



DREAM DEFERRED? BROKEN TRUST AND THE UPGRADING OF LANGRUG INFORMAL SETTLEMENT

Kwanda Lande and Yolande Hendler - Community Organisation Resource Centre

'It feels like we are standing still. How can we continue working together when we have not managed to complete existing projects?' (Meeting 29 May 2018¹). The sense of frustration was evident as members of the Langrug Community Projects Committee (LCPC) expressed their views about informal settlement upgrading initiatives in Langrug. Although not stated explicitly, a core aspect of the LCPC's question revolved around trust and the certainty of follow-through. These sentiments, along with the destruction and disruption of some informal settlement upgrading projects in Langrug² beg for critical reflection on our practice as the South African SDI Alliance³ and that of various actors involved in Langrug.



IN THE 2014 State of Local Governance publication, Tshabalala and Mwau (2014) highlighted the Alliance's collaborative approach to informal settlement upgrading projects in Langrug as being instrumental in building social cohesion and resilient communities. This approach was adopted in a context where the municipality had long tried to provide services through ad hoc, top-down methods with no success (Bradlow 2015). Kumar and Robyn (2016) make a point that this new approach in Langrug was characterised by a

community-led agenda, in which decision-making was not solely located in the state but shared between all parties. The approach thereby also resonated with aspirations set out in the 1998 White Paper on Local Government, including the provision of sustainable services through partnerships between local government and CBOs/NGOs.

By April 2016, repeated incidents of vandalism had culminated in the complete destruction of an upgrading project in Langrug – the Mandela Park

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WaSH) facility (du Preez and Malan 2016; Meiring 2017). The construction of a second WaSH and multi-purpose facility began in 2014. Known as the 'Innovation Centre', this facility is located in the Zwelitsha section of Langrug. By 2016, the construction of this facility had not yet been completed and, while it stood vacant, surrounding residents reported interspersed incidents of vandalism (CORC City Fund 2016⁴). This vandalism was a stark indication that 'the dream' of scaled up service delivery, an organised community and a sustainable model for upgrading, while once robust, had become brittle.

This paper investigates the dynamics contributing to the destruction and disruption of these two WaSH facilities, and engages with the perceived breach of trust as expressed by the LCPC and shares emerging responses from the SA SDI Alliance and the LCPC. While the paper recognises the inherent presence of conflict and contestation in collaborative upgrading processes (Bradlow 2015), it also seeks to uncover 'the generative potential of contestation' through which new options and alternatives can arise (Cirolia et al. 2016: 19). In this sense, this paper is a case-specific retrospective that may also have relevance for relationship building between informal settlement communities, local governments and support organisations elsewhere.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is informed by a mixed methods research approach. The research focuses on community organising and upgrading processes in Langrug since the Alliance's first engagement with the settlement in 2012 and with Stellenbosch municipality in 2010/2011. This study aims to investigate and learn from some of the setbacks that occurred in this period. The context in which this research took place was one in which the Alliance and community members affiliated to the

LCPC were engaged in a process of building trust. This process is underway because when initially approached about this research, LCPC members indicated that they would not support new projects or research without completing existing projects. In this light, the Alliance made use of the trust-building process with the LCPC as an avenue to draw insight for this study. The Alliance conducted four interviews with community-based actors (including the LCPC) who were involved with both WaSH facilities. These interviews with community members and project implementers provided valuable insight into the implementation and progression of these projects. Additional sources of data included extensive archived documentation by the Alliance, academic and policy documents, project reports, newspaper articles, and websites.

LANGRUG UPGRADING PARTNERSHIP

In the Alliance, Langrug holds a special status as a learning centre for other Federation of the Urban Poor (FEDUP) and Informal Settlement Network (ISN) affiliated communities due to the particular nature of the partnership between Langrug community, Stellenbosch municipality, and the Alliance. The partnership was initiated after the municipality approached ISN and the Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC) in 2010/2011 to partner with its newly established Informal Settlement Management department (Kumar and Robyn 2016), as the municipality recognised that it could not deliver services alone due to challenges associated with limited resources and community mobilisation that was required to facilitate interventions (Siame 2013). The partnership was celebrated as precedent setting because of the nature of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that was signed in 2012 between CORC (on behalf

of the SA SDI Alliance) and Stellenbosch municipality (Siame 2013).

The MoU provided a framework for implementing upgrading projects and enabling social facilitation to build capacity among informal settlement residents; it made provision for the establishment of an Urban Poor Fund with joint financial contributions and management by the municipality, CORC and the community. The MoU 'departed from a service delivery agreement [and made it possible] to service settlements rapidly without too much red tape' (Kumar and Robyn 2016: 224; see also Bradlow 2015). The MoU envisaged the upgrading of Langrug as encompassing settlement-based data collection, savings and capacity building of residents to manage small-scale and incremental partnership projects (Kumar and Robyn 2016). In addition to some improvements in service delivery in the community, the partnership resulted in short-term work for community members on upgrading projects (Bradlow 2015).

The challenge of the Langrug partnership, however, was the lack of a well organised, municipal-wide (Stellenbosch) and settlement-wide grassroots structures (Bradlow 2015). This scenario stood in contrast to the Alliance's experience in Cape Town, where the ISN had begun networking at settlement level before engaging the City of Cape Town for a partnership. Therefore, before partnering with the municipality, Langrug did not have a widely mobilised population, which meant that, concerning Langrug, pressure on Stellenbosch municipality was not so much exerted by Langrug residents as it was by the wider networks of ISN as a nation-wide structure, CORC, as a nation-wide NGO, and SDI, as a global network with grassroots mobilisation.

At the inception of the partnership, part of the agreement was to start a process of planning and preparation for upgrading projects, while FEDUP and

ISN were simultaneously mobilising Langrug residents to lead their community process of upgrading. In the case of the municipality, CORC acted as the initial intermediary and the assumption was that once the community was mobilised, they would lead the process and CORC would provide support (Kumar and Robyn 2016). However, due to weak community structures, in particular a weak presence of FEDUP and ISN practices in Langrug, CORC remained the Alliance's primary interlocutor with the municipality (Bradlow 2013).

LANGRUG INITIATIVES ARISING THROUGH THE MOU

One of the first partnership initiatives in Langrug was to form leadership committees, which consisted of 14 lower level street committees (Bradlow 2015). The aim was to organise the community to be able to determine community priorities, deepen leadership accountability, and manage projects (Bradlow 2015). In the same year, the people of Langrug also carried out an enumeration. The outcome of this enumeration emphasised poor service delivery in Langrug, but also opened up dialogue between Stellenbosch municipality and the community of Langrug (Kumar and Robyn 2016). Within Langrug, the impact of the enumeration became evident when the community established different portfolios to focus on crucial matters such as health, education, water and sanitation, and greywater (Kumar and Robyn 2016).

In particular, the health portfolio was of great assistance in paving the way for a partnership between a local hospice and the community (Kumar and Robyn 2016). These partners organised and facilitated different public events that were aimed at raising awareness and disseminating information about HIV/AIDS and antiretroviral therapy (Kumar and Robyn 2016). Similarly, water and sanitation, and greywater portfolios anchored the construction

of various projects, including the installation of pipes to manage greywater run-off, water taps, toilets, and internal relocations (within the settlement) to avoid flood risk (Kumar and Hendler 2014, Tshabalala, 2013, Kumar and Robyn 2016). In 2011 and early 2012, the initial Langrug partnership was expanded to involve academic and research institutions, including the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) and the University of Cape Town (UCT) (Tshabalala, 2013). According to Bradlow (2015), UCT supported the community of Langrug to develop a long-term vision for the settlement that included design and policy strategies for accessing the benefits of the Upgrading Informal Settlements Programme (UISP). The UISP is a subsidy instrument designed to deal specifically with requirements of informal settlements (Department of Human Settlements 2010). At this point in time, however, attempts to access funding for Langrug through the UISP were unsuccessful since the Western Cape Department of Human Settlements (WCDoHS) deemed the total household figure in the application inaccurate (du Preez and Malan 2016, Kumar and Robyn 2016). Meanwhile, WPI, together with CORC, Stellenbosch Municipality, and community representatives supported the process of conceptualising the Mandela Park WaSH facility, which was completed in 2013 (Tshabalala, 2013). According to Tshabalala (2013), WPI also made financial contributions by sponsoring the construction of the Mandela Park WaSH facility. In addition, the municipality, through the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP), created work for community members during construction and to maintain the facility (Meiring 2017). The EPWP is a government programme aimed at developing skills for community members and reducing levels of poverty and unemployment by providing temporary employment (Meiring 2017). In 2014, the construction of the Innovation Centre in Zwelitsha, an upper section of

Langrug, began. In this project the community of Langrug, WPI, Touching the Earth Lightly (TEL)⁵, CORC and Stellenbosch municipality provided financial and/or technical contributions (Kumar and Hendler, 2014). The construction of this facility was motivated by the lack of sanitation facilities in the area.

LANGRUG INITIATIVES ARISING AFTER THE MOU EXPIRED

In 2015, the MoU, which outlined the Langrug partnership and funding commitments for three years, came to an end. The Alliance began seeking alternative funding avenues to continue supporting community organising and upgrading initiatives in Langrug. Habitat for Humanity South Africa⁶ (HFHSA) and the SA SDI Alliance decided to follow up on the previous UISP application that was submitted to the WCDoHS. According to du Preez and Malan (2016), both organisations decided to approach Stellenbosch Municipality with intentions of completing and submitting another application for informal settlement upgrading in Langrug. At this time, a Professional Resource Team (PRT)⁷ was already appointed for Stellenbosch municipality to implement UISP projects (du Preez and Malan 2016). As a result, the Alliance and HFHSA started engaging with this team, and this evolved into an agreement that both the Alliance and HFHSA should complete some of the UISP project deliverables, which were initially assigned to the PRT (du Preez and Malan 2016).

In an attempt to carry out the work of completing the UISP deliverables, both the Alliance and HFHSA signed a sub-consultancy agreement which required

It became evident that many members of the community were no longer motivated to drive their identified development priority, including the additionally identified multi-purpose centre.

these organisations to work together to achieve three related goals. These goals included the development of a detailed informal settlement upgrading plan, a sustainable livelihoods framework, and to facilitate a capacity building programme. Moreover, the Alliance was also asked to facilitate another household enumeration. According to du Preez and Malan (2016), HFHSA was instrumental in supporting the formulation of a community action plan (CAP), which was the outcome of the sustainable livelihood framework developed together with community members from Langrug. In this plan, the community proposed a new multi-purpose centre, which was an addition to the Mandela Park WASH Facility and Innovation Centre (du Preez and Malan (2016).

Du Preez and Malan (2016) mention that in 2016, HFHSA made some funding available for the construction of the new multi-purpose centre. However, HFHSA had to return the funding due to numerous community issues that emerged at the time (du Preez and Malan (2016). Du Preez and Malan (2016) note that at this time, it became evident that many members of the community were no longer motivated to drive their identified development priority, including the additionally identified multi-purpose centre. In parallel, both the Mandela WASH facility and the Innovation Centre were being increasingly vandalised and misused rendering the area unsafe. In the midst of engagements by some community leaders to deal with these problems, word got out in the community that some members of the leadership intended to demolish the facility and use material to build the new multi-purpose centre (du Preez and Malan 2016). The community took it on themselves to demolish this structure and all the material disappeared into the settlement (du Preez and Malan (2016).

The latest initiative in Langrug is the Genius of Place (GOP) project, a collaboration between

BiomimicrySA, Informal South⁸ and the Western Cape Government's 110% Green initiative. This project was conceptualised in 2015 with the aim of addressing wastewater and solid waste challenges. The initiative involves the installation of drainage systems that filter water before it runs down the pipeline to prevent blockage and to treat water before it is used. In this project, the Langrug Community Projects Committee (LCPC) was established as a community structure that would drive the project (Sonxi interview 2018)⁹. According to Sonxi (Interview 2018)¹⁰, this committee has evolved to become a structure that oversees all projects in Langrug. It was elected through a general meeting and consists of community leaders affiliated to ISN, ward committee members, members of the Siyazama disabled initiative, and members of the community (Sonxi interview 2018).

RE-ENGAGING LANGRUG AT THIS POINT IN TIME

Recently, two new opportunities for collaboration around informal settlement upgrading have emerged in Stellenbosch between the Alliance and the Western Cape Department for Human Settlements. One opportunity is related to a pledge of R10 million for informal settlement upgrading that the provincial minister of Human Settlements, Bonginkosi Madikizela, had made to the Alliance after visiting a settlement in Cape Town¹¹ that had been upgraded and re-blocked with the support of the Alliance. This commitment was confirmed at a meeting held in 2015 where the minister outlined the background to the pledge agreement and introduced the Alliance to various heads of department. Since then, there have been some difficulties to unlock the R10 million pledge, in particular in the context of Cape Town.

According to Hendricks (interview 27 July 2018¹²), a first difficulty was that province had to establish how to handle procurement processes to

make the R10 million available without going out to tender. A second difficulty was that these funds required a partnership with a municipality, because that is where they were going to be implemented. The City of Cape Town, which was initially identified as a partner municipality, underwent organisational restructuring which made it difficult for the City to co-sign a partnership agreement with CORC (Hendricks interview 27 July 2018); this resulted in the Alliance identifying the Stellenbosch municipality as partner through which to implement the R10 million pledge. Additionally, the Alliance was convinced, based on discussion with the municipality, that the municipality would sign off and endorse this proposal (Hendricks interview 27 July 2018).

A second avenue of collaboration with the province emerged out of a joint and sustained advocacy initiative between urban sector NGOs in Cape Town. Together, these organisations successfully engaged the province about an increased financial allocation for intermediaries conducting social facilitation in UISP projects. The engagement culminated in an agreement whereby some of these NGOs and associated community movements (including, CORC on behalf of the Alliance) would play a key role in supporting informal settlement upgrading initiatives in various municipalities in the province. In the case of Langrug, these opportunities represent the possibility for renewed, more sustained engagement with Stellenbosch municipality and direct access to support for community-led design and informal settlement upgrading projects.

WHAT WENT WRONG IN LANGRUG?

There is a growing body of literature that critically interrogates the impact of various development interventions in Langrug (see Bradlow 2015, 2013;

Tshabalala and Mwau 2014; Meiring 2017; Siame 2013; Cirolia et al. 2016; Fieuw and Mwau 2016; Kumar and Robyn 2016; du Preez and Malan 2016). The research highlights power relations, divisions in community leadership, and community ownership as challenges that have arisen during upgrading in Langrug. One of the less developed aspects in this body of literature is a critical reflection on the role of supporting organisations. In this section, some of the engagements and projects that took place in Langrug since 2010 will be interrogated to understand 'what went wrong' in Langrug.

INCOMPLETE PROJECTS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

In Langrug, residents are convinced that most of the supporting organisations that were involved in various initiatives have disappeared and that the Alliance is one of the few organisations that is still present in the community (Meeting 21 June 2018)¹³. In addition, community members and leaders affiliated to the LCPC understand that most of the other support organisations that assisted the community were introduced to the community by the Alliance (Meeting 21 June 2018). For example, in the case of the Innovation Centre, Langrug residents indicated that they were initially not aware of most support organisations that were involved until the Alliance introduced them to the community. Additionally, these residents highlight that a working agreement that outlines the roles and responsibilities of all organisations that were involved in the construction of the facility was drawn up in their absence and that they were merely informed about it verbally (Meeting 6 June 2018)¹⁴.

Existing local realities of hierarchy, gatekeeping, and powerbrokers have worked against some of the aims of the Alliance, which include the building of social capacity.

Community residents of Langrug that attended a meeting on 6 June 2018 with the Alliance made the point that it was difficult for them to hold supporting organisations accountable, especially when some of these organisations ceased work before project completion. Hence, these residents hold the Alliance accountable since most of the organisations that were working in Langrug were introduced to the community by the Alliance. According to Glenn (interview 2018)¹⁵, some of the reasons why some projects were not completed include community politics (over who should control resources), lack of motivation, and leadership capacity to allow benefits of projects to filter down to a household level. Du Preez and Malan (2016), and Ley (2015) have also written about these challenges and the role that they play in relation to the objectives of the Alliance.

Ley (2015) argues that existing local realities of hierarchy, gatekeeping, and powerbrokers have worked against some of the aims of the Alliance, which include the building of social capacity. Du Preez and Malan (2016) write about how tensions were created with ISN coordinators once another community structure was created to oversee all processes regarding the development of a new multi-purpose centre. This feedback emerged from a meeting that the Alliance held with community leaders affiliated to the LCPC on 21 June 2018. In this meeting, community leaders mentioned that a perception was created in Langrug that the Mandela Park WaSH facility belonged to a group of five community leaders and that it was not accessible to other community members. This belief was a result of a 'handover' process that was attended by Stellenbosch municipality, which was understood by residents as 'handing over' authority of the facility to this group of leaders. This misunderstanding was a source of mistrust and conflict in the settlement, which may have played a contributing role in the

eventual demolishing of the facility since it was perceived as only benefiting a small group of community leaders (Meeting 29 May 2018)¹⁶.

CONTRADICTIONS IN BUILDING COMMUNITY 'OWNERSHIP'

It is crucial to understand what 'ownership' means in Langrug since the destruction and vandalism of some projects in this settlement is attributed to the lack of community ownership of the process and projects. Du Preez and Malan (2016: 12) write that in Langrug 'an effective leadership structure, capable to lead and take ownership of their own development could not be detected'. Du Preez and Malan (2016) further note that when HFHSA engaged with the community around some of the NUSP project deliverables (with the PRT and the Alliance), there were few committed individuals which was perceived as a divided leadership structure that struggled to take decisions and drive projects. One of the consequences of the lack of ownership was that supporting organisations began 'driving' meetings and development decisions, which is in stark contrast to the principles and approaches of many support organisations that were involved in Langrug (du Preez and Malan 2016).

In a meeting held on 21 June 2018 between the Alliance and Langrug community leaders affiliated to the LCPC, leaders explained that it was difficult to take ownership of the process since their involvement in the process was limited. For example, these leaders made the point that community members of Langrug did not participate in the budget process of most of the projects (meeting 21 June 2018); this created tensions in the community, especially when projects remained incomplete because ordinary community members started blaming their leaders, accusing them and the associated support organisations of corruption (meeting 06 June 2018).

According to Masiy (Interview 2018)¹⁷, this scenario had a detrimental impact on the credibility and legitimacy of many leaders that worked very closely with supporting organisations since they were instrumental in convincing the community to support the development process.

POWER IMBALANCES BETWEEN ACTORS IN LANGRUG

Hlatshayo (2017), writing in the context of how the EPWP has been implemented in South Africa in general, identifies issues of patronage and nepotism as major factors that prevent equal access to benefits of the programme by community members; in the context of Langrug the same challenges have been experienced. Meiring (2017) writes that community negotiation over jobs for both Mandela Park WaSH facility and Innovation Centre was driven by politics of exclusion that is territorial and gendered. It was territorial and gendered since women who had voluntarily continued maintaining the facilities (even after payment ceased), were pushed out by a group of men claiming jobs for the residents of their section in Langrug. Additionally, in the midst of constructing the Innovation Centre in Zwelitsha, a female project leader had to make way for a long-standing male community leader more aligned to the Alliance. According to Meiring (2017), this female leader believes that the reason for her removal was because another community leader used his proximity to powerful partners such as CORC to ‘backstab’ her.

Power imbalances between the state and partners in similar partnerships were also observed by Pal (2006), who writes that state actors often use a constitutional mandate argument for legitimacy, to place themselves above other partners in terms of controlling the programme and approach. In Langrug, this power imbalance became evident especially

It is crucial to understand what ‘ownership’ means in Langrug since the destruction and vandalism of some projects in this settlement is attributed to the lack of community ownership of the process and projects.

during the second enumeration, where contradictions in approach between the Alliance and Stellenbosch municipality arose. While conducting an enumeration under the NUSP/PRT work, budget was allocated to pay a stipend to enumerators, which is not a practice that the Alliance follows during enumerations, as broad-based enumeration is not a mere data gathering exercise for the Alliance but, perhaps more significantly, a community mobilisation tool. Therefore, one can view this particular enumeration as marking the different nature of engagement between these actors, one in which the municipality played a more dominant and arguably more powerful role. According to du Preez and Malan (2016), a consequence of this payment was that people were no longer motivated to participate in the process once payment was stopped.

EMERGING RESPONSES ON BUILDING TRUST IN LANGRUG

The SA SDI Alliance and LCPC are currently engaged in a process of building trust between each other with the aim of supporting broad-based community organising in Langrug. Both parties have agreed to complete the Innovation Centre and to use this process as a learning moment that would inform a way forward in Langrug and offer learning for community organising in other settlements in Stellenbosch municipality. Moreover, both parties have agreed to work together in interrogating new opportunities in terms of benefits and disadvantages arising from the provincial pledge and ISSP engagements.

UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING OF BUILDING TRUST IN LANGRUG

In this paper, the authors are aware that understandings of 'trust' may differ, depending on context, and that the process of building trust itself may be politicised since informal settlement upgrading and community organising involves negotiating different interests and loci of power. In the initial phases of the Stellenbosch partnership, Kumar and Robyn (2016) note that follow through on practical actions and projects was a building block of trust. When speaking about informal settlement upgrading, Cirolia *et al.* (2016) suggest that building trust is at the foundation of participation. What can the (re)building of trust therefore look like in Langrug?

For the Alliance, completing the Innovation Centre is an important building block of trust as it signals to the community and its leaders that the Alliance is committed to continue supporting Langrug to self-organise and engage the municipality. For the Alliance, a significant marker of trust expressed by community leaders affiliated to the LCPC and Langrug residents, would be a continued willingness to include the Alliance, especially FEDUP and ISN, in community mobilisation efforts and to include the Alliance in general community meetings, which are often spaces in which the legitimacy of existing community leaders becomes apparent.

Additionally, trust between the Alliance and the LCPC is being built on the basis that a broad-based representation of residents, as a whole, should own project preparation for upgrading and manage assets that arise out of upgrading projects. Over the years, the ISN has experienced a high, almost annual turnover of leadership bodies in Langrug, who were

elected in general community meetings (Meeting 03 July 2018). The LCPC is the most recent community structure elected to look after projects in Langrug. The trend was generally that after a few weeks, only a quarter of elected leaders would partake in leadership requirements. In response, the Alliance is challenging itself to reassess what 'community' and 'representation' mean in Langrug.

RE-ASSESSING REPRESENTATION AND COMMUNITY

The Alliance acknowledges the presence of diverse and conflicting interests and actors in a community, in particular that social cohesion changes over time with different groups supporting different agendas (Smit *et al.* 2016). Indeed, a definition of a community would be one that is characterised by a group of people with diverse interests but linked to one another by social ties, and who engage in joint action for mutual upliftment, which can consistently change and vary over time (MacQueen *et al.* 2001). From this view, particularly, the necessity for legitimate, broad-based and relevant representation is important. In terms of understanding who in the community is represented by a particular actor or leadership body, ISN and FEDUP have indicated the critical nature of going 'deeper than leadership structures' and taking leadership decisions back to general community meetings, where the extent of attendance by ordinary community members provides insight into the extent of support for existing leaders (Meeting 03 July 2018). Thus, a general meeting was planned, where all decisions and a way forward would be discussed with the broader community.

In a meeting held on 21 June 2018, leaders affiliated to the LCPC noted that they were given a 'mandate' by the community to take ownership of the Innovation Centre, in terms of completing and maintaining the project. The LCPC originally wanted

When speaking about informal settlement upgrading, Cirolia *et al.* (2016) suggest that building trust is at the foundation of participation.

CORC to hand over the Innovation Centre to them, not realising that they needed to seek this mandate from community members residing in Zwelitsha section of Langrug who are the rightful owners of the project and to whom the leadership is accountable (Meeting 03 July 2018). It was made clear that CORC does not own any project in Langrug and that CORC cannot be in a position to determine which actors are in charge of maintaining projects in Langrug (Meeting 03 July 2018). The Alliance has therefore challenged the LCPC to garner its legitimacy to maintain the facility from broad-based support of Zwelitsha residents. For FEDUP and ISN (Meeting 21 June 2018) it is key that community leadership structures wanting to manage community assets must do so through the endorsement of their community, whom they must be accountable to.

Another important commitment regarding the long-term management of the Innovation Centre was noted by the LCPC in a meeting held on 21 June 2018. This group of leaders mentioned that they had approached the municipality to assist with electrifying the facility and providing EPWP workers to clean the facility, which the municipality had agreed to. Of the 50 EPWP workers that will be employed in Langrug by Stellenbosch municipality, the LCPC requested three EPWP workers to clean the facility on a regular basis. Currently, proposed long-term solutions include linking the Innovation Centre to an already running solid waste programme (the Genius of Space project) in the settlement, which may assist with leveraging funds to maintain the structure. Additionally, the LCPC has indicated linking the Innovation Centre to tourism activities in the settlement.

CONCLUSION

While the Stellenbosch partnership was celebrated for its precedent-setting and creative nature, this paper has engaged with a different, and perhaps more

While the Stellenbosch partnership was celebrated for its precedent-setting and creative nature, this paper has engaged with a different, and perhaps more subtle aspect of creativity, namely that 'creativity does not only take place in the moment of "innovation" but also in the commitment to repair and rework things that did not go well'

subtle aspect of creativity, namely that 'creativity does not only take place in the moment of "innovation" but also in the commitment to repair and rework things that did not go well' (Meiring 2017:25, quoting Jackson 2004) - for the Alliance, the critical self-engagement, and retrospective approach reflected in this paper, has been such an endeavour. In addition, this process is contributing to Alliance learning on how alternatives in practice can be negotiated and adapted.

By engaging with points of tension and conflict between the Alliance and Langrug residents, in particular community leaders that are affiliated to the LCPC, some of the dynamics that contributed to the destruction of the Mandela Park WaSH facility and the discontinuation of upgrading at the Innovation Centre became evident. In addition to existing reports and research by partner organisations, writings by colleagues and academics on Langrug provided further insight into what went wrong.

In particular, this paper has looked at these dynamics through the effects of supporting NGOs in the Stellenbosch partnership, and in Langrug in particular. The Alliance recognises the detrimental effect of these dynamics, most notably that planning and meetings around projects should not be led by supporting NGOs. It needs to be emphasised that CORC is a support organisation to FEDUP and ISN who, in the set-up of the Alliance, take the role of primary actors. Further challenges in Langrug related to multiple differences in power, which include power dynamics between Langrug community members, the Alliance and the municipality.

If partnerships are indeed a 'modality for participation' (Cirolia *et al.* 2016: 9), they offer the potential to change patterns in decision-making. However, if trust is breached, the approach to participatory informal settlement upgrading in a particular context needs to be questioned. For the Alliance, the questions asked and insights gained were timely. As the Alliance finds itself in a position to offer continued support to Langrug through new opportunities for sustained engagement with Stellenbosch municipality, it has been critical to draw insights that would inform an alternative approach going forward.

These insights include, firstly, completing the Innovation Centre as a demonstration of commitment

and a stepping stone towards rebuilding trust between the Alliance, community leaders and residents of Zwelitsha section of Langrug. Secondly, the Alliance is clarifying when and in what way it is appropriate for supporting organisations (such as CORC) to step into the upgrading process. Thirdly, the Alliance is re-assessing its engagement with the notions of 'representation' and 'community', conceiving of both as containing and needing to be answerable to diverse interests and agendas. A fourth, critical insight, relates to adapting community mobilisation to the particular geographical and socio-political context of Langrug, which differs significantly to other contexts.

REFERENCES

- Bradlow BH (2013) *Quiet Conflict: Social Movements, Institutional Change, and Upgrading Informal Settlements in South Africa*. Massachusetts: Unpublished Thesis, MIT.
- Bradlow BH (2015) *Quiet Conflict: Institutional Change, Informal Settlement Upgrading, and Formalized Partnerships Between Local Authorities and Urban Social Movements in South Africa*. In Herreria P Ley A and Fokdal J (ed.) *From Local to Global Networks: Housing the Global Poor*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Cirolia LR, Gorgens T, van Donk M, Smit W and Drimie S (2016) *Upgrading informal Settlements in South Africa: An introduction*. In Cirolia LR, Gorgens T, van Donk M, Smit W and Drimie S (eds.) *Upgrading Informal Settlements in South Africa: A Partnership-Based Approach*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Department of Provincial and Local Government (DoPLG) (1998) *The White Paper on Local Government*. Pretoria: DoPLG.
- Department of Human Settlement (DoHS) (2010) *National Housing Policy And Subsidy Programmes*. Pretoria: DoHS.
- Du Preez M and Malan H (2016) *The story of Langrug: Lessons learnt through the eyes of a support organisation*. Cape Town: Habitat for Humanity South Africa.
- Fieuw W and Mwau B (2016) *Creating 'urban commons': Towards a sustainable informal settlement upgrading paradigm in South Africa*. In Cirolia LR, Gorgens T, van Donk M, Smit W and Drimie S. (eds.) *Upgrading Informal Settlements in South Africa: A Partnership-Based Approach*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Hlatshwayo MS(2017) *The Expanded Public Works Programme: Perspectives of direct beneficiaries*. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 13(1), 1-8.
- Kumar Aand Hendler Y(2014) *Building the Siphumelele WaSH facility/Innovation Centre in Langrug, Stellenbosch*. <http://sasdialliance.org.za/building-the-siphumelele-wash-facility-innovation-centre-in-langrug-stellenbosch/>.
- Kumar A and Robyn J (2016) *Who needs partnerships? An informal settlement upgrading partnership framework*. In Cirolia LR, Gorgens T, van Donk M, Smit W and Drimie S (eds.) *Upgrading Informal Settlements in South Africa: A Partnership-Based Approach*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Langrug Community (2011) *Langrug Enumeration Report*. Stellenbosch Municipality: Informal Settlement Network, Community Organization Resource Centre.
- Ley A (2015) *Entangled or empowered? Networks of grassroots organizations and NGOs in housing and human settlement process*. In Haferburg C and Huchzermeyer M (eds.) *Urban Governance in Post-Apartheid Cities: Modes of Engagement in South Africa's Metropolises*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- MacQueen KM, McLellan E, Metzger DS, Kegeles S, Strauss RP, Scotti R, Blanchard, L and Trotter RT (2001) *What is community? An evidence-based definition for participatory public health*. *Am J Public Health*, 91(12) 1929–1938.
- Meiring R (2017) *A case study of women's households, sanitation and care in Zwelitsha, an informal settlement section in Stellenbosch Municipality*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

- Pal A (2006) Scope for Bottom-up Planning in Kolkata: Rhetoric Vs Reality, *Environment and Urbanisation*, 18(2), 501-521.
- Siame G (2013) The Institutional Dynamics of Participatory Slum-Upgrading Process: The Case of Langrug Informal Settlement. Unpublished MSc. Thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Smit W, Cirolia LR, Gorgens T, van Donk M and Drimie S (2016) Conclusion: Reflecting on informal settlement upgrading experiences in South Africa. In Cirolia LR, Gorgens T, van Donk, M, Smit W and Drimie S (eds.) *Upgrading Informal Settlements in South Africa: A Partnership-Based Approach*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Tshabalala T and Mwau B (2014) Beyond the numbers: Langrug wash facility as a community space. In Good Governance Learning Network (ed.) *Community Resilience and Vulnerability in South Africa*. Cape Town: The State of Local Governance Publication.
- Tshabalala T (2013) *The Langrug Wash Facility a New Common Space for the Community*. Available: <https://www.sasdialliance.org.za/langrug-wash-facility-a-new-common-space-for-the-community/>

MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS

- SA SDI Alliance meeting with leaders affiliated with the LCPC, 29 May 2018, Stellenbosch.
- SA SDI Alliance meeting with leaders affiliated with LCPC, and Zwelitsha residents, in Langrug, 06 June 2018, Stellenbosch.
- SA SDI Alliance meeting with community leaders affiliated to the LCPC, 21 June 2018, Cape Town.
- Internal SA SDI Alliance Meeting on Stellenbosch municipality, 3 July 2018, Cape Town.
- Internal CORC City Fund Meeting minutes, 26 May 2016, Cape Town.
- Interview with Trevor Masiy, ISN Coordinator in Stellenbosch Municipality 06 June 2018, Cape Town.
- Interview with Solomon Sonxi, Chairperson of LCPC, 25 July 2018, Cape Town.
- Interview with Chadernmay Glenn, CORC technical support professional, 26 July 2018, Cape Town.
- Interview with Moegsien Hendricks, CORC Project Manager Informal Settlement Upgrade, 27 July 2018, Cape Town.

NOTES

- ¹ SA SDI Alliance meeting with Leaders affiliated to LCPC, 29 May 2018, Stellenbosch.
- ² In this paper, the term “Langrug” always denotes Langrug informal settlement in Stellenbosch municipality, Western Cape.
- ³ The South African SDI Alliance supports urban poor communities to find solutions to homelessness, landlessness, and poverty through building organised communities and collaborative partnerships. The Alliance includes a membership based social movement, the Federation of the Urban Poor (FEDUP) and an issue-based network of the urban poor, the Informal Settlement Network (ISN). The Community Organisation Resource Centre (CORC) supports FEDUP and ISN.
- ⁴ Internal CORC City Fund meeting minutes, 26 May 2016.
- ⁵ Touching the Earth Lightly is a green design company that combines people, design and conservation. Projects have included producing low-tech, replicable solutions that respond to fires and flooding.
- ⁶ Habitat for Humanity South Africa is a non-profit organisation that supports communities in breaking the poverty cycle through participatory advocacy and awareness initiatives.
- ⁷ The Professional Resource Team (PRT) was a team tasked, through the National Upgrading Support Programme (NUSP), to assist Stellenbosch Local Municipality with conducting participatory-based planning for informal settlement upgrading. NUSP is an implementing arm of the National Department of Human Settlements (NDoHS) tasked specifically with the roll out of the UISP.
- ⁸ Both BiomimicrySA and Informal South are organisations consisting of scientists, engineers, architects and innovators that seek to promote the study and imitation of designs that utilise nature to create sustainable technologies.
- ⁹ Interview with Solomon Sonxi, Chairperson of LCPC, 25 July 2018. Cape Town.
- ¹⁰ Interview with Solomon Sonxi, Chairperson of LCPC, 25 July 2018. Cape Town.
- ¹¹ Flamingo Crescent/Heights in Lansdowne, Cape Town
- ¹² Interview with Moegsien Hendricks, CORC Project Manager – Informal Settlement Upgrading, 27 July 2018, Cape Town
- ¹³ SA SDI Alliance and community members affiliated to the LCPC Meeting 21 June 2018.
- ¹⁴ SA SDI Alliance meeting with leaders affiliated to the LCPC, and Zwelitsha residents, in Langrug, 06 June 2018, Stellenbosch.
- ¹⁵ Interview with Chadernmay Glenn, CORC technical support professional, 26 July 2018, Cape Town.
- ¹⁶ SA SDI Alliance meeting with leaders affiliated with the LCPC, 29 May 2018, Stellenbosch.
- ¹⁷ Interview with Trevor Masiy, ISN coordinator in Stellenbosch Municipality 06 June 2018. Cape Town.