shifted from top-down planning and creating solutions for communities but with communities social cohesion is a major requirements for successful re-blocking projects. The ISN and FEDUP have been revealed as significantly important actors in this because they are themselves residents in informal settlements and experts in understanding community dynamics.

Also, the UISP as the policy framework for insitu upgrading projects, has a strong influence on the outcome of re-blocking processes. For instance the UISP phases determine the time frames for upgrading projects that often cause long waiting times, frustration and disruption and even drop-outs within communities. Moreover, the financial resource allocation of UISP projects causes challenges for NGOs such as CORC and ISN which makes them financially depending on donors and their agendas. The pressure to benefit more people per project however may alter the scope of individual re-blocking projects towards large scale and shared facility projects. These however may not meet
the local needs and also cause problems of maintenance on the long run.

Therefore, a revise of the UISP on resource allocations, clearer guidelines on how municipalities can engage with communities, as well as better acknowledgment of the role of NGOs, GRO and CROs in community capacitation work would be necessary.

Considering the dramatic housing situation in South Africa, re-blocking can of course only be one of many approaches to cope with the increasing lack of appropriate shelter for millions of people. Indeed, alternatives have to be developed which can reach a larger share of people than re-blocking. Yet, especially the example of re-blocking has approved that community driven and collaborative projects can be successful and improve the life quality of single persons drastically. Therefore, the latest and most advanced project, Flamingo Heights, has become popular in South African media and also gains increasingly international acknowledgement. It is a practical example for opportunities of collaborative planning with poor communities even in a countries that are characterized by corruption and tremendous spatial injustice.

In the end re-blocking teaches how to approach informality not as a threat but as the everyday-life for millions of people that must be taken seriously. This becomes especially important when considering not only the growth of the informal sector in housing, transportation and economy in the Global South but also the fact that governments of the Global North increasingly fail to cope with international challenges, such as the influx of asylum seekers or homeless EU migrants in Western Europe. Since civil society mobilisation and organisations already now engage into the care and provision of services for refugees and other migrants, the may also become important actors in negotiating the tasks with governmental institutions. Considering these developments, collaborative planning, as flexible, shared- task and communication oriented approach bears qualities that will be increasingly important in the global future.
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