

## The Global Research Network on Human Settlements *HS-Net*

HS-Net is a network of individuals, networks and institutions engaged in human settlements research. HS-Net seeks to promote global dialogue, collaboration and exchange of information on human settlements conditions and trends and the implementation of the Habitat Agenda and the targets of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) on slums, water and sanitation.

UN-HABITAT's research based flagship reports, the *Global Report on Human Settlements* and *The State of the World's Cities* report (published biennially) are the main vehicles for global reporting and dissemination of the agency's monitoring and substantive research results. The research on substantive issues and policies required for the Global Report on Human Settlements, the larger of the two flagship reports, is based on partnerships with research institutions all over the world. To strengthen this partnership, UN-HABITAT launched HS-Net in November 2004.

The main objectives of HS-Net are to advise UN-HABITAT on the contents and organization of its *Global Report on Human Settlements*. As part of its key activities, the network advises UN-HABITAT on the publication of the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series, where experts are able to publish cutting-edge policy oriented research on human settlements. HS-Net also coordinates the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award, an annual award given for outstanding and sustained contributions to human settlements research. Lectures delivered by the Award winners are posted on the HS-Net website and also published in hard copy in the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award Series. The lectures are also disseminated through DVDs. In addition, HS-Net shares information on human settlements trends and conditions through its website.

The key organs of HS-Net are its members, Secretariat and Advisory Board. HS-Net members share information on new and ongoing research in human settlements and contribute to global dialogue through discussions hosted by HS-Net. The Policy Analysis Branch of UN-HABITAT serves as the Secretariat of HS-Net. The Advisory Board consists of experienced researchers in the human settlements field representing the various geographical regions of the world. The Advisory Board is primarily responsible for advising UN-HABITAT on its *Global Report on Human Settlements*. The Board also reviews papers submitted for the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series, serves as the selection committee for the UN-HABITAT Lecture Award and defines the strategic focus and activities of HS-Net in consultation with the Secretariat.

Visit the HS-Net website at <http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>

Visit the Global Report on Human Settlements website at <http://www.unhabitat.org/grhs>

Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices



## Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices

Willem van Vliet-



**UNITED NATIONS HUMAN SETTLEMENTS PROGRAMME**

P.O. Box 30030, GPO Nairobi 00100, Kenya

Tel: +254 (20) 7623120; Fax: +254 (20) 7623477/7624266/7624267

E-mail: [infohabitat@unhabitat.org](mailto:infohabitat@unhabitat.org); Website: [www.unhabitat.org/](http://www.unhabitat.org/)



UN-HABITAT

Series: ISBN 978-92-113-1924-8  
Volume: ISBN 978-92-113-1956-9

---

## Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series

---

### FOREWORD

The Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series provides a forum for publishing cutting-edge policy oriented research in human settlements. The Series is managed by the Policy Analysis Branch of UN-HABITAT, which also serves as the Secretariat for the Global Research Network on Human Settlements (HS-Net). The purpose of the series is to encourage dialogue and exchange of ideas in the human settlements field. It keeps readers informed and up to date with trends and conditions in human settlements, but also contributes to the building of research capacity in developing countries. The target audience of the series includes researchers, academic institutions, public policy makers and non-governmental organizations.

The subject of the series is confined to the human settlements field, both urban and rural. Authors are encouraged to submit papers on topics within the thematic focus areas of the Habitat Agenda, i.e.: urban planning, development and management; land and housing; urban environment; water, sanitation, transport and other types of infrastructure; urban economic development; housing and municipal finance; risk and disaster management; social inclusion; as well as global monitoring of human settlements conditions and knowledge management.

All papers submitted for publication are reviewed by human settlements experts selected from within and outside HS-Net's Advisory Board. Some five to ten papers are published annually and are also posted at the HS-Net website.

It is my hope that researchers, policymakers and practitioners will find the research papers in this series informative and useful. I urge researchers from all over the world to submit papers for publication. Guidelines for contributors are given at the back of this publication.



**Anna Kajumulo Tibaijuka**

**Under-Secretary-General and Executive Director  
United Nations Human Settlements Programme**

To access electronic versions of the papers,  
visit the HS-Net website at  
<http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>

---

## Recently published papers in the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series

---

**No. 1: Globalization and urban centres in Africa. Carole Rakodi and Emmanuel Nkurunziza**

The paper explores the implications of globalization processes for urban Sub-Saharan Africa. It argues that urban settlements and their inhabitants are generally unable to defend themselves against the adverse impacts of globalization or to realise its potential benefits, due to Africa's economic and political marginalization and its aid dependence.

ISBN 978-92-113-1891-3

(2007) 58+vi pp.

**No. 2: Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices. Willem van Vliet-**

This paper presents tri-sector partnerships as an emerging strategy with the potential of being more effective than more narrowly conceived public-private partnerships. These partnerships involve the public sector, the private sector and civil society organizations. Effective partnerships include civil society groups in meaningful roles and function around clustered programme domains.

ISBN 978-92-113-1956-9

(2008) 81+ xiv pp.

**No. 3: Municipal finance and urban development. Mona Serageldin (team leader), David Jones, François Vigier, Elda Solloso, Shannon Bassett, Balakrishna Menon and Luis Valenzuela**

The paper addresses the challenges facing municipal authorities as they seek new ways to finance urban development in an increasingly globalizing world. It highlights creative initiatives in developing, transitional and advanced economies and documents the emergence of several important new trends.

ISBN 978-92-113-1914-9

(2008) 141+xii pp.

**No. 4: Governance reform from below: Multilevel politics and the 'New Deal' campaign in Toronto, Canada. Martin Horak**

This paper analyzes Toronto's recent campaign to secure more powers and resources from other levels of government. It rejects the view that the campaign is a functional by-product of globalization. Instead, it develops an explanation that focuses on the impact of previous governance reforms and on the dynamics of multilevel politics.

ISBN 978-92-113-1955-2

(2008) 51+vi pp.

Electronic versions of all papers in the Series are available at: <http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>

Printed copies of these (and other) UN-HABITAT publications can be obtained from:

UN-HABITAT

Information Services Section

G.P.O. Box 30030, Nairobi 00100, KENYA

Fax: (+254-20) 762-3477, 762-4266 or 762-4267

E-mail: [Habitat.Publications@unhabitat.org](mailto:Habitat.Publications@unhabitat.org)

Website: <http://www.unhabitat.org/>

---

Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series, No. 2

# **Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices**

Willem van Vliet-

Department of Planning and Design,  
College of Architecture and Planning  
University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0314,  
United States of America

---

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT)

Nairobi, 2008

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or regarding its economic system or degree of development. The analysis, conclusions, and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme or its Governing Council.

This material is copyrighted. Excerpts from the text may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source (© UN-HABITAT) is indicated and that the HS-Net Secretariat is notified (by e-mail, to [hs-net@unhabitat.org](mailto:hs-net@unhabitat.org)).

Cover design: UN-HABITAT.

Cover photo credits: UN-HABITAT.

Printing: UNON Print Shop, Nairobi.

Copyright ©: UN-HABITAT.

Nairobi, 2008.

Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series, No. 02.

HS/973/08E

ISBN 978-92-113-1956-9 (This volume)

ISBN 978-92-113-1924-8 (Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series)

An electronic version of this publication is available from the UN-HABITAT website at <http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>.

UN-HABITAT publications can be obtained from our Regional Offices or directly from:

UN-HABITAT

Information Services Section

Box 30030, GPO Nairobi 00100, Kenya

Tel: +254 (20) 7623477; Fax: +254 (20) 7623477/7624266/7624267

E-mail: [infohabitat@unhabitat.org](mailto:infohabitat@unhabitat.org); Website: <http://www.unhabitat.org/>

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Approaches to governance .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Concepts of civil society .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1. Civil society as associational life and volunteering.....	5
3.2. Civil society as negotiation among diverse interest groups .....	5
<b>4. The emergence of partnerships .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. The Role of partnerships in alleviating urban poverty .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6. Partnership characteristics.....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1. Scope .....	14
6.2. Activity sectors .....	16
6.3. Types of sponsoring organizations.....	18
6.4. Partnership structures .....	22
6.5. Beneficiaries, programme costs and flow of funds .....	22
6.6. Sustainability and replication.....	25
<b>7. Partnerships by programme area .....</b>	<b>30</b>
7.1. Infrastructure .....	30
7.2. Services .....	42
7.3. Housing.....	51
7.4. Jobs .....	59
<b>8. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>69</b>
List of references.....	73
<b>Appendix: List of Reviewed Partnership Programmes .....</b>	<b>77</b>

## List of tables

Table 1.	Geographic scale of programmes.....	14
Table 2.	Diversity of activities and types of organizations involved in partnerships .....	15
Table 3.	Partnership activities .....	16
Table 4.	Government/NGO programmes by type and level of partner involvement.....	19
Table 5	Beneficiaries, programmes costs and flow of funds by geographic scale.....	23
Table 6.	Programme cost per household (\$).....	24
Table 7.	Partnership performance by primary focus of activities .....	26
Table 8.	Sustainability of programmes.....	28
Table 9.	Programme replication .....	28
Table 10.	Programme scale and cost by type (new/existing).....	29
Table 11.	Geographic scale of infrastructure programmes .....	30
Table 12.	Total partnerships with infrastructures as secondary focus ....	32
Table 13.	Size comparison of infrastructure and non-infrastructure programmes .....	33
Table 14.	Involvement of national and international partners in infrastructure programmes .....	34
Table 15.	Mean number of partner types for infrastructure and non-infrastructure programmes.....	35
Table 16.	Infrastructure and other programmes by partner type involvement.....	36
Table 17.	Sustainability and replication of infrastructure programmes .....	40
Table 18.	Issues faced by infrastructure and non-infrastructure partnerships.....	42
Table 19.	Geographic scale of social service programmes .....	44
Table 20.	Size comparison of partnership with and without social service activities .....	45
Table 21.	Primary programme activities with a social services component.....	46
Table 22.	Social services and other programmes by partner type involvement.....	47

Table 23. Replication of partnership programmes that include social services .....	49
Table 24. Challenges faced by partnerships with and without service programmes .....	50
Table 25. Type of programme activity by partnership focus.....	51
Table 26. Upgrading versus new construction by partnership focus.....	52
Table 27. Prevalence of self-help in partnerships by involvement in housing .....	53
Table 28. Scale of partnership activity by involvement in housing .....	53
Table 29. Primary partnership foci with secondary housing component .....	54
Table 30. Size comparison of programmes with and without housing activities .....	55
Table 31. Programme size comparison: new construction versus upgrading .....	56
Table 32. National and international partners in housing programmes .....	56
Table 33. Mean of partner types for housing and non-housing programmes .....	57
Table 34. Partners involved in housing and non-housing programmes .....	58
Table 35. Sustainability and replication among housing and non-housing programmes.....	60
Table 36. Programme development challenges faced by partnerships with and without housing programmes .....	60
Table 37. Primary programme activities with jobs component.....	61
Table 38. Overlap of jobs and micro-enterprise programmes .....	62
Table 39. Geographic scale of partnership programmes with job creation activities .....	63
Table 40. Scale of partnership programmes with job-creation activities .....	64
Table 41. Jobs programmes by partner type .....	66
Table 42. Sustainability and replication of programmes with and without job creation activities.....	67
Table 43. Issues faced by partnerships with job-creation programmes ...	68
Table 44. Clustering of partnership activities across programme sectors.....	71

## List of acronyms

CBO	Community-Based Organizations
HUDCO	Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited
ILO	International Labour Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
UNCHS	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme



# Abstract

After brief discussion of governance as a context for approaches to combating poverty, this paper presents tri-sector partnerships as an emerging strategy with the potential of being more effective than more narrowly conceived public-private partnerships. These partnerships, involving the public sector, the private sector, and civil society organizations, are then examined in a systematic evaluation of such cases included in the UN-HABITAT (United Nations Human Settlements Programme) Best Practices database. The findings produce several specific policy implications and the key conclusions that effective partnerships include civil society groups in meaningful roles and function around clustered programme domains, the synergistic interrelationships of which can be strengthened through appropriate policy interventions.

## *Key points*

- 1). Following a brief discussion of perspectives on governance and civil society, this paper examines newly emerging, broad-based partnerships (involving the public and private sectors as well as civil society organizations) as a strategy for enhancing urban liveability with a special focus on the alleviation of urban poverty, based on an analysis of cases from UN-HABITAT's Best Practices database in infrastructure improvements; access to services; affordable housing; and job creation.
- 2). Most of the 42 partnerships examined here (75 per cent) operate above the neighbourhood level; most commonly, their focus is on multiple neighbourhoods (57 per cent).
- 3). On average, a partnership operates simultaneously in seven programme domains (e.g., affordable housing construction, access to credit).
- 4). A partnership averages just over five participating organizations, but few of these organizations have direct responsibility for programme operations.

- 5). Nearly half of the 42 partnerships (45 per cent) indicate affordable housing as their primary focus and 25 (almost 60 per cent) have a housing component.
- 6). Job creation and micro-enterprise development activities rarely are the primary foci of programme activities, but were rather incorporated as secondary activities and pursued to support other programme efforts. Job creation was such a secondary activity in 55 per cent of programmes with a different primary focus; micro-credit was a secondary activity in 50 per cent of other primary programmes.
- 7). Most international partners play a funding, design, technical assistance and evaluation role, rather than assuming responsibility for programme operations.
- 8). Suspicion of government or poor intergovernmental cooperation are mentioned as a problem in nearly 60 per cent of the cases. Local NGOs (non-governmental organizations) are seen to provide an important resource for enhancing trust and participation among slum residents and helping to secure the commitment of external funding sources.
- 9). Private sector participation in urban anti-poverty programmes is present in nearly two-thirds of all local programmes (64.3 per cent), while CBOs (community-based organizations) participate in 88 per cent of local partnerships.
- 10). In many successful slum rehabilitation programmes sustainability and replicability hinge on the pivotal role of CBOs in defining programme objectives and methods, and in providing the institutional linkages to the intended beneficiaries.
- 11). The most common partnership type is that of state or local government with local NGOs and CBOs accounting for nearly 75 per cent of all cases. There are *no cases* in the Habitat Best Practices database where state or local governments have undertaken programmes *without* the involvement and support of local NGOs or community based organizations. Urban anti-poverty policies and programmes inevitably and inherently has a “local” component.

- 12). The average programme examined here:
  - a) Has served about 450,000 households;
  - b) Has cost about \$190 million;
  - c) Has undertaken programme activities in more than 7 separate or linked sectors;
  - d) Has been in operation for over 9 years; and
  - e) Cost about \$12.6 million per year.
- 13). In more than three-quarters of all programmes (76.2 per cent), partnerships assessed their programmes as being sustainable. Two out of three partnerships (66.7 per cent) indicated that their programme activities had been replicated either within the original city or elsewhere in the country.
- 14). The difference in financial costs per household beneficiary between sustainable and unsustainable programmes is not very large (\$5,600 versus \$4,700). This suggests that relative programme efficiency is unlikely to be a “cause” of sustainability.
- 15). Replicated programmes have lower per-beneficiary costs compared with those that are not (\$5,059 versus \$ 6,566).
- 16). New construction programmes tend to reach more people, but they cost a great deal more (by a factor of six) compared to slum upgrading programmes. New construction also more than doubles the flow of funds per year and the project cost per household.
- 17). Partnership-based urban anti-poverty programmes that focus on infrastructure improvements as either a primary or a secondary activity constitute just over 70 per cent of the cases selected from the Habitat Best Practices database (30 of 42 cases).
- 18). On average, partnerships involved with infrastructure improvement have more than four times as many beneficiaries (573,000 versus 131,000 households) than partnerships focused on different programme areas. They cost more than eight times as much (\$234 million versus \$30 million) and usually take longer to accomplish (10

years versus 8 years). Their cost per beneficiary (household) is about \$6,500 compared with \$2,500 per household for non-infrastructure programmes.

- 19). The greater complexity of infrastructure programmes requires the involvement of a greater number of different types of partners to design and implement these types of programmes and governmental oversight and coordination is often important. In one-half of these cases, state or local governments are managing partners, compared with only 25 per cent in non-infrastructure programmes.
- 20). 87 per cent of urban infrastructure programmes rely on “self help” participation by community residents. Because of this self-help component, the participation of community-based organizations such as neighbourhood associations, housing cooperatives local development councils and the like are essential to the implementation of local infrastructure projects. Twenty-eight of 30 infrastructure programmes studied here (93.4 per cent) benefit from involvement by these groups.
- 21). Nine out of ten partnerships highlight community organization as a challenge, testifying to the importance of local capacity-building. This is “where the rubber meets the road” and where programme design and operations must dovetail with the reality of community needs, priorities and capabilities.
- 22). Social service programmes are rarely the primary focus of a partnership. More than 95 per cent of these programmes are operated in conjunction with activities in another sector, creating a more comprehensive attack on poverty.
- 23). Local NGOs support the delivery of social service programmes in 26 out of 29 cases, with a large majority of them (69 per cent) having management roles. Over 93 per cent of social service programmes rely on CBOs for design and implementation.

- 24). Most partnerships with a housing programme (60 per cent) aim at upgrading existing housing in slums and squatter settlements (*in situ* upgrading), rather than building new projects to replace derelict housing. This finding reveals the orientation to and opportunity for more significant roles by slum residents in upgrading than in new building through self-help activities by households themselves or through the involvement of CBOs and other organizations representing the urban poor.
- 25). Upgrading programmes reach a much larger number of households, have a longer average duration (10.5 years vs. 6 years), and cost less per household than new construction (\$6,035 vs. \$9,188).
- 26). Perhaps due to their complexity, cost and diversity of partner types, programmes of housing-focused partnerships are less frequently replicated than partnership programmes in other programme domains (64 per cent versus 82 per cent).
- 27). Housing partnerships experience four times as often challenges in scaling up (40 per cent of the cases) than do partnerships that are focused differently. The reasons may be difficulties in forming more complex partnerships and acquiring a larger resource base. However, scaling up is less of a problem than aspects of community organization, found in 88 per cent of all cases, and institutional development, which is mentioned by 84 per cent of all housing partnerships.
- 28). Job creation is frequently undertaken in combination with primary activities in other sectors.
- 29). Local organizations and authorities can play important roles in job creation if they can act in concert with national or international partners and if their joint activities incorporate job creation in the context of activities in other sectors.

- 30). To alleviate urban poverty, partnerships typically operate in more than one sector. Partnerships tend to concentrate their efforts on particular sector combinations. A factor analysis reveals five such “programme clusters.” Policies and programmes supporting the linkages among cluster components can maximize synergistic outcomes.

## About the author

Willem van Vliet is a professor of planning at the University of Colorado, United States of America, where he directed the Center for International Research and Education Projects from 1991 till 2001. His primary interests concern urban development, housing, the relationships between research and policy, and participatory planning and decision making. Past president of the Research Committee on Housing and the Built Environment of the International Sociological Association (1992-2007), he serves on the editorial advisory board of several leading journals and is author and editor of more than ten books, including the award-winning Encyclopedia of Housing, as well as numerous contributions to professional journals and anthologies.

Willem van Vliet-  
Professor  
Department of Planning and Design  
College of Architecture and Planning  
University of Colorado Boulder, CO 80309-0314  
United States of America

# Acknowledgements

Preparation of this report benefited from research assistance by Antony Phipps and Anirban Pal.



# Broad-based partnerships as a strategy for urban liveability: An evaluation of best practices

## 1. Introduction

Governance is of critical importance in creating liveable cities. Governance is ineffective in cities that are plagued by corruption, where decision making is not transparent, where those in positions of authority are not accountable to the citizenry, where jurisdictions are fragmented and where actions are not coordinated. On the other hand, cities enjoy good governance when decision making is democratic, when resource allocation is equitable, when programme administration is non-discriminatory, and when actions are coordinated across sectoral agencies and urban areas. Poverty is perhaps the most important threat to urban liveability. Bad governance worsens urban poverty. Good governance alleviates it.

Bad governance means that basic services are absent, grossly deficient or available only to those with the ability to pay and live separately from the rest of the population. Such cities do not meet the needs of the urban poor concerning the provision of safe water, access to adequate sanitation, the collection of solid waste, availability of emergency services, health care and education.

These deficiencies undermine liveability generally, but especially so in cities. The reasons for this have to do with important differences between rural and urban poverty and the distinct characteristics of poverty in cities.<sup>1</sup> The greater concentration of people and the greater concentration of polluting and waste-producing activities by households, enterprises, and vehicles in cities produce commensurately greater exposure to the ill effects of pollution, contamination, and risks to health and safety. This vulnerability is heightened when large numbers of the urban poor are relegated to areas that are prone to natural and man-made hazards, such as floods, mudslides, dangers arising from industry and traffic.

---

1. See Satterthwaite and Tacioli (2003) for an excellent discussion of rural-urban differences and linkages in poverty.

On the other hand, in cities with good governance, there is greater potential to address problems of urban liveability in general and urban poverty in particular. This is so because in cities there is a greater critical mass of people to achieve economies of scale, thus making possible a more efficient delivery of services. In addition, urban households also typically have greater monetary incomes to support more cost-effective operations.

Governance, therefore, plays a critical role in promoting liveability and redressing poverty in cities. It either works to improve the lives of the urban poor, or it makes them worse. In this light, the UN-HABITAT Global Campaign for Urban Governance can make important contributions to the betterment of slum dwellers<sup>2</sup>.

This paper examines tri-sector partnerships involving the public sector, the private sector and civil society – as a strategy in newly emerging forms of urban governance to increase the liveability of cities with a special focus on the alleviation of urban poverty and the improvement of liveability. Within this wider context, this report aims to derive policy implications from an examination of the roles of civil society groups in these partnerships and of the relationships between the programme domains in which partnerships operate.

Before turning to an analysis of cases in the UN-HABITAT Best Practices database, the following sections briefly review approaches to governance, giving particular attention to concepts of civil society because it is the inclusion of civil society groups in partnerships that is different from the more established private-public partnerships. This inclusion is aimed at the realization of the potentials of the urban poor themselves as equal participants in the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes to increase liveability and reduce poverty (Mayoux, 2005).

---

2. For more information on the Global Campaign for Urban Governance, see: <http://www.unhabitat.org/campaigns/governance/>

## 2. Approaches to governance

Governance involves multiple stakeholders, interdependent resources and actions, shared purposes and blurred boundaries between the public and private, formal and informal, state, market and civil society sectors, greater need for coordination, negotiation and building consensus. It must address three key tasks:

- *coordinating* a more complex and fragmented government landscape;
- *steering* interdependent activities through new bargaining systems and institutions such as public-private partnerships or regional confederations in order to achieve desired outcomes—specifically, public goods— by bringing the necessary actors to the table and then moderating differences and negotiating cooperation; and
- *integrating* and managing diverse networks rather than focusing primarily on internal affairs.

To this end, the repertoire of strategies for distributing the costs and benefits of making and carrying out decisions includes *markets*, *hierarchies*, and *networks*. These three strategies have typically been associated with, respectively, the private sector, the public sector, and civil society. *The Global Report on Human Settlements 2001* discussed these three different approaches to urban governance in the context of globalization. Each has its advantages as well as disadvantages in dealing with urban poverty<sup>3</sup>.

None of these strategies can be presumed to be privileged or outdated; all three are viable, depending on the problems and purposes at stake. In different ways, they reduce the costs of making decisions while increasing the capacity to act. The question of “*how*” governance is exercised is crucial: the choice of governance strategies influences *who* is likely to be included or excluded. In this regard, enabling strategies can play a key role if they

---

3. For a fuller discussion, see (UN-HABITAT, 2001), chapter 4 and the background paper for that report by Susan Clarke.

are developed more broadly than to enhance market functioning so as to support decentralization and capacity building at the local level and in civil society, making possible the representation and participation of slum residents and the urban poor. The role of public-private partnerships in poverty alleviation has been much discussed, and often criticized for not meeting the needs of the urban poor and excluding their representative organizations (Bond 2006), so that it is appropriate here to briefly introduce the concept of civil society as background to consideration of its role in the analyses to follow.

In recent years, the term “civil society” has become increasingly prominent in development debates<sup>4</sup>. Acknowledging the inability or unwillingness of governments and market mechanisms to address persistent and pervasive problems of poverty, policy makers and researchers alike have jumped on the bandwagon in a portrayal of civil society as some sort of wonder drug or panacea. Although generally seen as situated beyond the household and understood as “the population of groups formed for collective purposes primarily outside the State and marketplace,” (Van Rooy 1998, p. 30; see also Keane, 1998). Upon closer examination it is clear that civil society is a concept with multiple meanings. Its usefulness as a policy tool and analytical construct depends on a correct understanding and application in its development context.

---

4. This discussion of differing concepts of civil society draws with permission of the author from a paper by David Lewis of the Centre for Civil Society, Department of Social Policy, at the London School of Economics and Political Science, presented in the colloquium series of the Developing Areas Research and Teaching Programme at University of Colorado, Boulder, on April 25, 2002. A revised version of this paper was published under the title Civil society in African contexts: Reflections on the usefulness of a concept in Development and Change 33(4): 469-485, September, 2002.

### **3. Concepts of civil society**

#### **3.1 Civil society as associational life and volunteering**

The work of Alexis de Tocqueville has been widely influential and has been used to support arguments 'in favour of' civil society (Tocqueville 1835(1994)). Tocqueville's positive account of nineteenth century associationalism in the United States stressed volunteerism, community spirit and independent associational life as protections against the domination of society by the state, and indeed as a counterbalance, which helped to keep the state accountable and effective. This account tended to stress the role of civil society as one in which some kind of equilibrium was created in relation to the state and the market. The neo-Tocquevillian position can now be seen in current arguments in many Western countries that the level of associationalism within a society can be associated with positive values of trust and co-operation.

Such ideas have been highly influential in relation to efforts by development policy-makers during the past decade to promote democratic institutions and market reforms in developing countries. This is the so-called 'good governance' agenda which was made popular in the early 1990s and which suggested that a 'virtuous circle' could be built between state, economy and civil society that balanced growth, equity and stability (Archer 1994). Indeed, much of the recent interest in civil society is linked to the global dominance of neo-liberal ideologies during the past decade, which envisage a reduced role for the state and privatized forms of services delivery through flexible combinations of governmental, non-governmental and private institutional actors.

#### **3.2 Civil society as negotiation among diverse interest groups**

There is a different strand of civil society thinking that has also been influential in some parts of the world. This strand has been influenced by Antonio Gramsci, who argued that civil society is the arena, separate from state and market, in which ideological hegemony is contested, implying

that civil society contains a wide range of different organizations and ideologies that both challenge and uphold the existing order (Gramsci, 1971). These ideas were influential in the context of the analysis and enactment of resistance to totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe and Latin America from the 1970s onwards. Gramscian ideas about civil society can also be linked to the research on 'social movements' that seeks to challenge and transform structures and identities<sup>5</sup>.

Two differing civil society traditions can therefore usefully be distinguished. However, it has been the organizational view of civil society, exemplified by de Tocqueville, which has been most enthusiastically taken up by agencies within development policy discourse during the past decade (Davis and McGregor 2000). Since the early 1990s, the 'good governance' agenda has deployed the concept of civil society within the wider initiatives of supporting the emergence of more competitive market economies, building better-managed states with the capacity to provide more responsive services and just laws, and improving democratic institutions to deepen political participation. Development donor support for the emergence and strengthening of NGOs has formed a central part of this agenda (Archer, 1994).

However, the essentially political nature of civil society warns against limiting the diversity of this concept and its practice. Hence, a key conclusion is the need for more micro-studies of actually existing forms of civil society. While there are many case studies of NGOs and community development projects, there are fewer micro-level studies of more broadly defined, culturally varied types of 'civil society' activity. There is a need to focus less on high levels of rhetoric, abstraction and ahistorical generalization and produce more close-up observation. We need an analysis of actually existing civil society so as to understand its actual formation, rather than

---

5. See, for example, (Escobar and Alvarez, 1992) and (Howell and Pearce, 2001). Keane, (1998, p. 13), shows how, in the 1960s, Yoshihiko Uchida and the 'civil society school of Japanese Marxism'. Drawing also on Gramsci's ideas, argued that Japanese civil society was weak, because the patriarchal family and a culture of individual deference towards power allowed a specific Japanese capitalism to grow quickly, with very little social resistance.

merely as a promised agenda for change (Comaroff and Comaroff, 1999, p. 4; and Mamdani, 1996, p. 19)<sup>6</sup>.

The remainder of this report examines broad-based partnerships that include specific examples of civil society functioning within the context of participation with the private and public sector. This analysis recognizes such partnerships as a new framework for action, allowing each partner to play supplementary roles in innovative initiatives, freeing up synergistic potential that leads to more effective problem-solving capacity.

It is important to distinguish these new arrangements from more conventional public-private partnerships, which have a long history. The following section briefly reviews the distinctive characteristics of these newly emerging, tri-sector partnerships, before examining how they function in efforts to promote urban liveability and alleviate urban poverty.

---

6. Although made originally with reference to Africa, these observations apply more broadly as well.

## 4. The emergence of partnerships

There is a long history of partnerships in which actors in the public and private sector have joined forces in order to accomplish goals that would be out of reach or more costly if either one acted alone. Such hybridic arrangements have been especially prevalent in industry, as seen, for example, in Japan's post-World War II research and development consortia, bringing together a small group of large firms and major government agencies to enhance the international competitiveness of its semi-conductor and information technology sectors (Chiang, 2000). Similarly, in the transitions taking place in China, there are now many instances of interpenetration of state and market sectors involving a proliferation of quasi-public and quasi-private organizations (Francis, 2001).

In relation to human settlement development there are early examples of public-private partnerships as well, and not only in the western context. For example, technological innovation in Valparaiso's urban services during the 1850s, including the building of the city's first gas network and horse car line, established a pattern of public-private ventures that persisted and helped shape future development (Martland, 2002).

More recently, public-private partnerships came to be looked upon for a solution to two problems in the planning, development and management of human settlements. First, many local governments increasingly realized that they lacked the resources necessary to meet the needs of their rapidly growing and urbanizing populations. Providing shelter and basic services simply exceeded their financial capacity. In addition, what resources did exist, were often directed first to military expenditures or investments in industrial development, deemed to be more productive for the national economy than urban development. The second problem resulted from the unwillingness of private suppliers in the market to respond to human needs that do not translate into a demand that generates profit.

In the early stages of the global economic crisis in the mid-1970s and onwards, national governments increasingly began to devolve responsibilities for welfare that they had traditionally assumed to lower levels of government, in particular local authorities, without a commensurate transfer of



resources. Many local governments responded by engaging cooperation from the private sector. Using their limited resources as leverage (e.g., land) and taking advantage of their regulatory powers to create constraints (e.g., taxes) and incentives (e.g., abatements), they entered into partnerships with private enterprises as parties from both sides sought to create win-win situations (Yamout, 2007; Sarangi, 2002; Choe, 2002). *Cities in a Globalizing World: The Global Report on Human Settlements 2001* reviews these developments with special reference to the provision of housing and the development of land<sup>7</sup>.

In more recent years, along with the successes of public-private partnerships, their limitations have begun to receive attention as well (Sagalyn, 2007). In this regard, it is important that the ambiguities and conflicts are not necessarily between the public and the private sector, but between these two sectors, on the one hand, and civil society on the other hand<sup>8</sup>. It has become increasingly clear that the outcomes of public-private partnerships do not always serve the best interests of low-income groups in particular<sup>9</sup>. As a result, the urban poor have increasingly begun to organize themselves in networks, federating themselves in national and international networks and allying themselves with government agencies and private organizations in negotiated cooperative arrangements that are more responsive to their needs. There is not yet an accepted label or name for these types of arrangements, which have been called Tri-Sector Partnerships and Multi-Sector Partnerships (Caplan and others 2001). However, what is emerging are the contours of a new development paradigm, broad-based

---

7. See Chapter 14 in particular.

8. For early observations in this regard, see Alain Durand-Lasserve (1987) Land and housing in Third World Cities: Are public and private strategies contradictory? *Cities*, November, pp. 325-338.

9. For example, see the case study of a traumatic municipal experience in a public-private partnership for solid waste management in Biratnagar, Nepal, 'Just managing: private sector participation in solid waste management in Biratnagar, Nepal' GHK Working Paper 442 02, by Janelle Plummer and Richard Slater, January 2001, GHK International in collaboration with the University of Birmingham's International Development Department, England.

partnerships in which civil society participates along with the public and private sectors<sup>10</sup>. This new paradigm has several characteristics.

First, while these new cooperative arrangements are pragmatically oriented to tangible outcomes, they tend not to be narrowly product-driven, but operate more in frameworks that support current as well as future development processes. In other words, there is a shifting away from an exclusive concern with completing an *ad hoc* project towards more institutionalized forms of negotiation and cooperation in which all of the parties play complementary roles based on their existing assets and *long-term* goals. Second, there is a trend for these types of multi-sector partnerships to go beyond a strictly local scale. The literature and the UN-HABITAT Best Practices database provide many examples of partnerships in which local groups partner with one or more regional, national or even international organizations from both the public and the private sector. Other examples are transnational in the sense that they may involve local groups from different countries, as in the case of twinning of municipal governments or community-based exchange of local experience<sup>11</sup>. Third, these newly emerging partnerships distinguish themselves by seeking the inclusion of the urban poor and their representative organizations as empowered participants.

Unlike more established forms of public-private partnerships, these new types of tri-sector partnerships are still very much in the early stages of development. There has been very little evaluation of them (Nijkamp and others 2002) but policies and programmes in support of them are being established. For example, the Public-Private Partnerships for the Urban Environment facility of the United Nations Development Programme

---

10. For a timely electronic discussion see the contributions to Partnering with Civil Society, available at: <http://www2.worldbank.org/hm/participate/index.html#>

11. Municipal International Cooperation (MIC) is an umbrella term for point-to-point municipal knowledge exchanges across international borders. Such exchanges are designed to build institutional capacity and to improve municipal responsiveness and service delivery. The worldwide trend of devolving power and resources from central to local authorities has generated more interest in using MICs. New information technologies now support the expansion of bilateral to multilateral arrangements (see also UNCHS 2001, ch. 14; Askvik, 1999; Cremer and others 2001; Hewitt, 1999; and Jones and Blunt 1999).

(UNDP) supports the development of innovative partnerships at the local level. Focusing on assisting small and medium-sized cities, the facility works with all potential stakeholders, including investors, providers, regulators, users, and experts to meet the challenge of providing basic urban environmental services<sup>12</sup>. The Global Learning Network is a decentralized international partner network of individuals, centres of excellence, institutions and programmes interested in sharing knowledge and pooling resources for joint activities related to partnerships at the local level. The Network provides partners with services that close the gap between practical experience and theoretical analysis through continuing learning from and exchange of best practices and lessons learned from concrete project implementation<sup>13</sup>.

The next section reviews the role of partnerships in enhancing urban liveability reducing urban poverty. The sections that follow it will examine more closely the characteristics of such partnerships operating to improve slum conditions as documented in the UN-HABITAT Best Practices database.

---

12. See: <http://www.undp.org/pppue/index.htm>.

13. Although PPPUE and the GLN are intended to include NGOs and community representatives, their terminology still speaks of public-private partnerships (PPPs). This reflects the lack of general acceptance of an adequate new name such as Multi-Sector Partnerships, but also conflates commercial enterprises with households, treating both as private sector actors.

## 5. The role of partnerships in alleviating urban poverty

Urban poverty includes many dimensions aside from monetary aspects. Poverty is more than lack of income. People living in poverty tend to suffer from lack of access to safe water, adequate sanitation, education, and healthcare, and they often live in areas where there are no proper waste disposal facilities, and where they are at risk of natural and human-made hazards. Furthermore, they often face discrimination and psychological stress, and they may not have an effective voice in decision-making processes. All of these are aspects of urban poverty. It is important to recognize the multidimensionality of urban poverty because the underlying causes are different. And just as the antecedent factors vary, so also do the local means to address them (Satterthwaite, 2002 for excellent coverage of these points).

Consequently, urban poverty programmes around the world have been designed to address a correspondingly wide range of issues, aimed at diverse populations at different scales. Nowadays, many of these initiatives involve partnerships among government agencies, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector. Such partnerships are different from more traditional public-private partnerships and can be seen as a newly emerging paradigm in development policy. They are usually undertaken because they are expected to leverage programme resources with respect to community participation and organization among intended beneficiaries, access to funding, institutional credibility, sustainability, and replication.

However, there has been no systematic review of these collaborative arrangements. The remainder of this paper seeks to do this through an examination of a selection of cases from the UN-HABITAT Best Practices database. This database is described as containing:

*“over 2150 proven solutions from more than 140 countries to social, economic and environmental problems, commonly attendant to urbanization, and demonstrating the practical ways in which public, private and civil society sectors are working together to improve governance, eradicate poverty, provide*

*access to shelter, land and basic services, protect the environment and support economic development”<sup>14</sup>.*

The database is presented as a powerful tool for:

- Analyzing current trends and emerging issues;
- Networking with the people and organizations involved in implementation;
- Capacity-building including new knowledge management tools and methods.
- Technical Cooperation through the matching of supply with demand for proven expertise and experience
- Policy development based on what works<sup>15</sup>.

For purposes of the analyses presented here, partnerships were selected through a search of the Best Practices database. A search with “partnership,” and “slum” or “squatter” as search criteria, yielded 42 cases<sup>16</sup>. The next section presents a summary of several important characteristics of partnerships with respect to programme scope; types of activities; types of organizations involved; beneficiaries and programme cost. Subsequent sections examine partnerships in four sectors in greater detail with respect to infrastructure improvements; access to services; affordable housing; and job creation. In each case, the analysis also considers cross-sector links with other partnership programmes focused on, for example, tenure security, access to credit, capacity building, environmental quality, and gender equity.

---

14. See: <http://bestpractices.org/>

15. Ibid. See note 4 supra, p. 50 ff., for commentary on the best practices database.

16. See: Appendix A for a list of these cases.

## 6. Partnership characteristics

### 6.1 Scope

A majority of anti-poverty programmes (79 per cent), carried out by broad-based partnerships among governments, the private sector, and civil society organizations, are still directed toward specific “projects” that is, the delivery of specific products or services to specific beneficiary groups. The remainder are “umbrella” types of programmes that focus on enhancing the capacity of the delivery system or improving local governance. Irrespective of their scope, programmes tend to endure, with an average history going back more than nine years. Because programme partnerships differ widely in terms of the types of organizations involved, they tend to operate at a variety of scales (see Table 1). Only one programme focused on a single project within a neighbourhood (Kenya’s environment and urban development training project), while three programmes were very large and operated in several cities simultaneously (e.g., India’s Housing and Urban Development Corporation Limited (HUDCO) programme). More commonly, anti-poverty partnerships address problems within multiple neighbourhoods (57.1 per cent), across an entire metropolitan area (9.5 per cent) or in multiple cities (7.1 per cent). A substantial minority of the partnerships, one out of four, operates at the neighbourhood scale.

Just as partnerships operate at various scales, so do they also involve multiple activities and organizational types. Table 2 shows that partnership-based anti-poverty programmes address a minimum of three different types or

**Table 1. Geographic scale of programmes**

Scale of partnership programmes	Percent	Number
Below neighbourhood	2	1
Neighbourhood	24	10
Multiple neighbourhoods	57	24
City or metro-wide	10	4
Multiple cities	7	3
Total	100	42

sectors of programme activities – for example, affordable housing, tenure security and access to credit is a frequent combination. At the other extreme, four of the reviewed programmes included activities in all 12 sectors<sup>17</sup>.

According to the case studies, the average partnership arrangement involves activities in more than seven sectors and enlists more than five types of partnering organizations<sup>18</sup> – not including the “self-help” component found in 37 of 42 programmes (88 per cent). However, many of the case studies reveal that, despite the broad range of involvement among partnering organizations, only a few of these partners have direct responsibility for programme operations (on average 1.9).

**Table 2. Diversity of activities and types of organizations involved in partnerships**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	N
Number of programme activity sectors	3	12	7.3	42
Types of partnering organizations	2	8	5.2	42
Organizations with direct management responsibility	1	4	1.9	42

17. These case studies identify eight types of partnering organizations: International governments (e.g., the European Union or City of Toronto); international NGOs (UN-HABITAT, CARE, multi-lateral banks, Ford Foundation); national governments (e.g., India’s Ministry of Local Government); national NGOs (e.g., National Association of Cooperative Housing Unions in Kenya); state and local governments (e.g., state of Maharashtra in India, city of Sao Paolo, Brazil); local NGOs (e.g., Fundacion de Vivienda y Comunidad in Buenos Aires); local private sector organizations (e.g., banks, real estate developers or other local businesses); community-based organizations (e.g., neighbourhood associations, tenants associations within specific communities).

18. These case studies identify eight types of partnering organizations: International governments (e.g., the European Union or City of Toronto); international NGOs (UN-HABITAT, CARE, multi-lateral banks, Ford Foundation); national governments (e.g., India’s Ministry of Local Government); national NGOs (e.g., National Association of Cooperative Housing Unions in Kenya); state and local governments (e.g., state of Maharashtra in India, city of Sao Paolo, Brazil); local NGOs (e.g., Fundacion de Vivienda y Comunidad in Buenos Aires); local private sector organizations (e.g., banks, real estate developers or other local businesses); community-based organizations (e.g., neighbourhood associations, tenants associations within specific communities).

## 6.2 Activity Sectors

It is possible to classify partnerships according to the domain or sector in which they are active. Table 3 presents this information, showing what percentage of partnerships have a certain sector as their primary and secondary foci, as well as the total percentage of partnerships active in each sector, regardless of its priority<sup>19</sup>. The partnerships from the Best Practices database, selected for this analysis, clearly emphasize affordable housing and infrastructure (water and sewer systems, drainage, electrification, roads, etc.). Nearly half of the 42 partnerships (45 per cent) indicate affordable housing as their primary focus and 25 (almost 60 per cent) have a housing component. Perhaps because they are more expensive, infrastructure construction or improvement is less frequently listed as a primary activity. However, including it as a secondary activity boosts its frequency to 30

**Table 3. Partnership activities**

Type of partnership activity	Primary focus (%)	Secondary focus (%)	Total partnerships (%)
Affordable housing	45	14	59
Infrastructure	26	45	71
Tenure security	19	33	52
Environmental quality	19	36	55
Gender equality	19	31	50
Credit access	14	62	76
Services	5	64	69
Capacity building	5	71	76
Development planning	5	62	67
Governance	5	41	45
Job creation	0	55	55
Micro-enterprise	0	50	50

19. For each partnership, programme activities were coded as: not present=0, secondary focus=1 and primary focus=2.



cases, meaning that more than 70 per cent of all partnerships undertake building or improvement of infrastructure.

Housing and infrastructure programmes are followed by tenure security, environmental quality (usually solid waste disposal) and gender equality – each with eight partnerships having these sectors as primary activities. Enhanced access to credit is the sixth most frequently mentioned primary partnership goal. It is often included as a secondary component of housing programmes. In fact, after combining primary and secondary activities, credit access (together with capacity building) becomes the *most* frequent partnership activity of all (32 of 42 programmes, or 76 per cent).

Although capacity building is rarely a primary focus of partnerships, it is nonetheless one of the most important activities of anti-poverty approaches because it helps to ensure that local programme sponsors and recipients can implement and benefit from more specific programmes.

Capacity building includes an array of diverse activities aimed at enhancing human capital and securing participation, including grassroots political organizing in order to draw attention to problems, obtain programme benefits, and plan programmes; education and training of local programme sponsors and beneficiaries; and building neighbourhood associations and other local stakeholder institutions. Kenya's Shelter Forum, for example, emphasizes its role in "facilitating training, information sharing and group exchange visits that empower vulnerable communities to develop appropriate and affordable shelter<sup>20</sup>." Such empowerment is a key component of capacity-building efforts in a majority of partnership arrangements.

Job creation and micro-enterprise development activities rarely are the primary foci of programme activities, but were rather incorporated as secondary activities (55 and 50 per cent, respectively) and pursued to support other programme efforts. Gender equity programmes, for example, often incorporate job creation and micro-enterprise development among women

---

20. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Shelter Forum (Kenya), Case Study.

and other disadvantaged groups to enhance their anti-poverty efforts and to increase the sustainability of their programmes<sup>21</sup>.

### 6.3 Types of sponsoring organizations

Anti-poverty partnerships world-wide enlist the support of a wide variety of different types of organizations. One useful way of classifying these organizations is to categorize them by: level of responsibility (international, national, state/local, and community); and governmental or nongovernmental. Using this framework for comparison, Table 4 provides an overall summary of the distribution of partnership arrangements across levels of responsibility and governmental versus nongovernmental partners. It also shows if partners were limited to participatory activity or (also) had programme management responsibility. For example, 24 of 42 partnerships (57.1 per cent) involved international organizations. Of these, 18 included international governments, but only 2 (4.8 per cent) of these had programme management responsibility. Information from the best practices database shows that most international partners, such as the European Union or Britain's Department for International Development play a funding, design, technical assistance and evaluation role, rather than assuming responsibility for programme operations. On the NGO side, in 42 programmes there were 22 participating international NGOs (52 per cent) but none of them retained operational control over the programmes. Rather, they typically acted as a source of funding, or in support of programme design, technical assistance or programme evaluation.

National level partners took part in a total of 26 of 42 programmes. National governments are somewhat more involved than national NGO counterparts (52 per cent vs. 40 per cent). The roles of both are about equally split between participation versus programme management. Largest was

---

21. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Integrated Approach to Women's Empowerment/ Kukatpally, India and Artistry That Shapes Destinies: SEWA, Lucknow, India case studies.

India's HUDCO programme, which over the last 25 years has invested over \$3 billion to help 6 million families<sup>22</sup>.

**Table 4. Government/NGO programmes by type and level of partner involvement**

Level	Government partners			NGO partners			Total programmes	
	Participant	Programme management	P+PM	Participant	Programme management	P+PM		
International level	N	16	2	18	22	0	22	24
	%	38.1	4.8	42.9	52.4	0	52.4	57.1
National level	N	11	11	22	9	8	17	26
	%	26.2	26.2	52.4	21.4	19	40.4	61.9
State/level	N	21	18	39	10	27	37	42
	%	50.0	42.9	92.9	23.8	64.3	88.1	100.0
Community level	Local private enterprise			N	23	4	27	27
				%	54.8	9.5	64.3	64.3
	CBOs			N	27	10	37	37
				%	64.3	23.8	88.1	88.1
Household level	Self Help			N				37
				%				88.1

Note: Percentages in table based on count of total programs (42); numbers do not add to 42 because of multiple participants.

Clearly, for the types of anti-poverty partnerships reviewed here, most of the action occurs at the state and local level. All 42 cases involved state or local governments (39), local NGOs (37) or both types of actors simultaneously. While state and local governments are nearly equally split between participatory and management roles, local NGOs play more active roles as programme managers (64.3 per cent). The reason for this may be that in some cases local governments “create” local NGOs to

22. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Innovative Housing Finance and Delivery Mechanisms: The HUDCO Approach (India) Case Study.

carry out certain programmes. For example, in Santo Andre, Brazil, a local nongovernmental organization was constituted specifically for the purpose of operating the Integrated Programme of Social Inclusion with funding, policy guidance and programme design provided by local governmental partners and international NGOs<sup>23</sup>. In many cases, local NGOs initiate the projects themselves and then enlist the support of local government agencies and other financial partners<sup>24</sup>. In other cases, local governments as project initiators prefer to partner with pre-existing local NGOs in order to enhance participation by external funding sources, community-level actors and slum residents. Suspicion of government or poor intergovernmental cooperation is mentioned as a problem in nearly 60 per cent of the case studies. Local NGOs, therefore, provide an important resource for enhancing trust and participation among slum residents and helping to secure the commitment of external funding sources<sup>25</sup>.

The findings presented in Table 4 show how important local commercial interests and CBOs are for fighting poverty in slums and squatter settlements. Private sector participation in urban anti-poverty programmes is present in nearly two-thirds of all local programmes (64.3 per cent), while CBOs participate in 88 per cent of local partnerships. Community banks are frequently enlisted to provide capital for slum improvement projects, either as a direct source of funds (e.g., the Buenos Aires Provincial Bank or the SEWA Cooperative Bank in Ahmedabad<sup>26</sup>), or as financial intermediaries to attract and manage programme funds (e.g., the consortium of 25 private sector financial institutions participating in Colombo's Sustainable Townships Programme<sup>27</sup>). In addition to banks, many partnerships rely

---

23. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Integrated Programme for Social Inclusion-Brazil, Case Study.

24. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Gender Resource Centre (GRC) Vijayawada, India, Case Study.

25. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Rehabilitation & Upgrading of the Manshiet Nasser Informal Settlement (Cairo, Egypt) Case Study.

26. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Inter-Sites and services programme in Gran Buenos Aires (Argentina) and Ahmedabad: Innovative Urban Partnerships Case Studies.

27. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Sustainable Townships Programme (STP), Colombo, Sri Lanka, Case Study.

on the private sector for direct financial support, technical assistance, job development, contributions of materials for infrastructure and housing, and management support. Arvind Mills, for example, is a key contributor to the Ahmedabad *Innovative Urban Partnerships* programme, providing not only technical assistance and management support, but also one-third of the financial resources<sup>28</sup>.

Although community-based organizations are very important and frequent partners in the urban anti-poverty programme delivery, compared with their local NGO counterparts, they tend to be less involved in programme management (24 per cent versus 64 per cent for local NGOs). However, they are essential to programme success because they constitute the vital linkage to the programmes' ultimate beneficiaries—the resident of slums and squatter settlements themselves. Much of the capacity building required of governments and NGOs in the delivery of projects and services focuses on the creation and support of viable, self-sustaining neighbourhood organizations, cooperatives, women's associations, etc. CBOs are a keystone of civil society because they “can provide legitimacy, reliable information about the needs and financial capacities of these communities, and a social delivery vehicle that values the communities themselves<sup>29</sup>.” In many successful slum rehabilitation programmes—for example, the People's Participation Programme in Mumbai<sup>30</sup>, sustainability and replicability hinge on the pivotal role of CBOs in defining programme objectives and methods, and in providing the institutional linkages to the intended beneficiaries. Without the involvement of CBOs few anti-poverty programmes would be successful. Finally, it is significant that almost 37 of 42 programmes (88.1 per cent) featured self-help by participating households.

---

28. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Ahmedabad: Innovative Urban Partnerships, (India) Case Study.

29. Baumann, T (2001) *Environment & Urbanization*, 13(2): 139-143.

30. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, People's Participation Programme: Accessing Land & Shelter in Mumbai, Case Study.

## 6.4 Partnership structures

There exist many combinations of partner types that may be harnessed in programmes to eradicate urban poverty. The number of partners is significantly and positively correlated with the number of programme activities undertaken<sup>31</sup>, the number of beneficiary households<sup>32</sup>, and total project cost<sup>33</sup>. The most common partnership type is that of state or local government with local NGOs and CBOs, accounting for nearly 75 per cent of all cases. There are *no cases* in the Habitat Best Practices database where state or local governments have undertaken programmes without the involvement and support of local NGOs or community based organizations. Urban anti-poverty inevitably and inherently have a “local” component. On the other hand, it is also critical to recognize that there are relatively few cases where local programme sponsors decide to “go it alone,” without participation of national or international partners. Both the number of beneficiaries and total project costs increase substantially with the involvement of national or international partners<sup>34</sup>.

## 6.5 Beneficiaries, programme costs and flow of funds

Beneficiaries, programme costs and flow of funds are three important characteristics useful in understanding the scale and outputs of urban anti-poverty programmes<sup>35</sup>. For beneficiary data, the unit of analysis is the household, and for cost data the unit of analysis is total programme costs over the duration of the programme<sup>36</sup>. Funds flow is calculated as the total

---

31. Pearson’s correlation coefficient,  $r=0.31$ .

32. Pearson’s correlation coefficient,  $r=0.49$ .

33. Pearson’s correlation coefficient,  $r=0.41$ .

34. For those cases with available data, the average number of programme beneficiaries in partnerships that included national and/or international partners was 537,866, whereas it was just 182,239 in strictly local partnerships. Relatedly, average programme costs were US \$237.2 million vs. US \$3.9.

35. Unfortunately, many of the cases in the Habitat Best Practices database examined here did not provide direct information on these three variables. This sub-analysis is based on 30 cases for beneficiary data, and 21 cases where cost data was supplied.

36. In some cases programme cost data were derived based on per-unit costs multiplied by total programme units (usually houses or households, but sometimes individuals).

programme cost divided by the duration of the programme. It provides an indicator of not only programme scale but can also be seen as a measure of sustainability<sup>37</sup>. Table 5 shows that the average programme examined here:

- Has served 454,887 households;
- Has cost \$190,062,565 million;
- Has undertaken programme activities in 7.3 separate or linked sectors;
- Has been in operation for 9.2 years; and
- Spent about \$12.6 million per year.

**Table 5. Beneficiaries, programmes costs and flow of funds by geographic scale**

Geographic scale	Number of households	Total project cost (\$ million)	Number of activities	Programme duration (years)	Funds flow/year (\$ million)
Within neighbourhood	N/A	N/A	4.0	5.0	N/A
Neighbourhood	1,799	5.5	6.4	8.7	1.5
Multiple neighbourhood	106,833	56	7.5	7.6	7.8
Metro-wide	1237,000	90	8.5	16.3	14.5
Multiple cities	4,00,000	3000	7.7	16.3	120
Mean	454,887	190	7.3	9.2	12.67
N	30	21	42	42	21

37. Higher numbers over a longer period of time means, it is argued, that programmes have attained a certain “momentum” of cash flow and experience to sustain the programme, as well as reliable and consistent funding resources (either external or internal) and local organizations to deliver services. However, there is an opposite interpretation to this ex-post facto sustainability argument, according to which higher fund flow simply means higher programme cost requirements, which may be less sustainable than a smaller scale programme with lower costs.

The data in Table 5 also indicate that the scale of programme results increases dramatically with the geographic scale of operations. With each step up in geographic scale, the number of beneficiaries, programme costs, activities, programme duration and funds flow per year increase as well. The increase in programme duration suggests another important characteristic of urban anti-poverty partnerships— that is, a “natural” growth factor. As programmes mature and build on prior successes, they tend to expand both geographically, through replication, and in terms of number of beneficiaries, programme costs, activities, and flow of funds per year.

**Table 6. Programme cost per household (\$)**

Geographic scale	Mean	N
Neighbourhood	4,930	3
Multiple neighbourhoods	5,822	13
Metro-wide/1	6,111	1
Multiple cities/2	500	1
Total	5,610	18

Note 1: Data from single case of Brazilian Women’s Conference, Sao Paolo and Contagem.

Note 2: Data from single case of HUDCO in India.

Programme efficiencies are not necessarily enhanced with increasing programme size. If one divides total programme costs by the number of beneficiaries to derive costs per beneficiary, the following results as shown in Table 6 obtain<sup>38</sup>.

38. Here and elsewhere, figures for costs per household are based on the overlap of cases where the best practices database provides information on both the number of household beneficiaries and total program costs (in most cases this number is a subset of each category), where household costs are calculated by dividing total program costs by the number of households.



Part of this “counter” pattern may be due to the increasing “mix” of programmes, particularly in the case of HUDCO in India, which undertakes many activities other than housing and infrastructure at correspondingly lower per-beneficiary costs.

Because the types of activities undertaken by different programmes can have substantial impacts on per unit costs, it is useful to ask how the numbers of beneficiaries, programme costs, duration and funds flow vary by the primary focus of programme activities. Table 7 provides a preliminary answer to this question.

Only half of the 42 partnerships reviewed here provided programme cost data for the Habitat Best Practices database. Despite this, Table 7 makes clear that housing and infrastructure programmes tend to be far more expensive than other types of programmes, both in terms of overall programme costs (average \$318,293,667 and \$447,079,886, respectively) and in terms of funds flow per year and programme costs per beneficiary (\$7,800 and \$3,200 per household, respectively). Housing and infrastructure programmes have many built-in links with “tenure security” programmes. Indeed, it is important to note that in none of these 42 partnerships did secure tenure activities take place outside of housing and infrastructure activities. This is logical since lack of secure tenure will undermine the reliance of housing and infrastructure programmes on self-help approaches. The intertwining of programmes oriented to tenure security with programmes focused on affordable housing and infrastructure makes the tenure security programmes look expensive (\$7,350 per household). This makes it important to consider sustainability and replication as two indicators of programme success.

## **6.6 Sustainability and replication**

In more than three-quarters of all programmes (32 out of 42, or 76.2 per cent), partnerships assessed their programmes as being sustainable. Two out of three partnerships (28 out of 42, or 66.7 per cent) indicated that their programme activities had been replicated either within the original city or

**Table 7. Partnership performance by primary focus of activities**

Primary focus of partnership	Number of households	Total programme cost (\$ million)	Partnership duration	Funds flow/year	Cost/household
Infrastructure	925,208	\$447.1	12.0	\$19,982,255	\$3224
Social services	15250	N/A	7.0	N/A	N/A
Affordable	490,319	\$318.3	10.0	18668316	7808
Tenure security	203,387	\$5.2	11.0	2438760	7350
Credit access	420,355	\$23.0	9.0	2688523	1339
Capacity building	30,000	N/A	9.5	N/A	N/A
Environmental quality	783,000	\$11.0	9.0	18840000	120
Development planning	N/A	\$0.65	4.0	216667	N/A
Gender equality	509,560	\$36.2	12.0	9790895	2067
Governance	N/A	\$0.65	9.0	216667	N/A
Mean for all programmes	455,120	\$190.0	9.2	\$12,606,517	\$5,394

Note: Job creation and micro-enterprise development were not cited as a “primary focus” of programme activities

elsewhere in the country<sup>39</sup>. Tables 8 and 9 show that sustainable and replicable programmes are very different from their counterparts. Programmes that are sustainable tend to be substantially larger than unsustainable ones both

39. These findings will reflect a “selection bias” because their inclusion in the Best Practices database is in part because they were self-sustaining and successfully expanded to other places.

with respect to number of beneficiaries and with respect to programme costs. By definition, programme duration is also much longer, and funds flow per year is almost double among sustainable programmes. However, the difference in costs per household beneficiary between sustainable and unsustainable programmes is not very large (\$5,600 versus \$4,700). This suggests that relative programme efficiency as measured by costs per household is unlikely to be a “cause” of sustainability.

Table 9 shows that partnerships have spin-off effects, as their programmes grow through replication, many times in new locations. Replicated programmes, therefore, tend to be larger than non-replicated ones with respect to the number of beneficiaries, total programme costs, programme duration, and funds flow per year. An important insight is that replicated programmes have lower per-beneficiary costs compared with those that are not.

Another feature that distinguishes programme sustainability and replicability in terms of costs is the substantial difference between programmes focusing on in situ upgrading compared with those that focus on new construction. Overall, 29 of 42 programmes focused on upgrading existing slums and squatter settlements, versus new construction (13 programmes). One reason for the preponderance of upgrading is undoubtedly related to cost. Table 10 includes only those cases for which cost data are available. It shows that new construction programmes tend to reach more people, but they cost a great deal more (by a factor of six) compared to slum upgrading programmes. New construction also more than doubles the flow of funds per year and the project cost per household.

**Table 8. Sustainability of programmes**

Sustainable		Number of households	Total programme cost (\$ million)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$)	Cost/household (\$)
Yes	Mean	22,673	26.3	4.5	792,4493	4,691
	N	8	5	10	5	4
No	Mean	612,373	241.2	10.72	1,4069,649	5,595
	N	22	16	32	16	14
Total	Mean	455,119	190.0	9.24	1,2606,517	5,394
	N	30	21	42	21	18

**Table 9. Programme replication**

Replicated		Number of households	Total programme cost (\$ million)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$)	Cost/household (\$)
Yes	Mean	137,747	26.6	7.4	7,678,615	6,566
	N	9	5	14	5	4
No	Mean	591,136	241.1	10.1	14,146,486	5,059
	N	21	16	28	16	14
Total	Mean	455,119	190.0	9.2	12,606,517	5,394
	N	30	21	42	21	18

**Table 10. Programme scale and cost by type (new/existing)**

Programme type		Number of households	Total programme cost (\$ million)	Fund flow/year (\$)	Cost/household (\$)
Upgrade existing	Mean	386,622	55.2	761,4396	3,606
	N	18	11	11	9
New construction	Mean	557,283	338.4	18,097,851	7,615
	N	12	10	10	9
Total	Mean	454,887	190.0	12,606,517	5,611
	N	30	21	21	18

## 7. Partnerships by programme area

### 7.1 Infrastructure

Partnership-based urban anti-poverty programmes that focus on infrastructure improvements as either a primary or a secondary activity constitute just over 70 per cent of the cases selected from the Habitat Best Practices database (30 of 42 cases; see Table 11). The absence of basic municipal services in slums and squatter settlements (water, sewer, drainage, public toilets, roads and electrification) presents serious health risks for the residents and undermines both liveability and livelihoods. In large cities such as Cairo, for example, half a million people in the Manshiet Nasser squatter settlement “are exposed to a plethora of environmental and health hazards due to absence of basic services<sup>40</sup>”. The lack of such services magnifies the risks of the spread of disease, fire, flooding, medical emergencies, and poor health and nutrition, with a corresponding decrease in the quality of life and human capital potentially available for the overall welfare of the city. As demonstrated in Visakhapatnam, India, large-scale infrastructure improvement projects can have substantial, direct and positive impacts on the survival, security and quality of life of slum

**Table 11. Geographic scale of infrastructure programmes**

Geographic scale	Infrastructure programmes		
	Included with other programmes	Primary focus	Total
Within neighbourhood	1 (5)	0	1 (3)
Neighbourhood	4 (21)	2 (18)	6 (20)
Multiple neighbourhoods	12 (63)	6 (55)	18 (60)
Metro-wide	1 (5)	2 (18)	3 (10)
Multiple cities	1 (5)	1 (9)	2 (7)
Total	19 (100)	11 (100)	30 (100)

Percentages are in parentheses

40. UN-HABITAT (2002) Best Practices Database, Rehabilitation & Upgrading of the Manshiet Nasser Informal Settlement Case Study.

residents (Amis 2001). The secondary benefit is that these residents can then participate more effectively in the social and economic life of the city with a commensurate reduction in poverty levels.

### 7.1.1. Scale

Infrastructure programmes are, by definition, “place-based” because they involve the placement of physical assets in particular locations. However, they are not always undertaken at the same scale with respect to the locus of programme activities, linkages with other activities, programme size, or the number of partnering organizations. Of 30 urban anti-poverty programmes involving partnership infrastructure activities, a majority (18 cases or 60 per cent) occurs at a scale of multiple neighbourhoods (see Table 11)<sup>41</sup>. Few projects (7) are at the scale of a single neighbourhood or below for a number of reasons<sup>42</sup>.

First, the selection of where municipal improvements take place is a highly politicized process not always amenable to logical determinations of relative need or beneficial impact<sup>43</sup>. Second, slums and squatter settlements tend to be physically contiguous or tightly integrated so that water, sewer and drainage systems in particular need to be undertaken over several neighbourhoods simultaneously, rather than separately. At the other end of the spectrum, only programmes with a very large resource base can afford to undertake projects because infrastructure projects are so expensive at this scale. Only five of the case studies examined here were able to marshal the resources required for undertaking infrastructure improvement at

---

41. This does not mean that the installation in multiple neighbourhoods was simultaneous; rather that the programme was designed to serve multiple neighbourhoods with installations frequently carried out serially.

42. In Table 11, and other tables referencing geographic scale, “within neighbourhood” refers to an area smaller than and part of a larger neighbourhood.

43. Because infrastructure projects represent substantial allocations of economic resources and manpower, the decision of where to locate municipal infrastructure is highly politicized. See, for example, Habitat “Best Practices” database, People’s Participation Programme: Accessing Land & Shelter in Mumbai, India.

a metropolitan or multi-city scale<sup>44</sup>. Clearly, one of the key challenges in the development and upgrading infrastructure is to find ways in which successful community-based approaches can be brought up to scale.

A second important characteristic of urban infrastructure programmes related to scale of operations is that they are frequently ancillary to other partnership efforts. Nineteen of 30 programmes (63 per cent) undertook infrastructure projects as part of or secondary to other partnership activities (see Table 12).

**Table 12. Total partnerships with infrastructures as secondary focus**

Primary focus	N	Per cent
Affordable housing	11	58
Tenure security	5	26
Credit access	4	21
Environment	3	16
Gender	3	16
Services	2	11
Capacity building	1	5
Development planning	1	5

Another distinguishing characteristic of infrastructure programmes is their size with respect to the number of beneficiaries, programme costs and duration, funds flow per year and cost per beneficiary. Table 13 indicates that infrastructure programmes, compared with other types of programmes, reach more households, cost more, take longer, involve greater annual cash flows, and yield greater values per household beneficiary. On average, partnerships involved with infrastructure improvement have more than

44. They were “Comprehensive Approach to Urban Development in Tamil Nadu”, “Cost-Effective and Appropriate Sanitation Systems (Sulabh International)”, “Innovative Housing Finance and Delivery Mechanisms: The HUDCO Approach”, “People’s Participation Programme: Accessing Land & Shelter in Mumbai”, and “Poverty Alleviation through Community Participation: UBSP/India.”



**Table 13. Size comparison of infrastructure and non-infrastructure programmes**

Project type		Number of households	Total project Cost (\$ millions)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$ millions)	Cost/household (\$)
Non-infrastructure programmes	Mean	131,463	\$30.3	8	\$8.3	\$2,531
	N	8	6	12	6	5
Infrastructure programmes	Mean	572,813	\$254.0	10	\$14.3	\$6,964
	N	22	15	30	15	13
Total	Mean	455,120	\$190.1	9	\$12.6	\$5,394
	N	30	21	42	21	18

four times as many beneficiaries (573,000 versus 131,000 households). They cost more than eight times as much (\$234 million versus \$30 million) and usually take longer to accomplish (10 years versus 8 years, on average). Even though they take longer, they still involve a higher flow of funds per year (\$14 million versus \$8 million). Finally, the cost per beneficiary (household) is about \$6,500 compared with \$2,500 per household for non-infrastructure programmes.

These differences have several implications. In general, compared with programmes in other sectors, those focusing on infrastructure require:

- Greater access to funding (not only for materials, labour and equipment, but also for management overhead, and debt service for bonds or other financial instruments);
- Greater technical support for design and construction;
- Greater management capacity for logistical support, financial management, project management and programme oversight; and

- Greater skills in community organization and training during installation—especially where self-help construction is involved (87 per cent of the time) and maintenance.

For these reasons, infrastructure programmes are more likely to involve national or international level partners, either government agencies or NGOs. Two-thirds of infrastructure programmes involve national partners and 60 per cent involve international partners, compared with half of non-infrastructure programmes requiring national and/or international support (see Table 14).

**Table 14. Involvement of national and international partners in infrastructure programmes**

Partners	Total projects	National or international partners	Percent
<b>National partners</b>			
Infrastructure	30	20	67
Non- Infrastructure	12	6	50
Total	42	26	62
<b>International partners</b>			
Infrastructure	30	18	60
Non- Infrastructure	12	6	50
Total	42	24	57

### 7.1.2 Partnerships

The role of national and international partners in infrastructure programmes raises a more general question: How do such programmes differ from non-infrastructure ones with respect to the number and types of partnerships involved in the delivery of programme benefits? Because they tend to be much larger in scale, one would expect infrastructure programmes to include a more diverse set of partnering organizations. Table 15 offers some support for this expectation.

Infrastructure programmes rely upon a somewhat larger number of partner types – on average 5.5 different types of organizations, compared with 4.7 types for non-infrastructure programmes<sup>45</sup>. Both the count of “participating” (non-management) and “managing” partners are higher for infrastructure programmes than for their non-infrastructure counterparts. These data support the notion that the greater complexity of infrastructure programmes requires the involvement of a greater number of different types of partners to design and implement these types of programmes.

**Table 15. Mean number of partner types for infrastructure and non-infrastructure programmes**

<b>Programme type</b>	<b>Count of partner type</b>	<b>Count of participating partners</b>	<b>Partners with Management responsibility</b>	<b>N of cases</b>
Infrastructure	5.5	3.5	2.0	30
Non-infrastructure	4.7	2.9	1.8	12
Total	5.2	3.3	1.9	42

Further examination of the data presented in Table 16, compares infrastructure programmes with programmes in other sectors according to the involvement of the eight primary types of partners.

Another distinguishing characteristic of infrastructure programmes is their size with respect to the number of beneficiaries, programme costs and duration, funds flow per year and cost per beneficiary. Table 13 indicates that infrastructure programmes, compared with other types of programmes, reach more households, cost more, take longer, involve greater annual cash flows, and yield greater values per household beneficiary. On average, partnerships involved with infrastructure improvement have more than four times as many beneficiaries (573,000 versus 131,000 households). They

45. For this review there are a maximum of eight partner types: international, national, and state/local governments; international, national, and local NGOs; local private sector enterprises, and community-based organizations (CBOs).

**Table 16. Infrastructure and other programmes by partner type involvement**

<b>International government</b>	<b>Participating</b>	<b>Managing</b>	<b>Not involved</b>	<b>Total</b>
Infrastructure	13 (43)	2 (7)	15 (5)	30
Non-infrastructure	3 (25)	-	9 (75)	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>16 (38)</b>	<b>2 (5)</b>	<b>24 (57)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>National government</b>				
Infrastructure	8 (28)	10 (33)	12 (40)	30
Non-infrastructure	3 (25)	1 (8)	8 (68)	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 (26)</b>	<b>11 (26)</b>	<b>20 (48)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>State/local government</b>				
Infrastructure	14 (47)	15 (50)	1 (3)	30
Non-infrastructure	7 (58)	3 (25)	2 (17)	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 (50)</b>	<b>18 (43)</b>	<b>3 (7)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>International NGOs</b>				
Infrastructure	16 (53)	-	14 (47)	30
Non-infrastructure	6 (50)	-	6 (50)	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 (52)</b>		<b>20 (48)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>National NGOs</b>				
Infrastructure	6 (24)	6 (24)	13 (52)	25
Non-infrastructure	3 (18)	2 (12)	12 (71)	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>9 (21)</b>	<b>8 (19)</b>	<b>25 (60)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Local NGOs</b>				
Infrastructure	7 (28)	15 (60)	3 (12)	25
Non-infrastructure	4 (24)	12 (71)	1 (6)	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 (26)</b>	<b>27 (64)</b>	<b>4 (10)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Local commercial</b>				
Infrastructure	17 (57)	3 (10)	10 (33)	30
Non-infrastructure	6 (50)	1 (8)	5 (42)	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>23 (55)</b>	<b>4 (10)</b>	<b>15 (36)</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>CBOs</b>				
Infrastructure	23 (77)	5 (17)	2 (7)	30
Non-infrastructure	4 (33)	5 (42)	3 (25)	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>27 (64)</b>	<b>10 (24)</b>	<b>5 (12)</b>	<b>42</b>

Percentages are in parentheses

cost more than eight times as much (\$234 million versus \$30 million) and usually take longer to accomplish (10 years versus 8 years, on average). Even though they take longer, they still involve a higher flow of funds per year (\$14 million versus \$8 million). Finally, the cost per beneficiary (household) is about \$6,500 compared with \$2,500 per household for non-infrastructure programmes.

These differences have several implications. In general, compared with programmes in other sectors, those focusing on infrastructure require:

- Greater access to funding (not only for materials, labour and equipment, but also for management overhead, and debt service for bonds or other financial instruments);
- Greater technical support for design and construction;
- Greater management capacity for logistical support, financial management, project management and programme oversight; and

For these reasons, infrastructure programmes are more likely to involve national or international level partners, either government agencies or NGOs. Two-thirds of infrastructure programmes involve national partners and 60 per cent involve international partners, compared with half of non-infrastructure programmes requiring national and/or international support (see Table 14).

Four findings emerge from the comparisons in Table 16. First, as noted above, international governments are more involved as partners, although not usually in a management role. National governments play a more direct role as managing partners (33 per cent of the time versus 8.3 per cent for non-infrastructure programmes). For example, in the HUDCO case in India:

*“In order to supplement the efforts for urban development including improvements of services, the Government of India decided to entrust the task of urban infrastructure financing to HUDCO which already had a strong*

*resource base, was organisationally and financially well established and had the necessary expertise to appraise and monitor such projects as well<sup>46</sup>."*

Likewise, there is the observation from the Tamil Nadu case study that:

*"Generally speaking, urban development projects are both too large and too complex for the limited planning, engineering and implementation capacity of sub-national governments<sup>47</sup>."*

Second, it is noteworthy that in one-half of the cases, state or local governments are managing partners, compared with only 25 per cent in non-infrastructure programmes. This is no doubt due in part to the inherent responsibility of local governments for the installation and maintenance of municipal service systems (water, roads, drainage, sewer, etc.).

Third, international and national NGOs participate in local infrastructure programmes in proportions roughly comparable to their participation in non-infrastructure programmes. On the other hand, local NGOs are somewhat less likely to be involved as "managing" partners (60 per cent versus 75 per cent for non-infrastructure programmes). This may be due in part to a lack of the technical or management expertise among local NGOs required for complicated installations. However, as shown in the case of Project Urban Self Help II in Lusaka, Zambia the partnership itself can form the foundation for acquiring the needed technical, financial and management capacity to successfully complete large scale installations<sup>48</sup>.

Finally, at the community level, two findings stand out. First, 87 per cent of urban infrastructure programmes rely on "self help" by community residents (not shown in the table). Due to this self-help component, the participation of community-based organizations such as neighbourhood associations, housing cooperatives local development councils and the like are essential to the implementation of local infrastructure projects. Twenty-eight of 30 infrastructure programmes (93.4 per cent) benefit from involvement by

---

46. UN-HABITAT "Best Practices" database (2002), Innovative Housing Finance and Delivery Mechanisms: The HUDCO Approach, India Case Study.

47. UN-HABITAT "Best Practices" database (2002), Comprehensive Approach to Urban Development in Tamil Nadu, India, Case Study.

48. UN-HABITAT "Best Practices" database (2002), Project Urban Self Help (PUSH II), Lusaka, Zambia, Case Study.

these groups. Few of these groups (only one out of six) have the technical and financial capacity and local government support necessary to manage these ventures. In unusual cases, such as the community development councils in Colombo's Million Houses Programme (Russell, 2000):

*"Necessary local capacity could only be increased if CBOs were actually given the freedom and responsibility to use project or financial management skills."*

Unfortunately, this effort to empower local community groups to control and manage such large-scale projects through "community action planning" was short-lived, and died with the change of government in the mid-90s.

### **7.1.3 Sustainability and replication**

Infrastructure programmes have approximately the same level of sustainability as non-infrastructure ones (75 per cent), but replicability – expansion of the programme in other locations is slightly lower (63 per cent versus 75 per cent) – see Table 17. Given the very high project costs and reliance on a limited number of external, primarily international funding sources, it is perhaps surprising that programme replication is even this high<sup>49</sup>. It should also be noted that replication is not always "external" to a programme's geographic or institutional boundaries, but may take place in other neighbourhoods of the city, or other cities within a region when additional project resources become available. The experience of Tamil Nadu's infrastructure programme is illustrative in this regard:

*"The success of the comprehensive approach to urban development in Tamil Nadu has been built upon a strong policy base and commitment to reform, and emphasizes the concepts of scaling up and replication, based on a participatory and demand driven process which is expected to be relevant not only for Tamil Nadu, but for the whole of India<sup>50</sup>."*

---

49. The findings with regard to these high levels of sustainability and replication are no doubt biased because of the inclusion of these cases in the UN-HABITAT Best Practices database.

50. UN-HABITAT "Best Practices" database (2002), Comprehensive Approach to Urban Development in Tamil Nadu, India, Case Study.

**Table 17. Sustainability and replication of infrastructure programmes**

<b>Demonstrated sustainability</b>	<b>No (%)</b>	<b>Yes (%)</b>
Infrastructure	23	77
Non- infrastructure	25	75
Total (N)	10	32
%	24	76
<b>Programme replicated</b>		
Infrastructure	37	63
Non- infrastructure	25	75
Total (N)	14	28
%	33	67

### 7.1.4 Programme development issues

In reviewing the Best Practices case studies, seven different kinds of issues or “lessons learned” were identified. They were:

- *Issues of scale* (typically, problems encountered when programmes expanded to other neighbourhoods or cities without appropriate organizational capabilities).
- *Social Issues* (usually deriving from conflicts of “cultures” or the need to overcome indigenous practices of social exclusion);
- *Intergovernmental Cooperation* (frequently a problem when new partnerships among governmental and nongovernmental organizations challenge pre-existing local or supra-local patterns of control);
- *Financial Issues* (most often related to the search for, or distribution of, the financial resources necessary to carry out programme objectives);
- *Institutional Barriers* (usually encountered when creating new organizations or building new partnering relationships that must be self-sustaining, mutually beneficial and programmatically viable);



- *Internal Management Issues* (referring to the management capacity of organizations responsible for the delivery of a programme's products and services); and
- *Community Development Issues* (typically reflecting the difficulties of securing adequate and self-sustaining participation by, and commitment of, community residents benefiting from the programme).

Table 18 shows how infrastructure programmes differ from and resemble non-infrastructure ones with respect to these seven categories of lessons learned. First, it is clear that many of these issues overlap and are interrelated. For example, problems of “scaling up” to expand a programme into other geographic areas are often directly linked to the adequacy of financial resources or internal management capacity. On average, infrastructure programmes encountered a comparable number of types of issues as non-infrastructure ones (4.6 versus 4.4, bottom of Table 18). However, this does not imply that the absolute number of problems encountered in programme operations were similar; only that the diversity of the types of issues faced is comparable.

Second, infrastructure programmes appear much more likely to confront issues of scale (40 per cent versus 0 per cent for non-infrastructure programmes), and internal management issues (60 per cent versus 42 per cent for non-infrastructure programmes). These differences are, no doubt, a function of the greater complexity and size of programme operations.

Third, infrastructure programmes appear to encounter somewhat less often issues related to intergovernmental cooperation (57 per cent versus 67 per cent) and financial issues (63 per cent versus 75 per cent). The former may reflect the fact that national and state/local governments are more likely to assert or maintain control of operations, thereby assuring fewer problems of cooperation. In the latter case, while a majority of partnerships in both the infrastructure and non-infrastructure sectors experience financial challenges, prior experience with large infrastructure projects, together with the involvement of national and international partnering agencies may offset to some degree a shortage of resources to complete projects.

**Table 18. Issues faced by infrastructure and non-infrastructure partnerships**

Issues	Infrastructure	Non-infrastructure	Total
Issues of scale	12 (40)	0 (0)	12 (29)
Social issues	20 (67)	9 (75)	29 (71)
Intergovernmental cooperation	17 (57)	8 (67)	25 (60)
Financial issues	19 (63)	9 (75)	28 (67)
Institutional development	26 (87)	11 (92)	37 (88)
Management issues	18 (60)	5 (42)	23 (55)
Community organization	27 (90)	11 (92)	38 (91)
Total programmes	30 (100)	12 (100)	42 (100)
Types of issues faced (mean)	4.6	4.4	4.6

Percentages are in parentheses

Finally, it is significant that the highest frequency of issues faced occurs in the community organization category. For both infrastructure and non-infrastructure programmes this is “where the rubber meets the road” and where programme design and operations must dovetail with the reality of community needs, priorities and capabilities. The fact that nine out of ten partnerships highlight these types of issue testifies to the importance of local capacity-building activities.

## 7.2 Services

One of the distinguishing characteristics of urban slums and squatter settlements is the widespread absence or inadequacy of basic social services including educational facilities, health clinics, public transportation, recreation, police and fire protection, and other emergency services<sup>51</sup>. The

51. The Best Practices cases from the UN Habitat database distinguished “basic social and municipal services” from the infrastructure installations for water, sewer, drainage, roads, street lighting and electrification discussed earlier.

negative consequences are an important dimension of urban poverty and closely linked not only to the physical attributes of slums and squatter settlements (inadequate infrastructure and housing), but also to the socio-economic deficits of ill-health, inadequate incomes, lack of education, and social exclusion (Anzorena and others 1998). Recognition of the connections between social services and urban poverty, have given rise to programmes such as the Urban Basic Services for Poor (UBSP) in India which reaches an estimated 10 million urban poor and which is a central component of that nation's anti-poverty efforts. UBSP centres around "a participatory process of planning and action with women from poor neighbourhoods to improve health, education; environment, access to credit and improved incomes and other basic rights for their children, themselves and their families<sup>52</sup>."

### 7.2.1 Scale

Urban anti-poverty partnerships frequently undertake the creation or upgrading of various social services. Nearly 70 per cent of the 42 cases examined here included the provision of social services as part of their activities. Despite this, in more than 95 per cent of the cases, social service programmes are operated in conjunction with activities in another sector. They are rarely the primary focus of a programme (only 3 of 29 cases or 3.3 per cent; see Table 19). The largest example of these is the UBSP programme in India.

The provision of social services may occur at various scales with respect to the locus of programme activities, linkages with other activities, programme size and number of partnering organizations. Table 19 shows that a large majority of social service programmes operate at the level of one or more neighbourhoods (83 per cent), with only five programmes undertaken on a metropolitan scale (three programmes) or a national scale (two programmes). This may be due in part to the linkage of social services with other primary and secondary activities that occur at the level of

---

52. UN-HABITAT (2002) "Best Practices" database, Poverty Alleviation through Community Participation: UBSP, India.

multiple neighbourhoods or below. A second reason may be the complexity of service provider networks that must be established locally in order to support social services in slums and squatter settlements. This supposition is supported by the observation that social services programmes often involve CBOs, which are used to help involve resident beneficiaries and coordinate service activities.

**Table 19. Geographic scale of social service programmes**

Geographic scale	Secondary to other programmes	Primary focus	Total
Neighbourhood	6 (23)	0 (0)	6 (21)
Multiple neighbourhoods	16 (63)	2 (67)	18 (62)
Metro-wide	3 (12)	0 (0)	3 (10)
Multiple cities	1 (4)	1 (33)	2 (7)
Total	26 (100)	3	29

Percentages are in parentheses

A second distinguishing feature of social service programmes is that they are often combined with other programmes that are secondary to the primary focus of other programmes. These combinations create a more comprehensive attack on the causes and consequences of urban poverty. Table 20 lists these other primary activity areas in the order of their frequency. The top six are affordable housing, infrastructure, tenure security, environmental quality, gender equity and credit availability. The fact that social service activities are included as programme components in more than half of these cases illustrates the comprehensiveness of most partner-based anti-poverty programmes in urban areas. It appears to confirm an acknowledgment that slum upgrading programmes that provide improved infrastructure and self-help housing assistance are insufficient in their own right to eradicate the diverse causes and consequences of poverty. Social service programmes are also necessary.

Social service programmes also tend to be associated with large-scale programmes directed toward other aspects of urban poverty. From the

**Table 20. Size comparison of partnership with and without social service activities**

Social service activities		Number of households	Total project cost (\$ millions)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$ millions)	Cost/household (\$)
Yes	Mean	577,535	290.9	10	17.6	7,487
	N	22	13	29	13	11
No	Mean	127,537	26.2	7	4.6	2,106
	N	9	8	13	8	7
Total	Mean	446,890	190.1	9	12.6	5,394
	N	31	21	42	21	18

available case study data it is not possible to distinguish the separate costs or number of beneficiaries of the social services component from overall programme costs or total beneficiaries. As a proxy, one can only examine total beneficiaries and programme costs when social service activities are included or not included. Table 21 shows the mean number of beneficiaries, total programme costs, programme duration, funds flow per year and programme cost per beneficiary for programmes that incorporate social services as part of the programme mix.

Clearly, it is not possible to conclude from these data that social services as a component of comprehensive anti-poverty programmes are causes of the relatively larger scale of such programmes. A more conservative and accurate interpretation would suggest that larger anti-poverty efforts that serve a greater number of beneficiaries are more likely to have a social services component in order to address health, education, public safety and other welfare issues that contribute to the poverty cycle. Greater resources make it possible not only to serve a larger number of beneficiaries, but also provide a wider range of services to confront the multiple deficits experienced by the residents of slums and squatter settlements. Indeed,

**Table 21. Primary programme activities with a social services component**

Primary focus	Number of programmes	Number with service component	Percent
Affordable housing	19	14	74
Infrastructure	11	9	82
Tenure security	8	7	88
Environmental quality	8	6	75
Gender equity	8	5	63
Credit availability	6	3	50
Capacity building	2	2	100
Development planning	2	0	0
Governance	1	0	0

Note: There are no partnerships in the database with job creation or micro-enterprise development as primary activities.

partnerships involved in social service activities, on average, undertake activities in 8.3 different sectors, compared with an average of just five sectors when they do not include social services.

## 7.2.2 Partnerships

Governments' partners are more often involved in management roles in social service programmes than in other programmes. National governments are involved in a management capacity in 31 per cent of social service programmes (versus 15.4 per cent for non-service programmes), and for state and local governments the contrast is even greater (51.7 per cent versus 23.1 per cent for non-service programmes; See Table 22). In fact, state and local governments are involved in some capacity in all partnerships carrying out social services programmes, and they also are more than twice as likely to help manage these programmes.

One reason for this may be that in most countries government is constitutionally bound to protect and enhance the health, safety and

**Table 22. Social services and other programmes by partner type involvement**

<b>International government</b>	<b>Participating</b>	<b>Managing</b>	<b>Not involved</b>	<b>Total</b>
Services	11 (38)	2 (7)	16 (55)	29
Non-services	5 (39)	-	8 (62)	13
Total	16 (38)	2 (5)	24 (57)	42
<b>National government</b>				
Services	7 (24)	9 (31)	13 (45)	29
Non-services	4 (31)	2 (15)	7 (54)	13
Total	11 (26)	11 (26)	20 (48)	42
<b>State/local government</b>				
Services	14 (48)	15	-	29
Non-services	7 (54)	3 (23)	3 (23)	13
Total	21 (50)	18 (43)	3 (7)	42
<b>International NGOs</b>				
Services	14 (48)	-	15 (52)	29
Non-services	8 (62)	-	5 (39)	13
Total	22 (52)	-	20 (48)	42
<b>National NGOs</b>				
Services	7 (24)	5 (17)	17 (59)	29
Non-services	2 (15)	3 (23)	8 (62)	13
Total	9 (21)	8 (19)	25 (60)	42
<b>Local NGOs</b>				
Services	6 (21)	20 (69)	3 (10)	29
Non-services	5 (39)	7 (54)	1 (8)	13
Total	11 (26)	27 (64)	4 (10)	42
<b>Local commercial</b>				
Services	17 (59)	2 (7)	10 (35)	29
Non-services	6 (46)	2 (15)	5 (39)	13
Total	23 (55)	4 (10)	15 (36)	42
<b>CBOs</b>				
Services	22 (76)	5 (17)	2 (7)	29
Non-services	5 (39)	5 (39)	3 (23)	13
Total	27 (64)	10 (24)	5 (12)	42

Percentages are in parentheses

welfare of the population even though its efforts may not meet the needs of vulnerable populations in slums and squatter settlements.

On the NGO side of service partnerships, Table 22 shows that international NGOs are less likely to be involved in social service programmes (48 per cent versus 62 per cent for non-service programmes), and, like the infrastructure programmes discussed in Section 6.1, play a significant role in providing financial support, programme design, technical assistance and evaluation, but somewhat less so in day-to-day programme operations. Overall, national-level NGOs are as likely to be involved in service as in non-service programmes counterparts (about 60 per cent), but they act less in management roles (17 per cent versus 23 per cent for non-service programmes; see table 23). Since social service programmes must be adapted to meet the welfare needs of local populations, it is not surprising that local NGOs support the delivery of service programmes in 26 out of 29 cases, with a large majority of them (69 per cent) having management roles in the partnership (compared with 54 per cent for non-service programmes; see Table 23). This pattern replicates the high levels of participation among local NGOs for infrastructure and housing programmes (87 per cent and 88 per cent, respectively), but differs from those patterns insofar as nearly 70 per cent of service programmes involve local NGOs as managing partners, versus 60 per cent for both infrastructure and housing programmes.

While private sector participation is the same for service and non-service types of activities (65 per cent versus 62 per cent), Table 22 provides clear evidence of the importance of community-based organizations in the delivery of social services in slums and squatter settlements). Over 93 per cent of social service programmes rely on such organizations for design and implementation, although their role as managers is less common than in non-service programmes (17 per cent versus 39 per cent). As noted previously, the self help involvement of community residents in these programmes (26 of 29 cases) requires that neighbourhood associations and other community groups be closely involved in the design and delivery of social service programmes. CBOs are an essential linkage between programme resources and community needs. This important point is illustrated by many of the cases, including the experience of Teresina,



Brazil, where a partnership focused on self-help housing, infrastructure and social service networks, using CBOs as joint programme managers with the municipal government:

*Although the [slum upgrading] transformation process requires a longer period, the operational conditions that sustain the project, particularly the use of service networks installed at the municipal entities, have produced a return well above expectations. It should be emphasized that community involvement has facilitated or even been responsible for accelerating, although at an initial scale, the definition of priorities and the periods required for actions<sup>53</sup>.*

### 7.2.3 Sustainability and replication

Although partnership activities in the social services sector are as sustainable as their activities in other sectors<sup>54</sup>, their service activities are less often replicated (see Table 23). The reasons for this are likely related to differences in scale: programmes with a larger number of beneficiaries, and requiring a larger resource base and greater cash flow are less likely to be replicated, even though their relative efficiency (cost per beneficiary) is comparable.<sup>55</sup>

**Table 23. Replication of partnership programmes that include social services**

Programmes replicated		No	Yes	Total
Services	N	1	18	29
	%	38	62	100
Non-services	N	2	11	13
	%	15	85	100
Total	N	13	29	42
	%	31	69	100

53. UN-HABITAT (2002) “Best Practices” database, Housing, Infrastructure and Poverty Eradication in Slum Areas (Teresina, Brazil), Case Study.

54. Data not shown.

55. Data not shown.

## 7.2.4 Programme development issues

Partnerships providing social services tend to encounter community organization issues (93 per cent versus 85 per cent), social issues (79 per cent versus 54 per cent), and management issues (66 per cent versus 31 per cent) more frequently than partnerships not involved in the social services sector (see Table 24). A reason for this may have to do with their larger size and their greater reliance on CBOs that need to be involved in programme design and delivery. As noted in the *Inter-Sites and services programme* in Gran Buenos Aires, Argentina “Big projects (more than 100/150 sites) are hard to follow and produce a very important impact in the surroundings causing conflicts at neighbourhood and municipal levels<sup>56</sup>.”

**Table 24. Challenges faced by partnerships with and without service programmes**

Issues	Service programmes	Non-service programmes	Total programmes
Issues of scale	11 (38)	1 (8)	12 (29)
Social issues	22 (79)	7 (54)	29 (71)
Intergovernmental cooperation	17 (59)	8 (62)	25 (60)
Financial issues	17 (59)	11 (85)	28 (67)
Institutional development	26 (90)	11 (85)	37 (88)
Management issues	19 (66)	4 (31)	23 (55)
Community organization	27 (93)	11 (85)	38 (91)
Total programmes	29 (100)	13 (100)	42 (100)

Percentages are in parentheses

Social services programmes appear less like to encounter problems with respect to financial issues (59 per cent versus 85 per cent), perhaps because they are already large in terms of programme resources and funds flow and have a dependable and sufficient resource base. They are comparable

56. UN-HABITAT (2002) “Best Practices” database, *Inter-Sites and services programme* in Gran Buenos Aires, Argentina, case study.

to non-service programmes with respect to intergovernmental cooperation (60 per cent) and institutional development (85 per cent).

### 7.3 Housing

A majority of the 42 partnerships selected for analysis are involved in the upgrading or construction of housing for slum residents (60 per cent). Most of these have housing as a primary focus (N=19 or 76 per cent), while the remaining 24 per cent include housing as a secondary activity (See Table 25). Far most of these partnerships (21) have a project focus directed at specific housing problems, while 4 partnerships (Consolidating Innovative Alternatives of Municipal Management in Diadema, Brazil; Integrated Programme of Social Inclusion in Santo Andre, Brazil; The Shelter Forum in Kenya; and the Mumbai Alliance in India) are better characterized as umbrella programmes that focus significantly on building alliances among governmental and nongovernmental programme managers toward more effective partnerships and improved management of existing programmes.

**Table 25. Type of programme activity by partnership focus**

Programme type		No	Yes	Primary focus	Total
Umbrella type % within the house	N	5	1	3	9
	%	29	17	16	21
Project focus % within the house	N	12	5	16	33
	%	71	83	84	79
Total within the house	N	17	6	19	42
	%	100	100	100	100

A large majority of partnerships with a housing programme (15 of 25 partnerships or 60 per cent) aim at upgrading existing housing in slums and squatter settlements (*in situ* upgrading), rather than building new

projects to replace derelict housing. This finding is particularly important because it reveals the orientation to and opportunity for significant roles by slum residents through self-help activities by households themselves or through the involvement of CBOs and other organizations representing the urban poor (see Table 26). Such self help is very common (in 92 per cent of all cases, see Table 27). Where housing is a *primary focus* of programme activities, a somewhat larger proportion of the partnerships undertakes new construction (up to 43 per cent from 33 per cent, or 8 of 19 programmes).

There is no appreciable difference between the scale of operations for partnerships that are active in the housing sector and others that are not. As shown in Table 28, it is most common that involvement is at the level of several neighbourhoods (56 per cent), followed by a single neighbourhood (24 per cent). These results are another confirmation of the importance of the local community to these partnerships, stressing further the importance of capacity building at the community level. They also point to the significance of networking across different communities in the same city to establish a critical mass and effective networks to exchange information and mobilize resources.

**Table 26. Upgrading versus new construction by partnership focus**

Programme type		No	Yes	Primary Focus	Total
New/Upgrade Existing % within the house	N	14	4	11	29
	%	82	67	58	69
New construction % within the house	N	3	2	8	13
	%	18	33	42	31
Total within the house	N	17	6	19	42
	%	100	100	100	100

**Table 27. Prevalence of self-help in partnerships by involvement in housing**

Self-help		No	Yes	Total
No	N	2	2	4
	%	8	12	10
Yes	N	23	15	38
	%	92	88	91
Total	N	25	17	42
	%	100	100	100

**Table 28. Scale of partnership activity by involvement in housing**

Geographic scale	Yes	No
<Neighbourhood % within any housing programme	0 (0)	1 (6)
Neighbourhood % within any housing programme	6 (24)	4 (24)
Neighbourhood % within any housing programme	14 (56)	10 (59)
Metro-wide % within any housing programme	3 (12)	1 (6)
Metro-wide % within any housing programme	2 (8)	1 (6)
Total % within any housing programme	25 (100)	17(100)

Percentages are in parentheses

### 7.3.1 Involvement in housing by partnerships with a primary focus in another sector

Partnership-based urban anti-poverty programmes with housing activities are strongly linked with involvement related to secure tenure, infrastructure and access to credit, and less so with services, gender and environment types of activities. All eight partnerships focused primarily on enhancing secure tenure also have a housing component, either as a primary or secondary activity. Eight of 11 infrastructure-oriented partnerships have a housing component (73 per cent), and half of the partnerships with a primary focus of credit access have a housing component (Table 29).

**Table 29. Primary partnership foci with secondary housing component**

Partnerships with primary focus on:	Partnerships with a housing component		
	All partnerships	N	%
Tenure security	8	8	100
Infrastructure	11	8	73
Credit access	6	3	50
Services	3	1	33
Gender	8	2	25
Environmental quality	8	1	13
Capacity building	2	0	0
Development planning	2	0	0
Governance	1	0	0

Note: The database had no partnerships with job creation or micro-enterprise development as a primary focus

### 7.3.2 Scale

On average, programmes with housing components are much more expensive than non-housing programmes<sup>57</sup>. Their average project cost is \$278 million compared with \$14.4 million for non-housing programmes. As a result, the funds flow per year is nearly four times that for non-housing programmes. At the same time, the average number of households served by housing programmes is smaller (370,000 versus 587,000), the cost per household is substantially larger (\$7,292 versus \$461 for non-housing programmes), while average programme duration is very similar. As seen in Table 29, housing programmes are more often intertwined with partnership activities in other sectors such as secure tenure, infrastructure and access to credit, making them also more complex and costly to implement and maintain (Table 30). These differences have important implications for the required capacity of sponsoring organizations to design and manage these larger scale programmes.

57. These higher costs may in part be explained by simultaneous involvement in other sectors, whose costs cannot always be separated.

There is a significant difference in scale of operations between partnerships that focus primarily on new construction and those that focus primarily on upgrading of the existing housing stock. Upgrading programmes reach a much larger number of households, have a longer average duration (10.5 years vs. 6 years), and cost less per household (\$6,035 vs. \$9,188, see Table 31).

**Table 30. Size comparison of programmes with and without housing activities**

Programme type		Number of households	Total project cost (\$ millions)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$ millions)	Cost/household (\$)
Housing programmes	Mean	370,046	\$277.9	9	\$16.5	\$7,292
	N	20	14	25	14	13
Non-housing programmes	Mean	586,606	\$14.4	9	\$4.8	\$461
	N	11	7	17	7	5
Total	Mean	446,890	\$190.1	9	\$12.6	\$5,394
	N	31	21	42	21	18

### 7.3.3 Partners

Given that partnerships with housing activities tend to operate somewhat more often at the level of the metropolitan area or several cities at the same time than do others focusing on different sectors, one might expect that there would be greater involvement by national and international sponsors in these types of programmes. This expectation is supported by the data in Table 32 although the difference is not very large. Housing programmes more likely include national-level partners (governmental and non-governmental) – 68 per cent versus 53 per cent for non-housing programmes.

**Table 31. Programme size comparison: new construction versus upgrading**

Programme type		Number of households	Total project cost (\$ millions)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$ millions)	Cost/household (\$)
New/ Upgrade Existing	Mean	186,028	\$93.3	10.5	\$9.8	\$6,035
	N	7	5	11	5	5
New construction	Mean	7513	\$50.5	6.0	\$7.9	\$9,188
	N	7	7	7	7	7
Total	Mean	96,771	\$68.3	8.7	\$8.7	\$7,875
	N	14	12	18	12	12

Perhaps because of their increased complexity and cost, housing programmes tend to involve a more diverse partnership structure, made up of a somewhat greater number of different partners. Housing programmes on average involve 5.4 types of partnering organizations compared with non-housing programmes that involve 5.0 types, while relatively these organizations also operate somewhat more often in programme management roles (See Table 33).

A further examination of the types of partners involved in collaborative arrangements in slum housing produces several findings. Table 34 shows

**Table 32. National and international partners in housing programmes**

Programme type	Total programmes	Programmes with national partners	Percentage of all programmes
Housing programmes	25	17	69
Non-housing programmes	17	9	53
Total	42	26	62



that governmental organizations at all three levels are more often involved than in programmes in other sectors. In varying degrees, this is the case at all levels: international, national and state/local. Furthermore, government agencies are more likely to play managing, as opposed to participatory roles. In no programmes do international NGOs play a management role. In line with the prevalence of national level actors in housing-focused partnerships, national non-governmental organizations are also frequent partners. Including management roles, they participate in 48 per cent of the partnerships active in housing (versus 29 per cent of all other partnerships) and when they participate, they are more than twice as likely to do so

**Table 33. Mean of partner types for housing and non-housing programmes**

Housing focus		Number of partner types	Participating partners	Partners with management responsibility
No	Mean	5.4	3.4	2.0
	N	25	25	25
Yes	Mean	5.0	3.2	1.8
	N	17	17	17
Total	Mean	5.2	3.3	1.9
	N	42	42	42

in a managing capacity (24 per cent versus 12 per cent). These findings parallel the results presented earlier for social service programmes. Local non-governmental organizations have a somewhat lesser presence in partnerships in the housing sector than in other sectors, but there still is a very high level of participation (88 per cent), most of it related to programme management. The local private sector also has less participation in housing, but remains an important partner that is present in 60 per cent of all partnerships. At the local level as well, housing-focused partnerships rely heavily on the involvement of community-based organizations but more as participants in the housing delivery system (68 per cent) than as programme managers (20 per cent).

**Table 34. Partners involved in housing and non-housing programmes**

<b>International government</b>	<b>Participating</b>	<b>Managing</b>	<b>Not involved</b>	<b>Total</b>
Housing programmes	10 (40)	2 (8)	13 (52)	25
Non-housing programmes	6 (35)	-	11 (65)	17
Total	16 (38)	2 (5)	24 (57)	42
National government				
Housing programmes	7 (28)	8 (32)	10 (40)	25
Non-housing programmes	4 (24)	3 (18)	10 (59)	17
Total	11 (26)	11 (56)	20 (48)	42
State/local Government				
Housing programmes	13 (52)	11 (44)	1 (4)	25
Non-housing programmes	8 (47)	7 (41)	2 (12)	17
Total	21 (50)	18 (43)	3 (7)	42
International NGOs				
Housing programmes	13 (52)	-	12 (48)	25
Non-housing programmes	9 (53)	-	8 (47)	17
Total	22 (52)	-	20 (48)	42
National NGOs				
Housing programmes	6 (24)	6 (24)	13 (52)	25
Non-housing programmes	3 (18)	2 (12)	12 (71)	17
Total	9 (21)	8 (19)	25 (60)	42
Local NGOs				
Housing programmes	7 (28)	15 (60)	3 (12)	25
Non-housing programmes	4 (24)	12 (71)	1 (6)	17
Total	11 (26)	27 (64)	4 (10)	42
Local commercial				
Housing programmes	12 (48)	3 (12)	10 (40)	25
Non-housing programmes	11 (65)	1 (6)	5 (29)	17
Total	23 (55)	4 (10)	15 (36)	42
CBOs				
Housing programmes	17 (68)	5 (20)	3 (12)	25
Non-housing programmes	10 (59)	5 (29)	2 (12)	17
Total	27 (64)	10 (23)	5 (12)	42

Percentages are in parentheses

### **7.3.4 Sustainability and replication**

A large majority of the best practices partnerships with activities related to slum housing reports being sustainable. This is the case in three out of four programmes, only slightly less than programme activities in non-housing sectors. However, perhaps due to their complexity, cost and diversity of partner types, programmes of housing-focused partnerships are less frequently replicated than partnership programmes in other sectors (64 per cent versus 82 per cent, see Table 35).

### **7.3.5 Programme development issues**

Finally, with respect to programme development issues, it appears that there are no major differences between partnerships that concern themselves with aspects of slum housing versus those that primarily occupy themselves with urban anti-poverty activities in other sectors, aside from one area. The findings suggest that partnerships in the housing sector experience four times as often challenges in rolling the program out to a larger number of beneficiaries, so called “scaling up,” (40 per cent of the cases), a difference that no doubt arises from difficulties in forming more complex partnerships and acquiring a typically larger resource base for their activities. However, scaling up is less of a problem than issues in other areas, in particular aspects of community organization, which surface in 88 per cent of all cases, and institutional development, which is mentioned by 84 per cent of all housing partnerships (see Table 36).

## **7.4 Jobs**

Programmes that create jobs or support micro-enterprise development in slums and squatter settlements are important to the livelihoods of the urban poor. They have the most direct impacts on monetary poverty because they generate income that would otherwise not be available<sup>58</sup>. Therefore, in Nairobi’s Mathare 4A project, for example, “international donor agencies

---

58. For a discussion of the relationship between “poverty alleviation” and direct “poverty reduction” see Anzorena and others, 1998.

urge governments to employ policies that combine shelter provision with job creation” especially in conjunction with NGOs, community-based organizations and community residents (self-help) in order both to address shelter needs and raise standards of living (Kigochie 2001, p. 223).

**Table 35. Sustainability and replication among housing and non-housing programmes**

<b>Demonstrated sustainability</b>	<b>No (%)</b>	<b>Yes (%)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Housing programmes	24	76	100
Non-housing programmes	12	88	100
Total	8	34	42
%	19	81	100
Programme replicated			
Housing programmes	36	64	100
Non-housing programmes	18	82	100
Total	12	30	42
%	29	71	100

**Table 36. Programme development challenges faced by partnerships with and without housing programmes**

<b>Challenge</b>	<b>Programme type</b>	<b>Yes (N)</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Issues of scale	Housing programmes	10	40
	Non-housing programmes	2	12
Social issues	Housing programmes	18	75
	Non-housing programmes	11	65
Intergovernmental cooperation	Housing programmes	15	60
	Non-housing programmes	10	59
Financial issues	Housing programmes	16	64
	Non-housing programmes	12	71
Institutional development	Housing programmes	21	84
	Non-housing programmes	16	94
Management issues	Housing programmes	15	60
	Non-housing programmes	8	41
Community organization	Housing programmes	22	88
	Non-housing programmes	16	94

A review of partnership-based anti-poverty programmes in slums and squatter settlements shows that such combined approaches (e.g., shelter and income generation) are common. Over 60 per cent of programmes with housing and infrastructure activities as primary foci have job creation and/or micro-enterprise development as a secondary activity (see Table 37).

However, the data also show that job creation and micro-enterprise development are rarely undertaken as primary activities, but are rather incorporated as secondary to shelter improvement projects. Part of the reason for this may be that, at least in the case of job creation, national, state and local governments have assumed responsibility for large-scale economic growth and labour policies related to structural adjustments intended to facilitate business expansion and reduce unemployment in the formal sector<sup>59</sup>. Programmes to reduce unemployment and generate new jobs, at least in the formal job market, require significant resources and thus often are the primary responsibilities of central governments'

**Table 37. Primary programme activities with jobs component**

<b>Programmes with primary activity in:</b>	<b>Total programmes</b>	<b>With job creation component</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Housing	19	12	63
Infrastructure	11	7	64
Gender equity	8	6	75
Credit access	6	4	67
Environment	8	4	50
Tenure	8	3	38
Services	3	2	68.
Capacity building	2	1	50
Development planning	2	0	0
Primary governance	1	0	0

59. There is no question that the "micro" crises of slums in an urban development context are intimately connected to large-scale macro-economic shifts occasioned by globalization. See, for example, Firman, 1999.

labour ministries, orchestrated out at national or regional offices. It is not surprising, therefore, that local efforts in job creation and micro-enterprise development are initiated in combination with, and secondary to, slum improvement programmes in other sectors.

It is noteworthy that there is significant overlap between the partnership activities aimed at job creation and those supporting micro-enterprise development. Table 38 shows that of the 25 partnerships that undertake one or both of these activities, 20 do both at the same time. The following analyses focus on job-creation although many of the same findings also apply to micro-enterprise development.

As mentioned above, job creation is frequently undertaken in combination with primary activities in other sectors. Table 37 shows that the four most frequent combinations are with housing, infrastructure, gender equity, and credit access. Twelve out of 19 housing programmes and 7 out of 11 infrastructure programmes have job creation components. Considering that almost all of these partnership programmes include a self-help component (>90 per cent), job creation for slum residents is an integral part of their design and implementation. Similarly, 75 per cent of gender equity programmes, and 67 per cent of credit access programmes have job creation components. At the other end of the spectrum, capacity building, development planning and governance are rarely combined with creating jobs.

**Table 38. Overlap of jobs and micro-enterprise programmes**

<b>Programme combinations</b>	<b>Number of combinations</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Neither jobs nor micro-enterprise	17	40.5
Jobs only	4	9.5
Micro-enterprise only	1	2.4
Both jobs & micro-enterprise	20	47.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### 7.4.1. Scale

Because job creation is so closely linked with housing and infrastructure programmes, the geographic scale of operations tends to track those of housing and infrastructure. Table 39 shows that of the 24 programmes with a jobs component, about 80 per cent were undertaken at the scale of multiple neighbourhoods or above. The comparable figure for non-jobs programmes was 67 per cent. As noted, generating employment typically requires access to significant funding and such funding is not usually available at the local neighbourhood level. Potentially, the relatively larger geographic scale of programmes with job creation activities facilitates the matching of people with job prospects in a larger job market—albeit predominantly in the informal sector.

As is the case with housing and infrastructure, programmes with job creation activities tend to: be directed toward a larger number of beneficiaries; cost more; be undertaken over a longer period of time; involve greater annual cash flows; and have a lower project cost per household, when compared with the programmes that do not include employment generation. The large differences shown in Table 40 between programmes with and without job creation are partially due to the inclusion of India’s \$3 billion HUDCO-programme (which has a strong employment component and has served over 6 million households); however, even with the exclusion of that case,

**Table 39. Geographic scale of partnership programmes with job creation activities**

Geographic scale	Yes	No	Total
<Neighbourhood	0 (0)	1 (6)	1 (2)
Neighbourhood	5 (21)	5 (28)	10 (24)
Multiple neighbourhood	14 (58)	10 (57)	24 (57)
Metro-wide	4 (17)	0 (0)	4 (10)
Multiple cities	1 (1)	2 (11)	3 (7)
Total % within any housing programme	24 (100)	(18) 100	(42) 100

Percentages are in parentheses

the same patterns hold true. The implications of larger scale for programmes structure and operations include greater management complexity, a more diverse range of partnership types and greater difficulty in securing community participation in the programme.

## 7.4.2 Partnerships

Employment generation has typically required relatively significant funding not available at the local level. Hence, one would expect to find strong representation of national and international level partners in job-creation programmes. However, this is not what the case studies from the Best Practices database show. In fact, the most frequent partners in job-creation programmes are local non-governmental organizations (96 per cent, mostly in programme management roles), community-based organizations (83 per cent, mostly in participatory roles) and local or state government

**Table 40. Scale of partnership programmes with job-creation activities**

	Programme type	Number of households	Total project cost (\$ millions)	Programme duration	Fund flow/year (\$ millions)	Cost/household (\$)
No Job	Mean	249,109	\$37.2	7.1	\$6.3	7,546
Creation	N	11	9	10	9	8
Job	Mean	555,670	\$281.3	10.9	\$16.0	3,458
Creation	N	20	13	24	13	11
Total	Mean	446,890	\$181.4	9.2	\$12.0	5,179
	N	31	22	42	22	19



(91 per cent, with responsibilities about evenly divided). Although local organizations and agencies are common partners, there are very few job creation partnerships that do not have any partner at the national or international level, either a government agency or a non-governmental organization. For example, 13 of the 24 partnerships that are involved in job-creation activities include an international NGO partner primarily for funding, technical assistance and evaluation. This finding may have important implications for reducing poverty in slums. It suggests that local organizations and authorities can play important roles in job creation if they can act in concert with national or international partners and if their joint activities incorporate job creation in the context of activities in other sectors. The local private sector also frequently participates in partnerships that aim to produce jobs for slum residents. It acts mostly as a source of employment and job training (see Table 41).

### **7.4.3 Sustainability and replication**

Partnerships with job-creation roles cite their activities much more often as being sustainable than do partnerships not seeking to produce employment (92 per cent versus 67 per cent). The reasons for this are not clear. It could be simply a reflection of the linkage with programmes of these partnerships in other sectors. It also reflects a particular view of sustainability as being linked to the availability of significant funding, as one would expect to find in the case of partnerships that have produced jobs over a sufficiently long period of time to have become institutionalized and warrant inclusion in the Habitat Best Practices database. Employment-generation programmes are also somewhat more often replicated than programmes without job creation components, but the difference is small, perhaps because replication of such programmes requires unusually large funding (See Table 42).

**Table 41. Jobs programmes by partner type**

<b>International government</b>	<b>Participating</b>	<b>Managing</b>	<b>Not involved</b>	<b>Total</b>
Jobs programmes	10 (42)	1 (4)	13 (54)	24
Non-jobs programmes	6 (33)	1 (6)	11 (61)	18
	16 (38)	2 (5)	24 (57)	42
<b>National government</b>				
Jobs programmes	7 (29)	5 (21)	12 (50)	24
Non-jobs programmes	4 (22)	6 (33)	8 (44)	18
Total	11 (26)	11 (26)	20 (48)	42
<b>State/local government</b>				
Jobs programmes	11 (46)	11 (46)	2 (8)	24
Non-jobs programmes	10 (56)	7 (39)	1 (6)	18
Total	21 (50)	18 (43)	3 (7)	42
<b>International NGOs</b>				
Jobs programmes	13 (52)	-	12 (48)	25
Non-jobs programmes	9 (53)	-	8 (47)	17
Total	22 (52)	-	20 (48)	42
<b>National NGOs</b>				
Jobs programmes	6 (25)	17 (71)	1 (4)	24
Non-jobs programmes	5 (28)	10 (56)	3 (17)	18
Total	11 (26)	27 (64)	4 (10)	42
<b>Local NGOs</b>				
Jobs programmes	6 (25)	3 (13)	15 (63)	24
Non-jobs programmes	3 (17)	5 (28)	10 (56)	18
Total	9 (21)	8 (19)	25 (60)	42
<b>Local commercial</b>				
Jobs programmes	15 (63)	1 (4)	8 (33)	24
Non-jobs programmes	8 (44)	3 (17)	7 (39)	18
Total	23 (55)	4 (10)	15 (38)	42
<b>CBOs</b>				
Jobs programmes	17 (71)	3 (13)	4 (17)	24
Non-jobs programmes	10 (56)	7 (39)	1 (6)	18
Total	27 (64)	10 (24)	5 (12)	42

Percentages are in parentheses

#### 7.4.4 Programme development Issues

Although the average number of issues addressed in the design and implementation of programmes with job creation components is comparable to that of programmes that do not produce jobs (4.7 versus 4.3 out of 7 issue types), there are difference in the types of issues that are most frequently encountered. Job programmes are especially more likely to have to deal with issues of community organization (100 per cent), institutional development (92 per cent), and social issues (87 per cent). On the other hand, they are less likely to encounter difficulties in the areas of intergovernmental cooperation and internal programme management (see Table 43).

**Table 42. Sustainability and replication of programmes with and without job creation activities**

<b>Demonstrated Sustainability</b>	<b>No (%)</b>	<b>Yes (%)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Job programmes	8	93	100
Non-job programmes	33	67	100
Total (N)	8	34	42
%	19	81	100
Programme replicated			
Job programmes	25	75	100
Non-job programmes	33	67	100
Total (N)	12	30	42
%	29	71	100

**Table 43. Issues faced by partnerships with job-creation programmes**

<b>Issue</b>		<b>Job- programmes</b>	<b>Non job- programmes</b>	<b>Total</b>
Issues of scale	N	8	4	12
	%	33	22	29
Social issues	N	20	9	29
	%	87	50	71
Intergovernmental cooperation	N	12	13	25
	%	50	72	60
Financial issues	N	16	12	28
	%	67	67	67
Institutional development	N	22	15	37
	%	92	83	88
Management issues	N	12	11	23
	%	50	61	55
Community organization	N	24	14	38
	%	100	78	91

## 8. Conclusion

In the past, partnerships have often been between the public and the private sector, frequently resulting in outcomes that have not benefited local communities. Inclusion of civil society groups as partners in cooperative programmes with the public and private sector holds greater potential for the alleviation of poverty and improving the liveability of the environments of the urban poor. The analyses reported here provide a systematic evaluation of such tri-sector partnerships, based on cases included in the UN-HABITAT Best Practices Database. The findings show not only the significant roles played by civil society groups but also demonstrate the importance of cross-sectoral programmes.

Urban redevelopment policies have often taken a sectoral approach, focusing on problems in single domains such as sewage or water provision, health care, housing, and so forth. Development agencies operating along these lines have typically allocated funds from different sources and mobilized personnel from different divisions, in each case for specific projects. Not only has this hindered coordination and produced waste, it has also prevented synergistic outcomes that would occur if work in one sector were integrated with efforts in another sector.

The findings reported in previous sections of this paper show that the provision and operation of infrastructure and services and the production and upgrading of housing are prime examples of opportunities for such integration. In these situations, it is often possible to draw on the local population for the necessary workforce, thus creating jobs as well. Doing so allows residents to earn incomes that enable them to purchase materials and services, which, in turn, assists in cost recovery and further stimulates the local economy. In addition, such employment may help people acquire new skills and strengthen local social networks, thus building social capital and increasing community capacity (United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UNCHS) and International Labour Organization (ILO) 1995). A clear implication that follows from these insights is that policies should support the development and maintenance of appropriate cross-sectoral programmes and the participation of local residents in them.

The involvement of small-scale enterprises in infrastructure provision in slum upgrading and dwelling construction usually produces local income multipliers. Therefore, policies should extract the maximum amount of employment from the provision and operation of urban services commensurate with efficiency. This may involve redesigning the hardware of infrastructure to allow it to be constructed by small-scale contractors using labour-based methods. Experience of storm-water drains in South Africa shows how many jobs can be created and less costly machinery can be used by changing from spun concrete pipes to lined and covered channels (UNCHS/ILO, 1995).

In these situations, local authorities can act as managing contractors to provide supervision and training for the labour-based contractors. Involvement as community contractors or paid workers in infrastructure improvements in their neighbourhood is not the same as expecting residents to offer 'voluntary' labour in a spirit of communal endeavour. Indeed, it is important that a fair wage should be given to labour involved in infrastructure works (UNCHS/ILO 1995).

Infrastructure, such as waste disposal and recycling, local distribution and maintenance of water supply, supply and care for public toilets, and supply of fuel can also be effectively operated by local community-based enterprises in partnership with local government. To make these situations work, public agencies need to change their role from supplier to supervisor, regulator and trouble-shooter. These arrangements will help generate more jobs and income for people living in low-income neighbourhoods. In many places, services such as nurseries, infant education, family planning advice, and sometimes primary health care, are also provided through local small-scale enterprises.

The analysis of tri-sector partnerships working to alleviate poverty and improve liveability, presented in the foregoing, shows that it is common for such partnerships to operate in more than one sector. However, it is also clear that there exist clusters of programme domains in which partnerships tend to combine their activities and on which they concentrate their efforts. These factors are seen in Table 44, which suggests that

**Table 44. Clustering of partnership activities across programme sectors**

Programme sector	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Housing+ Tenure+ Credit	Jobs +Micro + Capacity	Infrastructure+ Environment+ Planning	Service+ Gender	Governance
Infrastructure	.200	-.155	.730	.432	.027
Services	.122	.126	.202	.875	.171
Affordable housing	.918	-.033	.223	.030	.074
Secure tenure	.884	-.089	.143	.230	.107
Access to credit	.836	.166	.049	-.136	-.298
Capacity building	-.239	.691	.014	.307	-.306
Environment	-.482	.446	.602	.062	.263
Job creation	.143	.910	-.083	-.003	.124
Micro-enterprise	.016	.885	-.191	.038	.112
Development planning	.292	-.178	.811	.024	.121
Gender	-.178	.325	-.550	.513	-.320
Governance	-.080	.106	.189	.111	.901

there are five such clusters<sup>60</sup>. Housing, Secure Tenure and Credit Access programmes consistently “hang together” (Component 1), as do Capacity Building, Jobs Creation and Micro-Enterprise Development (Component 2) with a weak connection to Environment and Gender Programmes. The third cluster consists of partnership programmes focused on Development Planning, Infrastructure, and Environment issues (Component 3). Service programmes tend to be linked with programmes aimed at addressing Gender concerns, although the linkage is not very strong (Component 4). Governance programmes are in a category by themselves, and do not often combine with partnership activity in any other sector (Component 5).

Policies and programmes to alleviate urban poverty and enhance urban liveability should strengthen the linkages among cluster components in order to maximize the potential of synergistic strategies. In doing so, it is important that these policies and programmes recognize and support the important roles of civil society groups representing the urban poor, found in the analyses of partnership programmes reported here.

---

60. Five-Component Factor Matrix accounting for 83.6 per cent of variance. Factor analysis of 12 programme types (all coded: 0=not present, 1=present). Cutoff at Eigenvalue=1+ yielding 5 principal components with varimax rotation. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.



## List of references

- Amis, P. (2001), "Rethinking UK aid in urban India: reflections on an impact assessment study of slum improvement projects", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 101-113.
- Anzorena J, Bolnick J, Boonyabancha S, Cabannes, Y., Hardoy, A., Hasan, A., Levy, C., Mitlin, D., Murphy, D., Patel, S., Saborido, M., Satterthwaite, D., and Stein, A. (1998), "Reducing urban poverty; some lessons from experience", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 167-186.
- Askvik, S. (1999), "Twinning in Norwegian Development Assistance", *Public Administration and Development*, vol. 19, pp. 403-408.
- Archer, R. (1994), "Markets and good government", in Clayton, A (ed.) *Governance, Democracy and Conditionality: What Role for NGOs?*, Oxford: International NGO Research and Training Centre.
- Bond, P. (2006), "Global governance campaigning and MDGs: from top-down to bottom-up anti-poverty work", *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 339-354.
- Caplan K., Heap S., Nicol A., Plummer J., Simpson S., and Weiser J. (2001), *Flexibility by Design: Lessons from Multi-Sector Partnerships in Water and Sanitation Projects*, Business Partners for Development: Water and Sanitation Cluster, Water Aid, London.
- Chiang, J. T. (2000), "Institutional frameworks and technological paradigms in Japan: Targeting computers, semiconductors, and software", *Technology in Society*, vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 151-174
- Choe, S.C. (2002) "The promise and pitfalls of public-private partnerships in Korea", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 253-259.
- Comaroff, J. L. and Comaroff, J. (1999), "Introduction", in Comaroff, J. L. and Comaroff, J. (eds.) *Civil Society and the Critical Imagination in Africa: Critical Perspectives*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cremer, R. D., de Bruin, A. and Dupuis, A. (2001), "International sister-cities - Bridging the global-local divide", *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 377-401.

- Davis, P. R. and McGregor, J. A. (2000), "Civil society, international donors and poverty in Bangladesh", *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 47-64.
- Escobar, A. and Alvarez, S. (1992), *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy and Democracy*, Boulder: Westview.
- Firman, T. (1999), "From "global city" to "city of crisis": Jakarta Metropolitan Region under economic turmoil", *Habitat International*, vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 447-466.
- Francis, C.B. (2001), "Quasi-public, quasi-private trends in emerging market economies: the case of China", *Comparative Politics*, vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 275-294.
- Gramsci, A. (1971), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hewitt, W.E. (1998), "The role of international municipal cooperation in housing the developing world's urban poor: The Toronto-Sao Paulo example", *Habitat International*, vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 411-427.
- Hewitt, W.E. (1999), "Cities work together to improve urban services in developing areas", *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 27-44.
- Howell, J. and Pearce, J. (2001), *Civil Society and Development: A Critical Exploration*, London: Lynne Rienner.
- Jones, M. L. and Blunt, P. (1999), "'Twinning as a method of sustainable institutional capacity building", *Public Administration and Development*, vol. 19, pp. 81-402.
- Keane, J. (1998) *Civil Society: Old images, New Visions*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kigochie, P. W. (2001), "Squatter rehabilitation projects that support home-based enterprises create jobs and housing: The case of Mathare 4A, Nairobi", *Cities* vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 223-233.
- Mamdani, M. (1996), *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Martland, S.J. (2002), "When gas went out of fashion: The elite of Valparaiso and urban technology", *Eure-Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbanos Regionales*, vol. 27, No. 83, pp. 67-81.
- Mayoux, L. (2005), "Marrying Jekyll with Hyde? Transnational enterprises, pro-poor development and sustainable ethical learning". Available at: <http://www.nextbillion.net/files/MarryingJekyllwithHyde-TNEs.pdf>
- Nijkamp, P., van der Burch, M., and Vindigni, G. (2002), "A comparative institutional evaluation of public-private partnerships in Dutch urban land-use and revitalisation projects", *Urban Studies*, vol. 39, No. 10, pp. 1865-1880.
- Russell, S. and Vidler, E. (2000), "The rise and fall of government - community partnerships for urban development: grassroots testimony from Colombo", *Environment and Urbanization*, vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 73-86.
- Sagalyn, L.B. (2007), "Public/private development: lessons from history, research and practice", *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 73, No 1, pp. 7-22.
- Sarangi, D. (2002), "Infrastructure development: a public-private partnership in India", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 54, No. 2, p. 267-271.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2002), 'Reducing urban poverty: some lessons from experience', Working Paper 11, London: IIED.
- Satterthwaite, D. and Tacoli, C. (2003), "The urban part of rural development: the role of small and intermediate urban centres in rural and regional development and poverty reduction", Working Paper 09, London: IIED.
- Tocqueville, A. d. 1835(1994), *Democracy in America*, London: Everyman.
- UNCHS/ILO (1995), *Shelter Provision and Employment Generation*, Nairobi; UNCHS.
- UNCHS (2001), *Cities in a Globalizing World; Global Report on Human Settlements 2001*, London: Earthscan.
- Van Rooy, A. (1998), *Civil Society and the Aid Industry*, London: Earthscan.

Yamout, G. and Jamali, D. (2007), "A critical assessment of a proposed public-private partnership (PPP) for the management of water services in Lebanon" *Water Resources Management*, vol. 21, No. 3, p. 611-634.

## Appendix: List of Reviewed Partnership Programmes

Country	City	Programme Name	Programme Cost (US\$)	Households	Partner Types
<b>Africa</b>					
Botswana	Gaborone	Housing Low Income People in Botswana	N/A	1,700	4
Egypt	Cairo	Rehabilitation & Upgrading of the Manshiet Nasser Informal Settlement	\$760,000	760	5
Kenya	15 cities	Environment and Urban Development Training Project-(EUDTP)	N/A	N/A	6
Kenya	Mathare Valley	Mathare Youth Self-Help Slum and Environmental Cleanup Project	N/A	30,000	5
Kenya	Nakuru Town	The Integrated Urban Housing Project	N/A	400	5
Kenya	National	Shelter Forum (SF)	N/A	N/A	6
Kenya	Voi	Voi Community Land Trust	N/A	3,000	6
Morocco	Agadir	Shelter Upgrading in Agadir	\$14,000,000	1,400	4
Nigeria	Ibadan	Sustainable Ibadan Project (SIP)	N/A	N/A	6
Zambia	Lusaka	Project Urban Self Help (PUSH II)	\$18,000,000	600,000	6

## Asia

India	Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad: Innovative Urban Partnerships	N/A	40,000	8
India	Chennai	Social and Financial Empowerment of Poor Women in India	\$8,262,500	500,000	7
India	Hyderabad	Integrated Approach to Slum Improvement	\$363,500,000	73,000	6
India	Indore	Slum Networking: Using Slums to Save Cities	\$11,040,000	92,000	6
India	Kukatpally	Integrated Approach to Women's Empowerment	\$11,559,929	N/A	4
India	Lucknow	Artistry That Shapes Destinies: SEWA Lucknow	\$459,459	5,000	2
India	Mumbai	People's Participation Programme: Accessing Land & Shelter in Mumbai	N/A	1,200,000	4
India	Mumbai	Mumbai Alliance	N/A	N/A	6
India	National	Cost-Effective and Appropriate Sanitation Systems	N/A	2,500,000	8
India	National	Innovative Housing Finance and Delivery Mechanisms: The HUDCO Approach	\$3,000,000,000	6,000,000	8
India	National	Poverty Alleviation through Community Participation: UBSP	N/A	2,000,000	7

India	New Delhi	Eco Development, Management, Conservation and Policy Reform	N/A	500,000	4
India	Tamil Nadu	Comprehensive Approach to Urban Development in Tamil Nadu	\$70,000,000	N/A	8
India	Vijayawada	Gender Resource Centre (GRC)	\$50,788,450	24,800	4
Pakistan	Lahore	Lahore Sanitation Programme	N/A	N/A	4
Philippines	Cebu	Women, Home and Community -The Bantay Banay Programme	N/A	N/A	5
Philippines	Manila	Organizing for Land and Housing, Social Inclusion and Human Development	N/A	N/A	4
Philippines	Negros	Socialized and Incremental Housing Project	\$11,545,700	2,630	7
Sri Lanka	Colombo	Sustainable Townships Programme (STP)	\$9,343,200	687	6
Sri Lanka	Colombo	National Housing and Urban Development Authority (Million Houses Programme)	N/A	N/A	6

**South  
America**

Argentina	Buenos Aires	Inter-Sites and services programme in Gran Buenos Aires	\$1,029,600	936	4
Brazil	Diadema	Diadema: Consolidating Innovative Alternatives of Municipal Management	N/A	14,000	4
Brazil	Londrina	Revival Project - PROJETO RENASCER	\$60,000,000	20,000	3
Brazil	National	Team Work of Female-headed Households	\$110,000,000	11,000	5
Brazil	Palmeira	Improved Banking, Palmeira	N/A	870	2
Brazil	Santo Andre	Integrated Programme of social inclusion	N/A	500	6
Brazil	Santo Andre	Reciprocity Waste Recycling Programme	N/A	N/A	4
Brazil	Sao Paolo	International Municipal Cooperation-Integrated Operations	\$71,285,509	7,413	5
Brazil	Sao Paolo	Community Housing Production Programme	\$72,600,000	11,000	4



Brazil	Teresina	Housing, Infrastructure and Poverty Eradication in Slum Areas	\$15,489,589	2,039	4
Peru	Lurigancho	Urban District Consult of Lurigancho Chosica	\$650,000	N/A	4
<b>USA</b>					
	Chattanooga	Affordable Housing, Chattanooga	\$91,000,000	3,460	6

---

**Source:** UN-HABITAT *Best Practices Database*.

## Members of the HS-Net Advisory Board

(who are also the main referees of the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series) 2007-2009

**Dr. Winnie Mitullah**

**HS-Net Chair**

Institute of Development Studies, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

**Prof. Samuel Babatunde Agbola**

Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

**Prof. Louis Albrechts**

Institute for Urban and Regional Planning, Catholic University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

**Prof. Suocheng Dong**

Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, People's Republic of China

**Dr. József Hegedüs**

Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest, Hungary

**Prof. Alfonso Iracheta**

Program of Urban and Environmental Studies, El Colegio Mexiquense, Mexico City, Mexico

**Dr. Graham Tipple**

**HS-Net Vice Chair**

School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

**Prof. Aloysius Mosh**

Department of Architecture and Planning, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana

**Dr. Deike Peters**

Center for Metropolitan Studies, Berlin University of Technology, Berlin, Germany

**Prof. Elliott Sclar**

Centre for Sustainable Urban Development, Columbia University, New York, USA

**Dr. (Ms) Dina K. Shehayeb**

Housing and Building National Research Center (HBNRC), Cairo, Egypt

**Prof. Richard Stren**

Centre of Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

**Mr. A. K. Jain**

Delhi Development Authority,  
New Delhi, India

**Dr. Belinda Yuen**

School of Design and Environment,  
National University of Singapore,  
Singapore

**Ms. Paola Jiron**

Housing Institute, University  
of Chile, Santiago, Chile

### **HS-Net Secretariat**

Policy Analysis Branch, Monitoring and Research Division,  
UN-HABITAT

<http://www.unhabitat.org/categories.asp?catid=328>

**Naison Mutizwa-Mangiza**  
Chief

**Inge Jensen**  
Human Settlements Officer

**Nelly W. Kang'ethe**  
Staff Assistant

**Ben C. Arimah**  
Human Settlements Officer

**Edlam Abera Yemeru**  
Human Settlements Officer

**Naomi Mutiso-Kyalo**  
Secretary

## The UN-HABITAT Lecture Award

The UN-HABITAT Lecture Award is an annual award organized by the Global Research Network on Human Settlements (HS-Net) to recognize outstanding and sustained contribution to research and thinking in the human settlements field. Upon selection, the Award winner will be invited to deliver a thought-provoking lecture during a session of the World Urban Forum or another major international event. The Award winner will also be presented with a commemorative plaque engraved with his/her name and a prize of \$10,000.

The Award seeks to stimulate global dialogue on human settlements issues and capture and disseminate new thinking and trends in addressing the multi-faceted challenges of sustainable human settlements. Furthermore, the Award is designed to enhance the visibility of the Habitat Agenda and of human settlements issues in general. It also keeps UN-HABITAT up to date with current research and thinking on human settlements thereby enriching the content of the *Global Report on Human Settlements*.

The Lecture Award is open to any individual with an outstanding and sustained track record of research in the human settlements field, both urban and rural. The ideal candidate will:

- 1). Have made a significant and original contribution to human settlements research, thinking and practice;
- 2). Have a sustained record of research and publication in reputable refereed journals, or in the form of books and book chapters;
- 3). Have a substantive reputation, evidenced by widespread peer recognition, either globally or regionally;
- 4). Be engaged in innovative research on current human settlements issues; and
- 5). Be a citizen or permanent resident of a country in the region designated for the Lecture Award for the relevant calendar year.

Institutions or individuals can nominate candidates for the award. Individuals may also nominate themselves. The HS-Net Advisory Board, composed of experienced researchers in the human settlements field, serves as the selection committee for the award.

The theme for the lecture may be related to the theme of an upcoming *Global Report on Human Settlements*, or it may be a topical issue, as determined by the Award winner in consultation with the HS-Net Advisory Board. The lecture is widely disseminated through various media, and a written copy of the lecture is posted at the HS-Net website.

**For further information, and to nominate candidates,  
visit the HS-Net website at <http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>**

### UN-HABITAT Lecture Award winners

<b>Year</b>	<b>Award winner</b>	<b>Title of lecture</b>
2006	John Friedmann	The wealth of cities: Towards an assets-based development of urbanizing regions
2007	Martha Schteingart	Urban problems and policies in Latin America: Truths and fallacies

Visit the HS-Net website at  
<http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>  
to access a copy of the lecture.

## Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series: Guidelines for contributors

The HS-Net Secretariat welcomes **submission** of manuscripts for consideration at any time. By submission of a manuscript, an author certifies that the work is original and is not being considered simultaneously by another publisher. It is expected that papers will reflect the wide spectrum of disciplines found within the human settlements field. The submission of papers from practitioners and scholars in the field who represent the policy community as well as the academic community is encouraged. Articles should be methodologically rigorous with either quantitative or qualitative sophistication as necessary. All contributions are refereed. Only those receiving favourable recommendation will be accepted for publication.

**Manuscripts** should be typed on one side of the paper, double spaced, with ample margins, and bear the title of the paper and name(s) of the author(s) on a separate sheet of paper. All pages should be numbered. Papers should normally be 15,000 to 20,000 words in length, and should be written in the English language. Only manuscripts submitted electronically (using MS Word) through the HS-Net website (at <http://www.unhabitat.org/hs-net>) will be accepted.

Manuscripts should contain a list of all **acronyms** and special terms used. Section headings should be numbered (e.g., I.A.1.a.i.). Do not **abbreviate** names of countries, geographical regions or areas. Reduce other abbreviations to a minimum. Use "per cent" instead of "%", unless it is in a quote.

**Tables, graphs, maps, diagrams, and other illustrations** essential to the subject of the paper should be submitted (in black and white only – no colour illustration will be accepted) in a condition suitable for publication. Each of these should be numbered consecutively and referenced in the text. Footnotes should be used only for substantive observations and should be numbered consecutively. Endnotes should not be used.

**References** to books, articles and statistical sources should be identified at the appropriate point in the text by surname of author, year of publication and (where appropriate) page reference, as follows: "UN-HABITAT (2003:23)" or "(UN-HABITAT, 2003:23-25)". In cases where there are more than one reference to an author in the same year, distinguish them by use of letters (a,b,c) attached to the year of publication: (e.g., "2003a"). **Quotations** in the text should have double quotation marks. If a quote is more than three lines, it should be indented.

All references used in the text should be listed in full at the end of the paper as indicated below. All items should be alphabetically listed by author's surname and initial, (providing the full list of multiple authors), date of publication, full title of book, publisher and place of publication. For journal articles provide author's surname and initial, date, full title of article and of journal, volume, number and page reference. Titles of journals should not be abbreviated. URLs should be included when available.

Berner, E., (2002), "Learning from informal markets: innovative approaches to land and housing provision", in Westendorff, D. and Eade, D., (eds.), *Development and cities: Essays from development in practice*, Oxfam, Oxford, pp. 226-247.

Payne, G., (1996), "Strategies for enabling informal settlers to obtain decent housing", Presentation to the NGO workshop on Housing for Low-Income Groups at the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II), June 1996, Istanbul.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Majale, M., (2004), *The urban housing manual: Making regulatory frameworks work for the poor*, Earthscan, London.

Tipple, A.G., (1996), "Housing extensions as sustainable development", *Habitat International*, vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 367-376.

UN-HABITAT (United Nations Human Settlements Programme), (2003), *Rental housing: An essential option for the urban poor in developing countries*, Nairobi. Available at <http://www.unhabitat.org/programmes/housingpolicy/pubrental.asp>.

Manuscripts should be submitted along with, on separate sheets of paper, **two abstracts** of maximum 50 words and 250 words respectively (to be used by UN-HABITAT for promotional purposes). The longer of the two abstracts should contain a summary of the following aspects of the paper: (a) objective(s); (b) methodology used (if this is considered necessary by the author); (c) main findings; and (d) five keywords. Author(s) should also submit, on a separate sheet of paper, a **short review** (200 words maximum) of his/her previous publications, present occupation and research interests; and appropriate contact details of the author(s), which should contain (at least), name, designation, institution of employment and e-mail address.

**Proofs** will be sent to authors before the paper is published. They should be corrected and returned to the publisher within one week. Major alterations to the text cannot be accepted at this stage. Authors of papers accepted for publication will receive ten copies of the published paper free of charge.

**Copyright.** It is a condition of publication that authors vest copyright in their articles, including abstracts, in UN-HABITAT. This enables us to ensure full copyright protection and to disseminate the paper, to the widest possible readership in print and electronic formats as appropriate. Authors may, of course, use the article elsewhere after publication without prior permission from UN-HABITAT, provided that acknowledgement is given to UN-HABITAT and the Human Settlements Global Dialogue Series as the original source of publication, and that the HS-Net Secretariat (e-mail: [hs-net@unhabitat.org](mailto:hs-net@unhabitat.org)). Authors are themselves responsible for obtaining permission to reproduce copyright material from other sources.