

Case study summary matrix

Case study institutions/areas	Delivery context	Access	Institutions, governance and regulation	Participation
<p>iLembe DM and Siza Water Pty Ltd</p> <p>Private concession alongside a municipal WSP within the same municipal district</p>	<p>Impoverished, largely rural, district with growing urban settlements and elite coastal develop strip.</p> <p>Concession arrangement emerged from late 1990s interim municipal restructuring, during which the concession was proposed by national government advisors as best route to meet growing delivery obligations without exacerbating other existing challenges.</p> <p>Concession inherited by post-2000 municipal entities with low buy-in and major challenges of delivery to confront outside concession area.</p>	<p>Concession area has seen eradication of backlogs with FBW, as well as effective maintenance, but little or no progress on upgrading basic service levels. Requires new policy frameworks with iLembe, iLembe as a provider has made progress on backlog eradication but faces major challenges in rural areas and must confront poorly maintained core infrastructure, as well as unmaintained RDP schemes.</p>	<p>District is relatively capacitated, but has been recipient of support through Project Consolidate and via DBSA support programmes and has experienced periodic institutional crises in recent past.</p> <p>Solid performance by Siza, but ineffective iLembe oversight and non-existent independent review.</p> <p>Regulation of iLembe's performance weak, although improvement witnessed with piloting of DWAF assessment tools.</p> <p>Despite WSA role at District level systems of governance appear fragile and planning and management is weak, resulting in undermining of accountability.</p>	<p>Limited direct participation in delivery choices and processes by users in iLembe and in concession.</p> <p>Water Services Development Plan tagged on to Integrated Development Plan as technical item with no real engagement. No innovation in participatory mechanisms by Siza or iLembe DM.</p>
<p>uThukela Water Pty Ltd (in Amajuba and Umzinyathi Districts)</p> <p>Municipal public company as water service provider under the multi-jurisdictional authority of two municipal districts and a local municipality</p>	<p>History of collaborative engagement between three adjacent, largely rural, districts led to endorsement of proposal to create multi-jurisdictional service delivery partnership vested in a jointly owned public company.</p> <p>Lack of tried and tested governance relationships between municipal leaders and inadequate technical feasibility led to new entity being beset by crisis from its establishment and subsequent failures to secure delivery impact.</p>	<p>Backlog eradication set back by institutional problems in uThukela Water. Schemes delivered on have major maintenance problems.</p>	<p>District partners have relatively low municipal capacity and have needed to rely on various forms of support through Provincial and National Government programmes (e.g. Project Consolidate). Capacity challenges aggravated by distance from major labour market agglomerations.</p> <p>uThukela Water failed in performance in first years of operation, with fractured governance and poor management.</p>	<p>Limited direct participation of users in process to establish uThukela Water or in subsequent restructuring processes.</p> <p>WSDP processes by partner districts/municipalities tending to be technical appendages to Integrated Development Plan processes.</p>

Case study institutions/areas	Delivery context	Access	Institutions, governance and regulation	Participation
<p>Ugu DM</p> <p>Municipal water service provider in the entire municipal district</p>	<p>Intervention by KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Department of Local Government led to suspension of public company board and introduction of administrator team to run company.</p>	<p>Steady progress made on backlog eradication, but concerns about maintenance of services, as well as little progress in defining improved service levels.</p>	<p>Both municipal partners and other spheres of government demonstrated reluctance to intervene timeously, despite initial pressure to test multi-jurisdictional model.</p> <p>Water authority role in partner municipalities marginal to performance oversight.</p>	<p>Relatively strong generic participation in municipal processes but weak engagement on water and sanitation service specific matters.</p>
<p>Cape Town Metropolitan Council</p> <p>Municipal service outsourcing contracts to private companies for informal settlement sanitation service provision</p>	<p>Incremental institutional reform approach after 2000 local government restructuring to create integrated district wide capacity.</p> <p>Solid progress against delivery goals in more urbanised communities, but gaps in more peri-urban and rural delivery.</p>	<p>Complex and uneven mixes of technology and service provision standards renders service coverage patchy and often below official standards.</p>	<p>District is relatively capacitated and has demonstrated considerable institutional stability and an ability to maintain key relationships with service providers and local municipalities.</p> <p>Capacity built up with sound area knowledge base internal to District.</p>	<p>Little or no participation in determination of sanitation approach in informal settlements.</p> <p>No consideration given to user perspectives on quality of service providers.</p>
	<p>Growing urbanisation in informal settlements in land areas unsuitable for long-term housing development require provision of interim services to settlements.</p> <p>Informed by notion of temporary nature of settlements limited funds set aside for project.</p> <p>Outsourcing of sanitation servicing to private contractors seen to reduce management burden and optimise delivery coverage with available resources.</p>		<p>Relatively capacitated metropolitan council with considerable human and financial resources. However, has struggled with integration of previously fragmented systems and considerable levels of political and administrative upheaval.</p> <p>Institutional marginalisation of informal settlement programmes with no internal municipal oversight and weak oversight of contractors.</p> <p>Little if any role played by DWAF. WSA role non-existent.</p>	

Case study institutions/areas	Delivery context	Access	Institutions, governance and regulation	Participation
<p>Bushbuckridge Local Municipality</p> <p>Public water board and local municipality operating within a municipal area</p>	<p>Municipal restructuring left patchy administrative arrangements for water and sanitation services.</p> <p>Persistent lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities and weak capacity, exacerbate already complex delivery environment in large water-scarce rural area.</p>	<p>Progress made on increasing access but serious challenges faced with maintenance of supply arrangements.</p> <p>Concerns about inadequacy of supply arrangements and slow processes to provide connections.</p>	<p>A weak local municipality in a weak district with fragile provincial and other water-related institutions. Relatively fragile low technology delivery systems supported by limited capacity.</p> <p>Institutional upheaval has substantially influenced fragmentation.</p> <p>Lack of integrated approach by water board/municipality exacerbating shortcomings.</p>	<p>determining service delivery approaches.</p> <p>channels around service quality/access matters.</p>
<p>Maluti-a-Phofung Local Municipality and Maluti-a-Phofung Water Pty Ltd</p> <p>Municipal public company as water service provider with a five-year management contract to a private consortium (Uzinzo) under the authority of a local municipality</p>	<p>Post-2000 amalgamation process of different water and sanitation service entities through Section 78 process led to creation of new public entity, managed for five years by contracted management consortium.</p> <p>History of differing approaches and contexts of water and sanitation services and context of impoverished peri-urban and rural settlement lead to significant delivery challenges.</p>	<p>Backlogs have been reduced, but policy with respect to informal settlement services and peri-urban/rural dwellers tends to reduce access.</p>	<p>Medium capacity local municipality but still needing to draw on considerable external skills to meet delivery expansion obligations.</p> <p>Systems of governance and accountability of Maluti-a-Phofung Water still evolving and being institutionalised. Significant progress made during period of case study.</p> <p>Uncertainty of appropriateness and sustainability of institutional model.</p>	<p>delivery choices and processes by users.</p>
<p>Chris Hani DM and community-level service provision</p> <p>Small scale community level service contracts managed and supported in water service provision activities at the municipal level by intermediary private and NGO contractors and overseen on behalf of the District by a contracted public water board</p>	<p>Largely rural district with dispersed settlement pattern in context of deep poverty and weak institutions sought to build on history of NGO-driven community level service provision.</p>	<p>Sustaining of community-oriented model has allowed for reach of water programmes that might not have been possible through other mechanisms.</p>	<p>Weak capacity district entity reliant on outsourced capacity – both in terms of management and technical elements and in terms of localised delivery at community level.</p> <p>Complex institutional structures created to manage community-level service delivery with concerns about weak accountability and higher cost.</p>	<p>participation through interaction with community level service delivery agents. A direct and accessible point of reference for smaller rural-type schemes.</p>

Case study institutions/areas	Delivery context	Access	Institutions, governance and regulation	Participation
<p>Johannesburg Metropolitan Council and Johannesburg Water Pty Ltd</p> <p>Municipal public company as water service provider with a 5 year management contract to a private consortium (Jowam) under the authority of a Metropolitan municipality</p>	<p>Mid-1990s municipal financial crisis-driven restructuring led to decision to corporatise water and sanitation services in the form of public-owned municipal entity under a 5 year management contract.</p> <p>Context exacerbated by highly uneven services, rapid urbanisation and conflict, and history of poor quality administration of function.</p>	<p>Access levels and quality of services improved under Jowam concession.</p> <p>Affordability of level 2 approach questioned but seen to be an important innovation over and above basic RDP.</p>	<p>High capacity metro emerging out of deep institutional crisis. Capacity stabilising and in some areas strengthening.</p> <p>JOWAM contract period witnessed considerable improvements in service reliability and technical standards (incl. water loss) alongside a greater transparency of planning and contract accountability to the City of Johannesburg's CMU. The CMU's clear mandate and limited interference allowed it to play an effective role with the Johannesburg Water Board structure.</p>	<p>Limited direct participation in delivery choices and processes by users.</p> <p>Considerable stakeholder conflict over policy choices and implementation approaches as directed by Johannesburg Metro.</p>