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ABSTRACT

International Aid or Official Development Assistance (ODA), especially its implementation and effectiveness, has long been and continues to be a vigorously contested matter amongst the stakeholders in the development arena. The objective of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of ODA in two municipalities in the Eastern Cape – Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipalities – during the period 2005–2010. This period coincided with the introduction of the Paris Declaration (PD), an intervention intended to improve the ODA or Aid landscape globally. This was also the period during which the so-called service delivery protests in almost all municipalities in South Africa escalated.

A diversified methodology including both quantitative and qualitative approaches was used in this study while adhering to the evaluation framework of the Paris Declaration as recommended by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This framework put special focus on the five principles of ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and mutual accountability. Of particular significance in this study is the special attention paid to the actual beneficiaries on the ground, namely the communities, which is contrary to most existing Paris Declaration evaluations.

The research findings suggested that there had been no conscious efforts to implement the Paris Declaration in the two municipalities that were investigated. Furthermore, the prevailing weaknesses in governance, coupled with both administrative and operational paralysis in these two institutions, provided for less than fertile ground for this intervention to thrive.

The findings also highlighted that ODA programmes were very poorly known by most stakeholders, especially the communities who were supposed to benefit directly from this assistance. These results also underscored the partisan nature of ODA and how it influenced the perceptions of the various key players.

The success and future of ODA programmes in South Africa, particularly in municipalities, will largely rely on “Active Citizenry”. Although ODA’s contribution to South Africa seems negligible in monetary terms, its significance lies among others in the innovations, piloting,
risk mitigation, catalytic initiatives and capacity development it introduces or generates and which need to be correctly exploited, implemented and maximised.

ODA in South Africa should therefore focus at the local level, the municipalities, which represent the interface between the citizens and the state. To ensure that the ensuing innovations are optimally cascaded down in an organised and effective manner to where they are mostly needed, ODA should preferably operate at the strategic level in municipalities. This would in turn assist in counteracting the current high levels of poverty and inequality in the country.

Study findings further suggest that South Africa should cease its current ambivalence regarding ODA and refrain from the so-called “Triangular” ODA in support of the rest of Africa. The demands in it’s own back yard are steadily mounting. This is clearly reflected by the continuous service delivery protests and instability in several municipalities in South Africa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Accra Agenda for Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Aid Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCM</td>
<td>Buffalo City Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCMM</td>
<td>Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEE</td>
<td>Black Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBBEE</td>
<td>Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICS Countries</td>
<td>Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>Comite’ d’aide au development (Same as DAC in English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDW</td>
<td>Community Development Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLGF</td>
<td>Commonwealth Local Government Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>Community Liaison Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGTA</td>
<td>Cooperative Government and Traditional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Democratic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee (an OECD body that deals with aid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF</td>
<td>UN Development Cooperation Forum (a UN body that deals with aid policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS</td>
<td>Development Cooperation Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (of the UK government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLGTA</td>
<td>Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSSEC</td>
<td>Eastern Cape Socio Economic Consultative Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRS</td>
<td>Environmental Drilling &amp; Remediation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURODAD</td>
<td>European Network on Debt and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHISER</td>
<td>Fort Hare Institute of Social and economic Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGP</td>
<td>Gross Geographic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GINI COEFFICIENT</td>
<td>A measure of statistical dispersion, a measure of Inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSDRC</td>
<td>Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (UoB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLF</td>
<td>High Level forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLD</td>
<td>International Centre for Local Democracy (Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDASA</td>
<td>Institute for Democracy in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>Industrial Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Financial Institution (includes the World Bank and IMF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGRF</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>International Relations Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPA</td>
<td>Key Performance Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Least Developed Country (a classification of the poorest countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>Low Income Country (a classification of the poorest countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLDC</td>
<td>Land Locked Developing Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFMA</td>
<td>Municipal Finance Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIG</td>
<td>Municipal Infrastructure Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>Municipality Performance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Management Systems International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTREF</td>
<td>Medium Term Revenue and Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURP</td>
<td>Motherwell or Mdantsane Urban Renewal Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFCOC</td>
<td>National African Federated Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOP</td>
<td>National Council of Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>The New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMBM</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Bay Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMBMMM</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Bay Metro Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ODA  Official Development Assistance (aid from governments used instead of ODA)
OECD  Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OTP  Office of the Premier
PD  Paris Declaration
PDE  Paris Declaration Evaluation
PERCCI  Port Elizabeth Regional Chamber of Commerce and Industry
PFMA  Public Finance Management Act
PDLGTA  Provincial Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs
PPP  Public Private Partnerships
QoL  Quality of Life
RDP  Reconstruction and Development Programme
PGDP  Provincial Growth and Development Plan
RA  Result Area
RSA  Republic of South Africa
SA  South Africa
SACN  South African City Networks
SALGA  South African Local Government Association
SCOPA  Standing Committee on Public Accounts (South Africa)
SIDS  Small Island Developing States
SOCR  State of the City Reports
SOPA  State of the Province Address
SPSS  Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SSC  South-South Cooperation
TA  Technical Assistance
TOR  Terms of Reference
UDDI  Uitenhage Despatch Development Initiative
UN  United Nations
URP  Urban Renewal Programme
US  United States
USAID  United States Agency for International Development
USD  US Dollars
UWV  Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen (a social security agency in the Netherlands)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>Value Added Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR</td>
<td>South African Rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNG</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP-EFF</td>
<td>Working Party on Aid Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION AND ORIENTATION

1.1 Introduction
South Africa has been a favourite of donor nations and multinationals, post 1994. This has been partly due to the donor resolve to “alleviate poverty” on one hand as well as the desire to exercise one of the principles agreed on by most Development Partners (DP), namely to support countries that are emerging from internal conflicts. Another underlying factor is the fact that South Africa is seen as a model of good and stable administration and economic development, an entity on which the rest of Africa can thrive. Most of this aid to South Africa has been logically targeted through the perceived coal-face actors, namely the municipalities. According to Chapter 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa1996, local government is the third sphere of government and is responsible for translating national and provincial plans into tangibles, in short to deliver to the communities. This is where the delivery of services to the community should be carried out.

There is a general understanding that development can occur mainly through the improved capacities of the concerned individuals and the institutions in which they operate, assuming that a conducive climate exists.

In this case, capacity would refer to three interrelated areas, namely:

- The individual,
- The organisation, and
- The enabling environment.

It is interesting to indicate further that pre-1990 development aid was exclusively channelled through NGOs in South Africa but post-1994 there was a complete shift to support the new democratic government directly through implementation of its policies and this was later cascaded down to the provinces and the municipalities.
Whereas development aid in most developing countries contributes directly towards operational budgets, the picture in South Africa is quite different. In South Africa, development aid through its various modalities is used to support innovative, new and more effective ways of implementing government policies, mainly in the form of piloting and testing new ideas as well as providing for new innovations and capacity building (National Treasury, 2007:8).

Some of this assistance has been channelled through local government; in this case the municipalities, over time, because this sphere of governance is perceived to be nearer to the coalface of development and assistance to the communities. This aid has been delivered to the municipalities through various modalities such as technical assistance, twinning, or even budget assistance.

It is interesting to note that Buffalo City Municipality has for some time now had standing relations through twinning agreements with various cities including Gaevle in Sweden, Leiden in Netherlands, Milwaukee in United States of America and lately with Jihhua in the People’s Republic of China. Buffalo City celebrated 10 years of engagement with the City of Leiden in Holland during 2008. It also developed a very comprehensive International Relations Framework to cater for, among others, the following:

- Alignment of Buffalo City’s international relations and development co-operation activities as closely as possible to the South African foreign policy;
- Positioning of the city in the ongoing national debate about the role of local government in international relations;
- Ensuring that the city’s priorities as outlined in its City Development Strategy, Integrated Development Plan and Local Economic Development Strategy are adhered to in international relations; and
- Supporting the council’s strategic visions and goals.

The understanding here is that municipal international relations agreements should be based on principles that promote economic growth and development through trade investment and tourism. Further, enhancement of social development, poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability has to be anchored in whatever relationships are built.
Through its “Sister City programme” Nelson Mandela Municipality has established relations with five towns: Annaba in Algeria, Stichting Steun in the Netherlands, Ningbo in China, Goeteberg in Sweden and Jacksonville in Florida, USA. Each partnership focuses on certain areas, ranging from economic development, urban development, tourism, culture, education, trade and social development, all based on mutual equality and understanding. Most of the relationships have been going on for at least 8 to 9 years.

This municipality is planning to enter into new cooperation agreements with another six cities in six countries worldwide. An international relations policy which refers to “International Relations as one of the catalysts that enable our municipality to gain exceptional competitive advantage for economic growth and development in a quest to improve the quality of life of all the people of the metro was developed in 2007 (Mandela Bay Municipality 2007:1).”

A group of Development Partners (Donor)/Partner countries (Recipients) and certain major multilaterals such as the World Bank sat in Paris in 2005 with several United Nations bodies to come up with an innovative way in which aid could become more effective. In other words they tried to come up with a formula whose intent was to revolutionise aid and its management globally. This was the birth of the Paris Declaration of 2005 (Wood et al., 2008: x).

The last three decades have experienced vigorous debates on whether aid given to recipient communities is indeed achieving its objectives namely poverty alleviation and development. This was followed on by the third Accra High Forum level meeting which was attended by 1,700 participants from ministers to heads of donor agencies, developing countries, United Nations institutions, various foundations and, for the first time, 80 civil organisations (Third Accra High Level Forum, 2008:1). Whereas the Paris meeting focused more on how donors would work together, the Accra meeting shifted the emphasis to “ownership” of development aid, with the view that development interventions can only be successful if they are owned by the recipient countries.
The internationally used evaluation criteria for development aid involves among others the following: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coverage, coherence and coordination (DFID, 2009:1-2). Not all criteria must be used in every study but the choice and depth are determined by the needs of a given investigation. A further improvement in the development aid evaluation process was the introduction of the Paris Declaration of 2005 which is a donor-recipient roadmap with specific targets focused on development co-operations and evaluations by the year 2010.

The key elements in the Paris Declaration, as shown in Figure 1.1, are:

- Ownership,
- Alignment with countries’ strategies, systems and procedures,
- Harmonisation of donor’s actions,
- Managing for results, and
- Mutual Accountability

(Wood et al., 2008:2).

The biphasic evaluation process attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of aid and its contribution to development using five key principles: ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results, and accountability (Wood et al., 2008:1). The underlying arguments were the recurring debates about aid effectiveness and its contribution to development in the so-called recipient countries (Wood et al., 2008:x).

Post-apartheid South Africa can still be regarded as a fragile state. The question then arises whether the debate around “decentralisation in fragile states” applies here and whether it is a key problem in the management of various issues including aid. Whereas many argue that decentralisation is key to delivery of essential basic services (GSDRC, 2008), others such as the World Bank (2000) and Jack and Scott (2007) are of the view that in many cases this results in the elite hijacking the process and therefore the anticipated services fail to materialise (GSDRC, 2008:1; Jack and Scott 2007:25). This study will therefore attempt to shed light on these matters of aid and
aid management, using some of the internationally proposed evaluation criteria as well as the five elements in the Paris Declaration of 2005 as a basis.

Figure 1.1: The Paris Declaration Pyramid

![The Paris Declaration pyramid (Concepts)](image)

Source: OECD 2009 Joint Evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase 2. Evaluation Framework and Work Plan

The litany of lack of capacity at both communal and institutional levels, accompanied by failure to deliver on local commitments such as social services, health, housing, sanitation and a multitude of failed projects warrants a deeper investigation into the way development aid is influencing capacity in the municipalities under study.

1.2 Problem Statement

After 1994, a number of countries and multilaterals identified South Africa as one of the countries on the priority list in terms of aid assistance. This was especially because of the post-apartheid era, in which the focus was on addressing issues of the majority and the erstwhile previously disadvantaged population, especially the African, Coloured and Indian communities. Further, South Africa was also a priority area because of its classification as a post-conflict area (Riddel 2007:39)
Seventeen years down the line not much change can be seen on the ground. In fact municipal reports are full of litanies of inefficiencies, corruption, inability to deliver and lack of both human and institutional capacities. This has been of late, especially in mid-2009, reflected through community strikes and crumbling services such as water, sanitary, health and social services.

The situation seems to be getting dire by the day in both municipalities every year. Current interventions are only scratching on the surface, instead of dealing with the deep seated challenges and do not exploit the positive benefits aid engagements could bring about. Further, current literature on this subject does not delve deep enough into the functioning of aid at the coalface levels, namely the municipalities. Most documentation report on higher level activities –country level, and forget that service delivery and the people’s needs are generally catered for at the municipality levels.

Given the critical issues raised, the following research questions are posed:

- What sort of International Development AID (ODA) has been made available to these two municipalities?
- How have the five elements of the Paris Declaration (PD) been implemented in these metros/municipalities?
- Are the municipalities under study better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the current development aid processes in the two municipalities under study in the Eastern Cape, namely Buffalo City with its main centre in East London and Nelson Mandela with its centre in Port Elizabeth, in relation to the three interrelated areas namely:

- The individual,
- The organisation,
- The enabling environment
1.4 **Significance of the Study**

Post 1994, and in spite of increased aid to South Africa in various modalities and methodologies and at various levels of governance, there seemed to be very few tangible improvements especially in the way the municipalities were carrying out their activities, especially on service delivery.

Some studies around the implementation of the Paris Declaration have been done at country levels in countries such as Uganda, India and South Africa but not specifically at local government level. The South African country level report on the Paris Declaration in 2008 put its emphasis on the country level picture but did not go into details at the third tier of governance namely the municipalities.

**Figure 1.2: Major Service Delivery Protests in South Africa by Year**

![Bar chart showing major service delivery protests in South Africa by year from 2004 to 2009 (Jan-Aug).](chart)

[Source: Municipal IQ 2009, Municipal Hotspots Monitor]

This study becomes even more important considering the 2009 crisis in various municipalities in South Africa. Early in 2009, there were increased protests over lack of service delivery in various provinces including the Eastern Cape, as reflected in
Figure 1.2. Protests were not only from the beneficiaries but in some cases employees of these very municipalities were part and parcel of these uprisings in spite of the fact that their main gripe was around their working conditions and salaries. According to the researcher’s knowledge, there is no available study of this nature in the province on the subject, especially in relation to evaluating the impact of implementing the key elements of the Paris Declaration of 2005. The results from this study are also likely to feed into the planning sessions on both Municipalities at the IDP level so as to try and shape the integration of ODA into the two municipalities especially in those needy areas both at the management and as well as at the operational levels.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

This study limited itself to two municipalities in the Eastern Cape, namely Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality and Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality. These two municipalities are not only the two largest in the province but they are also known to have had longstanding Development Partner/Partner relationships in their jurisdictions. There was also a large possibility that not all the five key elements of the Paris Declaration – ownership, mutual accountability, alignment, harmonisation and managing for results – had been implemented in the two municipalities. This was to an extent due to the administrative structures of local Government and decentralisation whereby bureaucratic blockages hinder a fast flow of information from the national level through the province to the municipalities.

As in any study of this nature the credibility of the results was expected to reflect mainly on the quality and the results from the interactions with the main actors, namely the developing partners (donors) and the partners (beneficiaries, municipalities and communities). The extent and nature of the protests which were experienced in these two municipalities, especially those during late 2009, were expected to influence the type and quality of reports and answers which could be derived from this study. There was also a very real probability that key actors – mainly the management echelons in municipalities and in donor agencies – would not be very forthcoming in their responses. On the other side of the coin, those directly affected – the communities – could have easily exaggerated their circumstances to fall in with the then current belief that municipalities were not delivering. To mitigate
this, a representative sample from both groups was taken and a process of triangulation was employed.

While this study does not seek to draw any generalisations, the results are likely to shed some light on the effectiveness of aid and the status and implementation of the Paris Declaration at this level of governance and could indeed contribute towards the next round of deliberations “post Busan”, but more importantly it could assist in understanding why the current aid focused on the so-called “grass roots levels” is not working.

1.6 Study Outline
The study is organised into six chapters as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction and Orientation
This chapter introduces the study and outlined the background of the research as well as the way the subject would be interrogated in view of the research question. Attention is given to the assumptions, limitations, and possible benefits.

Chapter 2: Literature Review
This chapter explores the current literature especially in the area, of the “Aid debate”. The pros and cons of aid, the Paris Declaration, the available Community evaluations and the mandate of a municipality in South Africa with particular emphasis on the various negative allegations around this sphere of governance.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology
An appropriate instrument was designed and used to gauge the effectiveness of aid in the two municipalities. This was done using the CAD recommended evaluation system in particular reference to the elements in the Paris Declaration which were expected to measure the effectiveness of aid. The methodology which was used to carry out the initial Paris Declaration Country Evaluations was also consulted as this had been found by the CAD-OECD consortium to be very suitable for this type of work (OECD, 2007a:6).
Chapter 4: Interpretation and Discussion of Quantitative Data
This chapter is dedicated to analysing the quantitative data from the research instrument and preparing an encompassing report.

Chapter 5: Interpretation and Discussion of Qualitative Data
The chapter analyses the qualitative data from the secondary sources and, together with the results from Chapter 4, provides the results from this study.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations
The last chapter presents the conclusions from the results and proposes certain recommendations to improve the delivery of aid at municipal level so that the net result of development assistance at this tier of governance can be seen, namely the alleviation of poverty and the resultant development.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reflects on the existing body of knowledge about a very controversial subject, namely Aid or ODA, whose origins are deeply rooted in the post-war watershed meeting in July 1944 in Bretton Woods in the United States of America attended by 700 delegates from 44 countries. The intentions of this meeting were still valid in a statement made by the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Tony Blair, as quoted by Moyo: “The state of Africa is a scar on the conscience of the world, the West must provide more aid” (Moyo. 2010, xviii). Initially ODA is looking at the various trends over the years, claimed to be over US 2 trillion dollars over the last 50 years. This is followed by outlining some important areas in the dependency theory by delving into some of the debates about aid from the academics, practitioners, and other observers; thereafter introducing the Paris Declaration’s development partner and partner commitments document as a possible solution to the ever niggling general consensus that aid in its current form just does not work. This is followed by a description of the status quo of the aid milieu in South Africa and a brief interrogation of the service delivery protest which played out at the coalface of service delivery, the municipalities. In conclusion, the conundrum between aid and service delivery is stated as the nucleus of this study.

2.2 Aid or ODA Conceptual Framework
Aid can be defined as “Assistance provided by countries and by international institutions such as the World Bank to developing countries in the form of monetary grants, loans at low interest rates, in kind, or a combination of these.” This aid can be from DAC members, non-DAC members or multilateral organisations and could be disbursed in various forms such as programmes, projects, food aid, emergency assistance or technical cooperation (World Bank, 2007:351).

The DAC-OECD defines aid as “Financial flows, technical assistance and conditions that are designed to promote economic development and welfare provided either as grants or subsidized loans.” Further stricter classification puts emphasis on the type of aid flows as follows: ODA (Overseas Development Assistance) is the largest form of
aid which mainly flows from richer donors to low and middle income countries. OA (Official Assistance) on the other hand is provided to richer countries, whereas PVO (Private Voluntary Assistance) is a grant from private and non-governmental bodies (Radelet, 2006:5). But generally international development assistance is classified as ODA.

The origins of aid are from the development administration programmes based on modern or Western style type of institutions that assumed that developed societies had to be urbanised, literate and westernised. The development of aid over the years can be traced back from the 1940s to now and can be categorised into seven major eras: the birth of aid at Bretton Woods in the 1940s, the Marshall Plan in the 1950s, the decade of industrialisation in the 1960s, aid as an answer to poverty in the 1970s, aid for stabilisation and structural adjustments in the 1980s, aid as a buttress for democracy and governance in the 1990s, and now aid as a solution to Africa’s development challenges (Moyo, 2010:10).

2.3 Trends in ODA Financing
Aid given for various reasons – economic, political or moral – to poorer countries by rich countries over the last 50 years stands at about 2 trillion US dollars, most of it to Africa. In Africa alone, it stands at about US$300 billion since 1970 (Moyo, 2010:28). Total funding for ODA has been declining in real terms, especially that portion which is dedicated to actual development programmes over time. In 2005, ODA funding stood at about US$105 billion but unfortunately most of this went into debt relief, emergency assistance, and donor administrative costs. ODA is therefore skewed, in that, for example, debt relief accounted for about 70% of the total amount over the period. So in effect ODA for development programmes fell by 4.6% as compared to total ODA which grew by 11.4%. This observation from an International Development Association study (2007:5) confirms the findings in another study by Ikhide (2002:1). The contentious debate on aid, aid management and its outcomes has been discussed in various fora, platforms and by various authors (Hefeker, 2005:1). This debate is filled with overall frustrations over aids effects and outcomes coupled with a myriad of unfulfilled expectations from both donors and recipients (OECD, 2005:18). This debate is deeply anchored in the absence of a direct relationship between aid and economic growth at a broader level. The yardstick for aid
effectiveness has always been economic growth as a precursor towards poverty alleviation and an improvement in livelihoods, with the understanding that those countries which receive higher levels of aid are likely to record more growth. Unfortunately this has not been the case (Radelet, 2006:7). In spite of this there is a general consensus that aid is important and a necessary instrument in alleviating hardships of various types in developing countries and could even assist in stimulating economic growth if it is applied in a conducive environment (Ikhide, 2002:1; Radelet, 2006:7).

2.4 For or Against the Dependency Theory
ODA has been embroiled in deep debates over the years and in spite of various transformations, the differences, though clothed in different garbs over this period, remain entrenched in the original ‘Left and Right’ divide: this divide continues to influence the way aid is seen by the various actors up to now. Therien (2002:449) in his article “Debating Foreign Aid” talks about right and left being relative concepts which go a long way in explaining the lack of consensus not only in the meaning but also on the whole debate on aid. The left is more favourable to development assistance because it sees it as a “moral obligation” of the rich to the poor: the wealthy are obligated to the poorer nations, the benefits are larger than the costs, and as a result it is likely to bring about equity in the world (Riddel as quoted by Therien, 2002:461).

On the other hand, the right sees ODA as a tool which can be used either as a carrot or a stick (Burnell as quoted by Therien, 2002:461). The belief is that poverty alleviation is the duty of the state. It is understood that the aid has no clear effect on either growth or policies in the recipient country and that it just distorts the markets and creates a dependency syndrome, a view shared by Moyo in her book Dead Aid (Moyo, 2010:28). Against this backdrop, the right–left debate continues further as reflected by Goldberg (2009:4) in her review of Moyo’s Dead Aid in which she talks about progressives vis-à-vis the conservatives. It is interesting to point out at this juncture that the debate escalated further into North–South antagonism ending up in White views versus Black views and debates as the case is seen in the various commentators and reviewers of Moyo’s Dead Aid. Most of the attributes try to emphasise the fact that the views in this book should carry weight because they are
coming from a “black, well-educated woman who happens to have been educated at Harvard, held positions in reputable and respected organisations overseas and happens to be in the USA” (www.one.org).

The current views on aid are covered by the main protagonists and their publications, among them Jeffrey Sachs, the architect of the Millenium Development Goalss and a proponent of the grand plan that no-one should live on less than a dollar a day, that the gap between the poor and rich must be narrowed, and differentiating between poverty reduction and development. He sees development as mobilising the masses to develop themselves, whereas poverty reduction has to do with technocratic solutions to alleviate the suffering of the poor. Sachs advocates poverty alleviation as a means of reducing the security risks posed by poor countries as well as a need to unleash their potential (Sachs, 2006:5).

On the other hand Collier (2007:4-10) in his book The Bottom Billion agitates for a de facto re-colonisation of Africa by calling for more obtrusive aid with more strings attached, to these countries. He is convinced that an increase in aid is more central to development and that economic growth is key to development. William Easterly believes that the reason donors continue to partake in this process is because of self-interest with no real concern for Africa, and that the donor and the recipient are operating from completely different views but similar to Sachs, pleads for more aid to Africa but in a less obtrusive manner and with less of the so-called grand plans such as the MDGs and the G8 plans which he sees as mere “gestures” which do not work. He contends that aid lacks checks and balances and that it is measured in unrealistic units and self-referencing, for example how many meetings are held or how many reports are produced. He advocates for homegrown development (Easterly, 2006:6,145,318).

Calderisi (2006:35), who agrees with Easterly in principle but with a different approach, is of the view that “Africa has a passive and fatalistic culture, where elites do not care about the rest.” He believes that donors continue to dish out money because of internal guilt coupled with political correctness and that more aid should be provided, albeit with stricter conditionality, more politicised and more intrusive in nature whereas Moyo (2010:30) believes that ODA or aid is the mother of Africa’s underdevelopment and most of its accompanying woes. She believes that aid
increases corruption, inhibits entrepreneurship, minimises accountability, encourages laziness at all levels (individual and governmental), promotes reckless consumption and normally ends in civil unrest. She advocates for a complete halt to the way aid is currently dispensed.

According to the Paris Declaration of 2005, aid is supposed to contribute to development thereby alleviating poverty (OECD, 2005:18). In his critique on the aid debate, Dembeka in a 2009 Pambazuka newsletter says that there is a general feeling that aid or ODA is neither generosity nor benevolence. He sees aid as giving with one hand and taking with another. He goes on to give a comparative example of aid from the US and France, saying that for every dollar donated 89 and 86 cents respectively return to the donor countries (www.pambazuka.org).

In his article “The cartel of good intentions” Easterly asserts that the way donors present their aid is already a recipe for the recipient to fail. This is as a result of certain preconditions the donors prescribe but which the recipients are not in a position to fulfil. This starts from reporting requirements, glossy reports, complicated frameworks, always presenting everything as “new” and the fact that donors refuse to learn from the past (Easterly, 2003:1).

Hefeker (2005:6) on the other hand feels that aid just exacerbates the recipients’ ineffectiveness to deliver on their prescribed mandate. Hefeker goes on to say that donors provide aid for the sole purpose of self-interest, either by spending their budgets allocated to aid or by ensuring that there junior desk officers gain enough experience to maintain their postings or position in the developing countries.

In an article on budget support as a mode of aid, Molt (2006:2) calls aid “misplaced optimism”, giving an example of covert budgeting as used by France to reward “well behaved” countries resulting in those governments neglecting important deliverables in their administration such as road construction and other local social necessities in favour of the development partner requirements. One of the most recent examples was in Kosovo, where civil servants in such a partnership had no say in the way the aid would be used because they were very busy dealing with donors’ requirements.
Moyo describes aid as “the silent killer of growth” in Africa (Moyo, 2010:48). She sees aid besides other benefactors of corruption, such as natural resources, minerals and oil, to be the new culprit of state facilitation of graft, greed, nepotism and all other ills affecting most parts of the developing world, especially in Africa. Her argument is that foreign aid maintains and perpetuates corrupt governments by providing a ready source of liquid resources in a situation where the state does not need to account to its population, disorganises all state institutions and discourages investments, and the various cycle of aid continues whereby the donors continue to provide more cash.

Moyo goes on to say that the ills of aid lie mainly in its becoming a vicious cycle, it fosters greed and corruption, it stalls the development of a middle class in Africa, and it chokes social capital by eroding trust which is key in both state funding and people-to-people interactions in a given community. Further, Africa’s rich history of instability and coups d’état, especially in the 1990s, was mainly fuelled by the presence of aid in these countries. Most western countries fund the conflicts in their pursuit to secure a slice of the raw material resources (Moyo, 2010:55-59). In view of the above, she is a proponent of a complete stop to aid, albeit in a progressive manner – a “weaning off process” as reflected in her statement below:

Africa is addicted to aid – like any addict it needs and depends on its regular fix, finding it hard if not impossible to contemplate existence in an aidless world (Moyo, 2010:25-71).

There are also other voices which concur with Moyo’s views: Senegal’s President Wade is known to have said:

I’ve never seen a country developing itself through aid or credit … Countries that have developed elsewhere in Europe, Asia, Japan, Korea, Singapore have all believed in free markets (Wade as quoted by Moyo, 2010:149).

The study by Radelet (2006:8-10) packages the above arguments in three broad views covering the debate from the early 1970s to now. These are:
• Aid has a positive relationship with growth on average although not in every country, but its effect decreases with increasing volumes.
• Aid has no effect on growth and may undermine the whole process of growth.
• Aid has a conditional relationship with growth and helps to accelerate growth under certain conditions.

Because current aid efforts have not yielded the expected results there is a recent resolve by both development partners and their developing partners to find a way of improving this situation and the Paris Declaration of 2005 could be one of these ways.

2.5 The Paris Declaration (PD)
The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness is a practical Aid Road Map endorsed in 2005 by various actors in the donor arena whose aim is to improve the quality and quantity of aid and its impact on development. It is a result of a high level meeting held in Paris in 2005 called the Second Paris High Level Forum which was attended by government representatives, several ministers from both partner and developing partner countries, civil society organisations, and multilaterals as well as the private sector to review the status of aid worldwide (Woods et al., 2008:x). In essence this partnership of 52 donors, partner countries and 30 other organisations composed of several United Nations agencies, multilaterals and civilian groupings endeavoured to revolutionise AID by making it more effective and more development-orientated. AusAID sees the Paris Declaration as an agreement “grounded in good practices, identified over many years and reflecting an international consensus on reforming AID delivery and management” (www.AusAID.gov.au). Wood et al. refer to this document as “far reaching and monitorable actions to influence the way we deliver and manage aid” (Wood et al., 2008:430). The practical actions in this declaration are underpinned by the following five partnership commitments:

• Ownership,
• Alignment,
• Harmonisation,
• Managing for results, and
• Mutual accountability
Other reasons given for this drive, according to Tandon (2008b:2), are that this document would simplify aid administration and reduce costs, that the citizens of development partner countries were demanding a more cost-effective and results-orientated process, and that the current democratic and legitimacy deficiencies in the existing aid agenda are all skewed towards the development partners.

The Paris Declaration is composed of a set of five Partnership Commitments as a basis accompanied by a set of 12 specific indicators which have to be used to measure progress and five specific targets which have to be met by the year 2010 (OECD, 2005:2). It must be understood that though these parameters are supposed to be used by all the signatories to this declaration, they do not necessarily replace any other internal processes or arrangements planned or used by either the development partner or the partner country (OECD, 2005:1-8).

2.5.1 The Five Partnership Commitments (5 Pillars)

The five commitments coupled with the 12 indicators and the resolve to forge better partnerships seem to be the “armoury” which should bring about change in the aid business but the fundamental and anchor process in all still remains “Ownership” (Tandon, 2008b:3).

- Ownership

Partner countries are expected to take ownership of their aid programmes or activities by ensuring that “they lead from the front” by initiating and developing relevant policies and strategies and by coordinating all the aid process within their respective responsibilities. Up to now most development activities have been initiated and championed by the development partners or donors, hence the whole debate around in whose interest is aid being dispensed, whereas in this case the developing partners would only be playing a facilitating role to make aid more effective in the key priority areas and modalities, and lead coordination must be done by the partner countries. This foresees a consultation process involving all stakeholders solidly anchored in the developing needs of the partner country’s national development strategies.
• **Alignment**

This is a key area which must be prioritised by both the development partner and the partner country. According to the Paris Declaration, this can be defined as “donors basing their overall support on partner country’s National Development strategies procedures and institutions” (OECD, 2005:3). This involves specific areas where the development partner and the partner country or both must act as listed below:

- The development partner aligning with partner strategies;
- The development partner using country institutions and systems;
- The partner countries strengthening their capacity to plan, implement, manage, implement, monitor, evaluate and report;
- The strengthening of the internal financial management capacity, this means public finance reforms coupled with timely and reliable fiscal reporting; and
- The strengthening of the national or local procurement systems.

• **Harmonisation**

Harmonisation is defined as a situation whereby the development partner’s actions are harmonised, transparent and effective in a collective manner. The key areas hereunder are as follows:

- Implementing a common plan for planning, funding, disbursement, monitoring, evaluating and reporting coupled with working together with other development partners to avoid duplications and encourage shared training and assistance.
- Complementability, thereby avoiding duplications and promoting working together.
- Rewarding of collaborative undertakings in both the development partner and partner country areas.
• Ability to deliver aid in fragile states by ensuring that key management and administrative structures are set up within a broader national development strategy involving all stakeholders.

• Providing harmonised engagements in regard to the environment which seems already to be in place in many partner countries through the new environment awareness campaigns by insisting on environmental impact assessment studies before any project is undertaken.

• Managing for results

This means that the whole choice in planning and implementation in aid activities needs to focus not only on producing results but also on producing good and desirable results with the proviso that available information should be used to improve decision making. Whereas in this case partner countries are tasked with using performance indicators embedded in their national and local development plans together with results embracing participatory activities, the development partners are encouraged to refrain from introducing foreign assessment or monitoring models, but rather use the partner country’s own models to enhance results.

• Mutual accountability

Under mutual accountability it is understood that whole aid process and the resultant development results are a joint responsibility of both the development partner and the partner country. This calls for a joint resolve from both partners to ensure that they are doing their best to fulfil the five Partnership Commitments as they stand in the Paris Declaration through mutual accountability, transparency and the proper use development resources. To achieve this, the partner countries would call for more local legislative advocacy, for more finances, better policies and strategies in development within participatory and encompassing processes. The development partners on their side need to provide comprehensive information on available aid to assist the partner countries in presenting their development plans reports to the legislature and citizens.
There is a resolve to manage aid by ensuring that aid leadership is driven by the recipients and that it uses recipient systems (alignment principle) which work together (harmonisation) to make aid predictable, manage for results and be mutually accountable (M&E). The multilateral donors have been head over heels to address this problem in their own way. The Independent Group Monitoring in Tanzania, the 2000 Millennium Development Goals, the launch of NEPAD in 2001 and the African Peer Review Mechanism are some of the well-known efforts to date (Wood et al., 2008:5). The Paris Declaration of 2005 is a collective effort of 52 donors/agencies and partner countries and an additional 30 actors from the United Nations, the multilateral agencies and non-governmental organisations to bring all these proposals under one roof by clearly defining specific areas which could assist in enhancing aid efforts (OECD, 2005:12). This document emphasises the point that for aid to be effective the five key partner commitments listed above must be in place.

The Paris Declaration goes further to say that certain enabling conditions have to be in place for the above to take place, these being:

- Leadership,
- Capacities to do the expected, and
- Incentives.

It is also interesting to indicate here that some of the five key commitments contained in the Paris Declaration had already been mooted as a recipe for improvement of aid delivery in 2003 by Lopes and Theisson when discussing pre-requirements for meeting the MDGs. They maintain that ownership and alignment are key areas in the success of aid (Lopes and Theisohn, 2003:9).

In spite of the entire aura surrounding the introduction of the Paris Declaration and the various initial country studies, a coalition of European NGOs called EURODAD doubted its success in their civil report of 2008. They believed that its main shortcoming was that neither those whom aid is supposed to help (the actual beneficiaries) nor the NGOs were part of the Paris gathering. They think that the process could be flawed because the two groups which were left out are nearer to the coalface and therefore could have added value to the process through their inputs (EURODAD, 2008:13). This shortcoming was later addressed during the Third Accra High Level Meeting where the complainants were part of this gathering.
2.5.2 The Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study concerns itself with monitoring and evaluation of both the individual and Institutional capacities. Whereas monitoring is an ongoing function to determine progress or lack of in a process or in an undertaking, evaluation is rather a systematic exercise carried out to assess the progress of an outcome. There is a major paradigm shift in the International arena of “Development” towards measuring results and analysing of the effectiveness of those interventions (GSDRC 2007:4).

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in development activities, according to the World Bank (2004:5), are processes which “can provide governments, development managers, or civil society with better means of learning from past experience, improving delivery, planning and allocating of resources as well as demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders”. This is achieved by use of various tools and methodologies. These can be inter alia specific performance, logical framework approaches, theory based evaluations, formal surveys, rapid appraisal methods, participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, cost benefit or cost effectiveness analysis or impact evaluations (World Bank, 2004:6-25).

- Monitoring and Evaluation

According to the OECD-DAC (www.oecd.org) monitoring is defined as “the ongoing systematic collection of information to assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, outcomes and impacts”, and evaluation as “the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, programme or policies designs implementation and results”. Monitoring is an ongoing process whose focus is on the outcomes of an intervention rather than the intervention itself and therefore can be used as an early warning system to indicate whether the intervention is likely to achieve the expected results. Evaluation according to a later edition of the OECD-DAC can be defined as “the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project or programme, its design, implementation and results with the aim of determining the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability” (OECD-DAC, 2004:6).
Other studies go even further to call M&E, rather ME&L (Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning) to bring the notion of learning in the whole process to the fore. The questions they ask are: Are we doing the right thing? How can we do it better? This pushes the debate towards a better understanding of what is effective, best practices and increase in accessibility (Social Impact, 2006:27).

M&E in post-conflict situations brings other issues which must be considered. MSI (2006:2) notes the following:

- Convoluted goals or objectives,
- Missing baselines,
- Different understating of change,
- Foreshortened timeframes,
- Institutional deficiencies, and
- Urgent political or military considerations

Pressures are experienced between the need for immediate impact vis-à-vis long-term interventions, the need to accomplish a lot within a short time, working with illegitimate or distorted data or no data at all, and institutional complexities, mainly multiple donors operating within a weak host structure. Whereas some of these pressures can also occur under normal settings, their effects are amplified under post-conflict situations (MSI, 2006:1-6).

- **Capacity building**

Capacity development is currently viewed as a process of improving the status and knowledge of an individual but emphasises the organisation and the enabling environment (OECD, 2006:12). It is defined by Lopes et al. as “an endogenous course of action that builds on existing capacities and assets, and the ability of people, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, set and achieve objectives” (Lopes et al., 2003:9). The modern view of capacity goes beyond skills and procedures to encompass incentives and governance. Capacity would in this case refer to three interrelated areas:

- The individual
- One organisation
- The enabling environment
Change or development can only occur if there is an optimum interplay between these three factors.

- **Institutional development**
  The understanding is that improved capacity in an institution will translate into improved service delivery. Capacity development refers here to both the individual and to the institution itself. Capacity is not only about skills and procedure, but also about incentives and governance (OECD, 2006:7). Capacity development goes further to encompass the so-called “client and citizen levels”. In other words in a “pull” rather than a “push” situation the citizenry is able to request the services they need in an exact opposite of the past where the state has always decided on what they want to provide.

- **Capacity for decentralisation and local governance**
  The South African Constitution entrenches the three spheres of governance with the municipality on the coalface for good reasons (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996). There is considerable debate and disagreement on how decentralisation should be pursued in fragile or post-conflict states. SA can also be categorised in this group.

  There is an argument that strengthening of sub-national governance contributes to improved delivery of basic services (Edberg-Pedersen, 2008:2), but Jack and Scott argue that these expectations cannot be easily achieved. They assert that the issues of the poor are not addressed through this system but that it is rather used as a tool by the elite to extend their grip on resources (Jack and Scott 2007:25). This has been confirmed by a 2004 World Bank Report as quoted in an GSDRC helpdesk report which said that decentralisation in fragile states did not contribute to poverty reduction in some cases which had been studied (GSDRC, 2008:1).

  This study is underpinned by the whole theory of Monitoring and Evaluation of capacity both at an individual as well as at an institutional level premised on the understanding that improvement at this level translates into better delivery of services.
which leads to development and improved livelihood, thus pushing the borders of poverty away from the affected communities.

2.5.3 Monitoring and Evaluation in the Paris Declaration

The Paris Declaration envisages using the 12 specific indicators of progress as shown in Table 2.1 to monitor the effectiveness of aid in a given situation.

Table 2.1: The Paris Declaration Indicators of Progress (measured nationally but monitored internationally)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITMENT</th>
<th>INDICATOR NUMBER</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>BASELINE 2005</th>
<th>STATUS IN 2007</th>
<th>TARGET 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partners have operational Development strategies</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>At least 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reliable Country systems</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50% of countries move up at least to .5 on the PFM scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aid Flows are aligned to National priorities</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity by coordinated support</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Use of Country Public Financial systems</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Use of Country procurement systems</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel implementation structures</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aid is more predictable</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aid is untied</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Progress over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARMONISATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Donors use coordinated mechanisms for Aid delivery</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>Donors coordinate their Missions</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Donors coordinate their country studies</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGING FOR RESULTS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Results orientated frameworks</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Results orientated frameworks</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from a diagram on the PD from [www.oecd.org/documents](http://www.oecd.org/documents)
Locally there is a proposal to use the country reports mechanism, whereby qualitative and quantitative assessments would voluntarily be done in 2008 and in 2010. These country reports would then be collated at an international level to reflect progress on the partnership commitments, indicators and targets. The table further shows the expected targets per indicator by the year 2010.

Table 2.1 shows the 2005 baseline study values, the progress after the second monitoring in 2008 and the expected results in 2010 on the 12 indicators in the five key commitments of the Paris Declaration.

The Paris Declaration can for all intents and purposes be viewed as a set of political actions whose success would inevitably lie in most cases within political solutions from both the development partners as well as the partner countries. This is tantamount to a shared agenda with divergences (Wood et al., 2008:xii).

2.6 The Accra Agenda
The original Paris Declaration was enhanced in 2008 by the results of the Third High Level Forum on Aid which was held in Accra, Ghana, by further additions, thereafter called the “The Accra Agenda for Action”. This agenda pushed for accelerated implementation of the Paris Declaration through the following:
- Better harmonisation of development partner processes to avoid AID fragmentation;
- More predictability and transformation in the aid processes;
- Demand for more capacity development, sourcing within partner entities or South-South entities; and
- More use of country systems.

This gathering re-emphasised certain crucial key pillars in the reform of aid practices which were anchored in the initial Paris Declaration in 2005, and was a reaffirmation of the original partner and development partner resolve in Paris in 2005.

2.7 The Evolution of the Paris Declaration
The Paris Declaration stems from earlier attempts by developing partners under the DAC umbrella pre-2003 to put some order in AID especially in the public finances and procurement processes under the name Task Force on Donor Practices. This task
force was later replaced by something similar under the name Working Party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices (WP-EFF) with the express aim of promoting synchronising, monitoring and aligning aid (www.aidharmonisation.org). Tandon concurs with the above but adds that the lack of democracy and legitimacy in the aid arena could also have provided an impetus for the appearance of the Paris Declaration, maybe some sort of guilty consciousness by the OECD (Tandon, 2008b:2). Further developments were as follows:

- 2005: WP-EFF reports on its results on harmonisation and alignment to the Paris high level forum on Harmonisation.
- 2005 March: The Paris High Forum on Aid Effectiveness is held in Paris. The Paris Declaration is born and its five Partner Commitments and 12 Indicators with their targets are coined.
- 2005 July: The DAC hosts a meeting to establish the methodology and progress evaluation of the Paris Declaration.
- 2006: First round of Paris Declaration survey by 34 countries that receive aid to provide a baseline for the Paris Declaration monitoring.
- 2008 March to September: Second round of the Paris Declaration Evaluations. Consists mainly of country reports to evaluate the implementation phase.
- 2008 September: The Third High Level forum on aid effectiveness is held in Accra, Ghana, thereafter called the “Accra Agenda for Action”. According to the OECD the Accra HLF was important not only to re-emphasise the contents of the 2005 Paris Declaration but also to re-emphasise the issues of ownership and accountability. However Tandon (2008b:4) sees more into this meeting, being of the view that this was an indirect, back-door process to anchor the Paris Declaration in the United Nations negotiating systems, which had been omitted and should have been done at the onset.
- 2008-2011: Third round of the Paris Declaration evaluations, again at country level.
• 2011: Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness to be held in Korea. Reports on the second round evaluations are expected to be tabled during this gathering.

Since the signing of the Paris Declaration one round of country evaluations has been done and reported on in 2008, and the next round is ongoing and will be reported on in Korea during 2011. Whereas the first round focused on implementation, inputs, the processes themselves and to an extent the early outputs, the second round or phase focuses mainly on the core of aid, namely the effectiveness of the Paris Declaration, development results and poverty reduction. In summary, the intended effects of the Paris Declaration generally as well as within the South African context are poverty reduction, reduction in inequalities in society, increase in growth, capacity building and acceleration in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). According to the AusAID “delivery not just more but better aid is critical to maximize development impacts and contributes to tangible improvements in the lives of the poorest people www.AusAID.gov.au”.

2.8 Global Progress on the Paris Declaration

Using the 2008 country reports as a basis, in which incidentally South Africa was one of the eight partner country participants, indications are that progress is relatively slow and most targets are yet to be made. Woods et al. in their 2008 Paris Declaration Synthesis reported that six of the country reports do not see the Paris Declaration as a “Panacea for Development” and that the “One size fits all” seems to be a problem. Some of these countries feel that the document is too prescriptive on the partner countries and very soft on the development partners, hence the view that this document in its current state is still too “development partner driven”. There was also a general concern from the six partner country reports that the clarity, validity and use of some indicators was bordering on ambiguity. It is interesting to note that the majority of the development partner country reports were more positive in that they talked about effective aid as their raison d’être or as “being built into their institutional DNA” but they still conceded that there were inadequacies in some areas where they also felt that the document was still a “work in progress” (Wood et al., 2008:290).
Whereas the 2008 Synthesis report confirmed the issues mentioned above in the
global progress, certain broader conclusions were also elaborated on at the same time.
In the first instance the report underlined the fact that the Paris Declaration was
indeed a political agenda of action on aid rather than a simple technical tool.
Therefore its success is directly linked to and dictated upon by the existing politics
and political economy. This report also shows that in spite of all the goodwill from
both the development partners and partner countries glaring divergences do exist on
the ground, and these seem to be systemic in nature and deeply grounded and
embedded in the way both partners normally operate. For example there was a
reluctance to use partner country systems or the perceived increases in development
partner budgets to compensate for the extra activities accruing from the
implementation of the Paris Declaration. Most development partners are also wary of
the perceived low individual and institutional capacities in partner countries. This is
clearly reflected by the development partner’s insistence on using dual reporting
systems, especially for projects. The report further mentions the existence of differing
expectations, objectives and outcomes, which is reflected by some countries referring
to “statements of intent” vis-à-vis “non-negotiable decrees” in reference to the Paris
Declaration. This reflects glaring differences in the interpretation and purpose of this
document from both partners.

The use and limitations of the indicators are also brought into the limelight in this
report though it is clear that the competitive advantage of the Paris Declaration vis-à-
vis previous development agendas clearly outweighs this pessimism, through the very
clear-cut and specific indicators and targets. Some countries were worried about the
narrowness of the indicators or the fact that certain commitments had very few
indicators, as per country reports from the Philippines and Uganda respectively. Most
country reports highlighted the presence of both synergies and perceived tensions in
the Declaration. The best example here is about ownership against harmonisation
which can be viewed from different angles depending on whether it is the
development partner or the partner country. There is a feeling that increased
harmonisation can easily result in diminishing ownership levels because
harmonisation is by and large mainly centred in the hands of development partners.
Some development partners have also raised a concern in regard to possible
escalations in operational costs as a result of the re-engineering of the aid process.
This re-engineering process might require in some areas new skills, new rules of engagement, and a rethinking of the composition of the aid staff on the ground. Perhaps the third round of Paris Declaration Evaluations in 2008-10 would shed more light and clarity on these issues (Wood et al., 2008:31-36)

Though applauded as a tool likely to rejuvenate the aid dealings by development partners, partners and other parties, this consensus has in its short period of existence been subjected to serious scrutiny from various quarters among others by academics and practitioners in the development arena, it has even been referred to by some as one which is ushering in “a new era of colonial aspirations. Yash Tandon, in his article ‘Southern Discomfort’ (2008a:5), maintains that there is something untoward in the Paris Declaration beyond what one can see at first impression. He quotes Bissio (2007) talking about “asymmetrical conditions” under which negotiations take place between donors and beneficiaries resulting in some superstructure in the governance of world economic issues well above the World Bank and other regional banks. He goes further to say that other areas of concern are the non-involvement of the United Nations (UN) from the outset as well as the fact that most aid documents are still prepared without the involvement of the partner countries. There is a possibility, therefore, that the Accra HLF was an attempt to remedy this apparent shortcoming.

Another negative point here, according to Tandon, is the sudden movement from project funding to programme-based funding which concentrates the power equation in the hands of the development partner, because resources are pooled, the funds are merely put in the partner’s budget and all of this depends on the donor’s assessment of which domestic policies are good or bad. For example, the compliance test used by the World Bank does not use the local systems. Furthermore most funding donors still have a choice of either using local or international systems. So in effect the overall management of funding still resides in the hands of the development partners, hence the view that this is in effect “collective colonisation” by the donors because they are still exploiting the vulnerability of the smaller states (Tandon, 2008a:1-5).

A EURODAD report in 2008 confirms that although two key commitments of the Paris Declaration – ownership and accountability – have been singled out as the most important, the activities of both the development partners and the partners reflect the
exact opposite. Examples are that the French agencies are unable to say exactly how much assistance is provided to Mali, USAID is still imposing its rules in Mozambique and Mali, DFID and the World Bank are carrying out programmes in Sierra Leone without using the local systems, and the list goes on. Mahbubani in his critique of Western Aid “The Myth of Western Aid” says that some aid does indeed trickle down to where it is needed but the bulk still goes back to the development partner through administration expenses, consulting fees and direct payments to contractors from the donor side. The custodian of the PD – the OECD – is in his view, just an expensive research paper-churning organisation with little practical value for the developing world, thus he calls OECD “a sunset organisation”. He gives an example of where OECD countries just refuse to keep their pledges or renege on these at will. One example he gives is the 1969 OECD country commitment to free 7% of their annual gross revenues for aid purposes, but by 2006 these were up to only 0.31%. These sentiments resonate with those of Bissio as quoted by Tandon that in spite of the Paris Declaration the development partners have still the upper hand in the business of aid (Mahbubani, 2008:1-3; Tandon, 2008a:5).

Tandon proposes that in order to get rid of the albatross around the neck of the Paris Declaration, the following needs to be done: the Paris Declaration must be embedded in the UN systems to encompass, for example, the MDGs; the results of the Accra HLF must be taken with a pinch of salt; the Declaration must be distanced from the original Bretton Woods institutions; it must be admitted that aid is not the solution to development; alternative methods of development must be sought; and some UN bodies, such as the Development Cooperation Forum, should be used to oversee the implementation of the Paris Declaration (Tandon, 2008b:4-8).

2.9 ODA in the South African Context
South Africa is classified as a middle income country with a population of about 49 million people with a gross national income per capita of USD 3,630. At the same time 11% of the population survives on less than one USD a day. Though net ODA in South Africa in 2004 amounted to only USD 617 million, and between 2000-2008 to USD 8 billion and probably rated as a pittance in volumes in comparison to other countries receiving aid, it still remains an important source of development funding in South Africa (OECD, 2007:1). Of the total ODA disbursed, 63% is through the public
sector, 10% through NGOs or civil society, and the rest through multilaterals and other public private entities.

South Africa is known to be dealing with over thirty development partners, mainly European, most of whom are signatories to the Paris Declaration as well as some “new kids on the block” who in the development aid language are labelled “non-traditional” development partners such as China, India and some South American countries. Besides these sources South Africa also commands its own resources of development finance managed through the Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) amounting to ZAR 8.25 billion in 2010 as well as in the Industrial Development Cooperation (IDC) to the value of ZAR 30 million per annum. This puts South Africa in the position of being both a development partner and a partner (South Africa, 2011:7).

ODA or Official Development Aid in South Africa is housed under the Official Development Cooperation (ODA-P) and the IDC sections in the national treasury. This locus is strategic in that the national treasury is not only responsible for overseeing issues related to public financing but it is also mandated to ensure among others:

- Good governance;
- Driving economic development; and
- Generating finances needed for economic development and growth.

In view of the above it is interesting to reflect on the wave of the service delivery protests which engulfed almost all municipalities as from 2004 but peaking in 2010 within the bigger picture of the then current ODA in the country.

2.10 Understanding the Delivery Protests in South Africa 2004–2010
Whereas service delivery protests occurred pre-1994 during the apartheid era as well as post-1994, protests since 2004 have taken a different dimension in both their anatomy and physiology (nature and intensity) characterised by extreme violence and wanton destruction of lives and property targeted towards the third sphere of governance, namely the municipalities (IDASA, 2010:2; Research Unit Parliament of
It is not a coincidence that the communities were directing their anger at this level because it is a fact that municipalities, according to the current legislation in South Africa as well as the International Development Strategy, are tasked with the democratisation of society by having policies and institutional frameworks which contribute towards the bettering of the lives and livelihoods of its citizenry. This is well anchored in the Constitution of South Africa, Chapter 3 (the Bill of Rights) as well as in the World Development agenda, the Millennium Development Goals (IDASA, 2010:2). This presupposes strong leadership, good governance and a clear vision from this sphere of governance. IDASA propounds on this further by saying that:

It should be noted that the fundamental goal of a democratic system is citizen satisfaction. Therefore the effectiveness of good local governance needs to be judged by the capacity of local government structures to provide an integrated development approach to social and economic development issues and to supply essential services congruent with the needs and desires of the local communities. In this regard municipalities should be able to identify and prioritize local needs, determine adequate levels of services and allocate the necessary resources to the public (IDASA, 2010:1).

It is crucial to note how the different stakeholders were depicting these strikes: whereas most voices in government were seeing these strikes as more than about service delivery, they lumped them with other issues such as criminality, xenophobia, tenderpreneurs and political entrepreneurs. The Deputy Minister of the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) even coined the term “community strikes” to describe these protests during his address to the National Council of Provinces (NCOP) in Cape Town at the height of this social turmoil in April 2010 (Carrim, 2010:3). Social commentators, among others IDASA in their community survey during these upheavals, found that this was a case “of the communities causing the government to talk and to listen to them”. It was further a sign that the community mistrusted local government, in fact a Human Research Council survey rated this trust at only 43% (IDASA, 2010:3).
According to reports to the NCOP as well as to the National Parliament, the two top legislative bodies in the country, 27% of the protests were in Gauteng, 14% in North West, 12% in Western Cape, 12% in Mpumalanga, 11% in the Free State, 10% in the Eastern Cape, 7% in KwaZulu-Natal, 4% in Limpopo, and 3% in the Northern Cape. Another breakdown shows that 45% were in metros, 34% in informal settlements and the remaining 21% were in other areas in the country. There was a marked escalation in both the number and intensity of the protests between January and June 2009 affecting at least seven of the nine provinces in South Africa (Carrim, 2010:2; Research Unit Parliament, 2009: ii).

The precursor of these protests seems to go beyond the normal service delivery problems and points towards other “intrinsic issues”. Researchers and academics have grouped these into the following: Systemic (fraud, maladministration, nepotism, corruption), Structural (unemployment, land issues, healthcare systems) and Governance (loss of confidence in the administration, weak leadership) (Research Unit Parliament, 2009:vi). The study by IDASA in January 2010 in the affected municipalities went even deeper into the real possible causes. Key in their findings were that the political leadership in the municipalities was not responsive enough, that most ward councillors existed in name only and not in function, that the ward councillors were highly partisan and very politically aligned, that citizens are not being listened to, that there is a lack of citizen participation, and that the Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) do not reflect the requirements on the ground (only 3% of the national population participated actively in IDP processes in 2009). It goes further to say that the Municipal Finances Management Act (MFMA) is being flouted daily, and that the revenue base is weak because most municipalities are not in a position to properly correct their revenues. The report goes further to point to an inherent “fiscal distress” in these municipalities as a result of their being delegated to perform certain functions by national government without having the necessary muscle to generate their own funds. In a way national government is not exonerated from the chaos rampant at the third tier of governance (IDASA, 2010:3-5).

The skills deficit in the administrative and financial areas which has been widely reported on is part of any municipal report, coupled with the lack of general institutional capacity, exposes municipalities to the current failures and inability to
deliver on their mandates. The continued employment of unqualified people in areas which need expertise and experience, especially at managerial and technical levels, and in addition filling ward councillor posts with deployees of a similar calibre has exacerbated the void (Research Unit Parliament, 2009:iv; IDASA, 2010:6). Burger in his article to investigate the reasons behind the service protests brings in a different political dimension to the discussion. He says that political promises during election time are not adhered to or fulfilled, and that nepotism and the process of cadre deployment is a major concern to those in the deprived communities. In the case of political promises, there has been a pattern of protests after the elections in both 1994 and 2004 which incidentally occurred during winter which, according to some scholars, exacerbates the position of the poor because they are immediately faced with personal needs such as scarcity of heat, water and food which, though promised during the election campaigns, are in reality not fulfilled in the aftermath. In the latter, it is a glaring gap between the have-nots and the so-called fat cats, BEEs and tenderpreneurs. Former cadres and colleagues in the struggle against apartheid find themselves pitted against each other because of their positioning in the ruling party (Burger, 2009:1; van Wyk, 2009:4). The tragedy emanating from this area is well postulated by van Wyk in his 2009 article about service delivery, protests, strikes and labour action in South Africa as follows:

It is a country of huge contrasts with the leafy suburbs around Sandton such as Sandhurst and Houghton, north of Johannesburg accommodating the super rich, the ruling class have amongst the highest per capita income levels in the world contrasted to informal settlements (squatter camps such as Diepsloot, Ramaphosa Freedom park and shacks teetering on the edge of the Juskei River and radioactive streams such as the Wonderfonteinspruit (van Wyk, 2009:3).

The extreme violence, brutality and destruction of both life and property can only be compared to those in the eighties. Carrim argues that this could be a sign of extreme marginalisation and social exclusion, and refers to those who do not have as “outsiders” and those who have reaped the benefits of the new South Africa as “insiders”. He argues further that this anger is a result of reaching and going over a threshold with people’s expectations within a magnitude only comparable to that of
the apartheid days, not being addressed since the dawn of a new South Africa, with the motto “Nothing has changed, Nothing will change” (Carrim, 2010:2). This reminds one of similar uprisings in Europe in the 1980s especially in the then Federal Republic of Germany, spearheaded by young people against nuclear plants and urbanisation, where the situation was similar. The young felt they were not being listened to and disenfranchised; therefore they turned to violence and clashes with the police under the motto “No Future” (personal experience). The view above is embedded in Ted Gurr’s “Frustration-Aggression” theory as quoted by Burger, where he explains that aggression is a result of prolonged frustration. The more prolonged a frustration is the more aggressively it manifests itself. He argues that the more intense a deprivation is the more aggressive it becomes and that this is the source of human violence (Burger, 2009:2).

Lastly it is also argued that violent demonstrations are part and parcel of the South African landscape and society since the 1980s at the height of the apartheid struggles. Rendering a place ungovernable seems to have been one of the factors which brought apartheid to its knees. So if it worked then, why not now? The communities feel that this is the best way to elicit attention and the badly needed assistance, indeed to get anything done from the government. COGTA sees these protests to an extent as a manifestation of a culture of state dependency which has been perpetuated since 1994 through various government practices (Carrim, 2010:3).

In conclusion the solution to these community protests or service delivery protests would have been to tackle the politico-social-economic conditions prevailing in the various communities. The current agenda of employing the security establishments to quell the apparent symptoms without addressing the root causes is indeed a futile exercise which has no sustainability at all. Political promises must be made carefully and fulfilled and service delivery issues must be addressed (Burger, 2009:2). The point is not to quell the protests but rather, as Carrim observes, that service delivery protests are an important part of our democracy, acting as barometers of the quality of our democracy (Carrim 2010:5). Further IDASA goes on to say that “the failure of the municipalities to deliver on basic services not only causes immense hardship but can have a detrimental impact on the socio-economic development (IDASA, 2010:8).
2.11 The ODA Legislative Framework

South African ODA is managed within the provisions of specific South African policies and legislation together with certain requirements from the development partners: the Constitution of South Africa and the Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act.

The Constitution of South Africa (1996) section 231(1) contains a clear differentiation in the signing powers when dealing with foreign entities. All agreements involving any flow of funds can only be signed by the national executive, while those which do not involve direct fund flows and twinning can be signed at the second and third tier of governance. Whereas the Reconstruction and Development Act of 1998 specifically controls the Reconstruction and Development Plan (RDP) fund, the receipt and the management of the actual ODA funds are governed by the RDP Fund Act (Act 7 of 1994 and its amendment of 1998). The financial accounting, auditing and reporting of ODA funding is managed under the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) (Act 1 of 1999, the amended sections 72 and 76 as well as the Treasury regulations) and this refers specifically to the first and second tiers of governance. The ODA funding at the third tier of governance, the municipality, is managed under a different act: the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA), Act 56 of 2003.

The Preferential Procurement Policy Framework Act (Act 5 of 2000) is very important when dealing with partnerships involving procurement of goods and services, an important factor in view of the various BEE requirements and the need to empower previously disadvantaged groups, especially women, the youth and the disabled. Whereas the Value Added Tax (VAT) Act (Act 89 of 1991 as amended in 2000) specifically addresses itself to the fact that donor funds are VAT free, the Customs and Excise Act (Act 1 of 1964 as amended) is very relevant if through a specific agreement, equipment or a plant has to be imported into South Africa from a foreign country. Finally the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act of 2005 ensures that all those projects at both municipal and provincial levels are managed within the expected prescripts and norms as laid out at the national competency whereas the Aliens Control Act (Act 96 of 1991) ensures that the involvement of foreign personnel and technical assistants in the joint projects is properly regulated and that their presence in the projects and the country is legal (IDC, 2007:43).
2.11.1 The Role of ODA and Modalities

ODA in most developing countries goes directly towards augmenting operational budgets but the situation in South Africa is rather different. Pre-1994 most ODA was channelled through NGOs because of the then apartheid policies and the development partners resolve to ensure that this assistance did not land in the then apartheid regime’s coffers. Post-1994 the situation changed dramatically in that more and more ODA began to flow directly towards the national, provincial and municipal systems. Current indications are that more and more ODA is being directly targeted to the coalface of delivery and development, that is, the municipalities (IDC, 2007:6).

The picture in South Africa is also different in that although the country is more developed overall as compared to its immediate neighbours or other countries in Africa, the reality on the ground is that of a dual and parallel economy: the phenomenon of the so-called first and second economies, the former being comparable to those of middle-sized European countries and the latter depicting a picture of abject poverty and deprivation as the case is in most countries on the African continent (IDC, 2007:7–8). In the latter, service provision translates itself into lack of or poor infrastructure and poor services, especially in the townships and outlying rural areas. ODA is very strategic in South Africa in that although it only amounts to 1-2% of the national budget its value and importance lies in the fact that it is mostly used to provide solutions and tools to maximise the utilisation of the country’s own resources. It is used as a tool to enhance the implementation of government polices and priorities for purposes of improved service delivery, development and poverty alleviation. It is not merely a “gap filler” but rather a catalyst not in quantity terms but in quality terms by paving a new way in which development can take place. According to the IDC “it is used in capacity building, in innovative approaches to test and pilot new approaches, used as a catalyst, used to enhance domestic resources and is also very ideal in ventures which would under normal circumstance tend towards failing” (IDC, 2007:8). According to the second phase country report on the evaluation of the Paris Declaration in 2010, the value of ODA in South Africa lies in “leveraging own resources more effectively, implications or the transfer of knowledge, best practices, leveraging upstream policy change, embedding innovative approaches as well as supporting strategic partnerships in the so-called triangular development cooperation” (Woods et al., 2011b:7).
The recognised ODA modalities worldwide can be categorised as follows (but with the proviso that some are not applicable in South Africa):

- Project
- Programme
- Pooled funding (basket)
- General budget support
- Sector budget support
- Sector wide support

A project is defined in this context as an individual and distinct development intervention for purposes of achieving a particular objective within a specified framework and schedule. Whereas this modality is often discouraged in many developing countries with multiple parallel projects and bigger ODA budgets, it is a model of choice in South Africa because of its limited number of development partners, fewer intervention and smaller ODA budget. Programme support refers to a large project made up of multiple activities and cross-cutting in nature. In this case several small projects can be merged into one big operation involving several developing partners. This normally results in better coordination and joint management and shows better results. This method is popular in South Africa because of its enhanced coordination properties. Pooled funding or basket funding involves pooling of resources from the developing partners to achieve a certain objective or to support a joint undertaking. It is recommended in South Africa because it brings the management of various developing partners under one hat. General budget support is funding which flows directly into the fiscus of the country; it has no prescribed target and can be used at will by the partner. This type of support is mainly used in countries with deprived budgets, and is therefore not very applicable in South Africa.

Sector budget support is similar to general budget support but in this case the funding is earmarked to support a specific sector in government: this could be sanitation, water or roads. This modality is again not commonly used in South Africa but is sometimes acceptable in cases where the assistance involves other things besides money. Finally in the sector wide approach, the activities are smaller than in the
programme-based approach but it is elevated to the sector level. In this case all development partners support a single sector, such as for example tourism, thereby providing a coordinated front between themselves and the partner under government leadership and funding disbursement. This approach is popular in South Africa in cases where several developing partners are supporting a defined sector (IDC, 2007:6). The choice of a modality is dictated by several factors, including the development challenges, the nature and capacity of the implementing organ, and in some cases the preferences of the developing partner, although care must be taken to ensure that the final choice is made jointly between the partner and developing partners (Wood et al., 2008:12). It is also highly recommended to draw on past experiences in the partner / developing partner interaction or at best to draw on the experiences and advice from the IDC in the National Treasury before a choice of a modality is made.

2.11.2 The Millennium Development Goals

It is difficult to talk about development worldwide in general and in South Africa in particular without reflecting on the Millennium Development Goals, hereafter called the MDGs, and their relationship with the Paris Declaration as well as the current development agenda and discussions. South Africa seems to have taken this to heart especially in the way the third progress report of 2010 was done. The report was a joint effort between government, civil society and business (Government of South Africa, 2010a:2).

The MDGs are a consensus of 189 countries and 145 heads of state who met at the United Nations in 2008 to work towards activating certain critical economic and social development priorities by the year 2015. South Africa was a signatory to this accord which comprises eight development priorities, namely:

1. To eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.
2. To achieve universal primary education.
3. To promote gender equality and empower women.
4. To reduce child mortality.
5. To improve maternal health.
6. To combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases.
7. To ensure environmental sustainability.
8. To develop global partnerships development.

These inter-related goals and targets, in a similar fashion to those in the Paris Declaration, bind both developed and developing countries to work in tandem, through partnerships, to achieve them, thereby contributing towards development and the elimination of poverty (Government of South Africa, 2010a:11). A very interesting fact to note in the application of the MDGs in comparison to the Paris Declaration was the so-called “domestication process”, which is the process of ensuring that the international targets and indicators were made relevant to the country by neglecting issues of a local context. This was done through a process of local consultation with stakeholders ranging from government and civil society to business. Whereas the initial declaration in 2000 comprised 8 goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators, by the year 2010 the targets had changed to 20, and the indicators to 60 (Government of South Africa, 2010a:10-16).

Examples in the case of South Africa would be the strong emphasis on the health MDGs 4, 5 and 6. This domestication is also some sort of ownership by the fact that this process has further linkages and embedding in the eight MDG imperatives in the workings of the government of the day within the various relevant policies geared towards a comprehensive development strategy in South Africa (Government of South Africa, 2010a:15).

The development imperatives in the MDGs are informed by this domestication process whereby back in 2009 the government through its Medium Term Strategic Framework (2009–2014) identified specific development objectives which were to guide planning, allocation of funding and implementation through all three spheres of governance, namely national, provincial and municipal. These objectives were:

- To halve poverty and unemployment by 2014.
- To ensure a more equitable distribution of the benefits of economic growth and reduce inequality.
- To improve the nation’s health profile and skills base and ensure universal access to basic services.
- To build a nation free of all forms of racism, sexism, tribalism and xenophobia.
- To improve the safety of citizens by reducing incidents of crime and corruption.

These imperatives clearly link to the MDGs and in time also reflect a clear linkage to the Paris Declaration as shown in Figure 2.1 (Government of South Africa, 2010a:14).

**Figure 2.1:** Linkages between MDGs, National Development Planning and Development Outcomes

Source: Modified from the Government of South Africa, 2010a:16)

If then Development is in the main targeted towards poverty alleviation (called eradication of extreme poverty under the MDGs), the 2010 results show mixed results indicating a need to do much more in this area. Whereas the proportion of the population living below the poverty line has declined from 28.5% in 2000 to 7.9% in 2006 (taking the standard as a dollar a day), employment levels have remained more or less static at just below 4% over the period 2001–2009. It is also striking that whereas free basic services to all communities overall is on the decline, those specifically to “indigent communities” are on the increase. In spite of all the above the GINI coefficient (a measure of inequality) has increased, which flies in the face of an
earlier assertion that absolute poverty had declined. This can easily be explained by the grant system which has flourished from 2.6 million people in 2000, to 14.1 million in 2010 vis-à-vis a very high unemployment rate and low labour force participation as mentioned above. This in effect means that either a very large population in the country is surviving on the grant system or alternatively large portions of unemployed people depend on the few who are employed. This “dependency syndrome” is characteristics of all aid systems and is similar to cases in ODA and from the literature, these do not always augur well in the development scenario (Government of South Africa, 2010a:22-38).

2.11.3 Aid Effectiveness

In response to the inherent requirement in the Paris Declaration for each development partner and partner country to assess its progress, South Africa carried out its first country assessment in 2008 and thereafter presented its report (Woods et al., 2008:3). A questionnaire in electric format was distributed to 20 development partner representatives in South Africa, 24 government officials, 13 from the national departments and only three from the provinces. As per the international Terms Of Reference (TORs), the purpose was mainly to assess the behaviour patterns of both the development partners and the partner countries during the implementation of the Paris Declaration. The main question revolved around the usefulness of the Paris Declarations as an effective tool and whether noticeable changes had been noted in both the development partner and the partner country as a result.

The findings were in most cases very useful for such a task considering that this was the first time the key commitments were being used for this purpose. A common finding was that the five key commitments lacked clarity and that in cases of ownership this would have to be cascaded to the lower level beyond the current practice of only targeting the national competency. South Africa also felt that a number of development partners were refusing to use the local reporting systems, especially those in the financial areas. The current South African PFMA documents are comparable to the best in the world on financial management and therefore this reluctance is contributing to problems around alignment issues. There was also an observation that in harmonisation more efforts were erroneously being put on

The South African report underlined the fact that there was some confusion between managing for results and mutual accountability but these seem to have been addressed through the current and very strong monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes which permeate all the services in the public sector. It is important to note at this juncture that the original Paris Declaration was prioritised at national level but not adequately integrated and fully adopted at provincial and municipality levels, and that most public service actors at this level see this as an “add on”. Whereas the partner countries put a lot of emphasis on wownershp, alignment and harmonisation, the development partners rather put their emphasis on managing for results and mutual accountability. This disjuncture is indeed a recipe for failure if it is not addressed in the early stages. A key outcome from this report was that an Aid Operational Plan must be developed. As well as operating as a clear aid map, this would ensure that the right modality of aid is applied, that capacity is developed, and that the document is used to stimulate action both at the provincial and municipal level where aid is most required (Government of South Africa, 2008:1-7).

The spirit of the Paris Declaration (PD) requires development partners and partner countries to undertake regular self-assessments to gauge the effectiveness of this intervention as a tool to enhance the effectiveness of aid in their entities. As a result South Africa participated in the first phase of the Paris Declaration country evaluations in 2008. The next set of evaluations is currently in progress (2008-11) in preparation for the Fourth High Level meeting in Seoul, Korea in 2011.

2.12 The Local Drive to Cascade the Paris Declaration to the Provincial and Municipal Level

In 2009, South Africa embarked on a very strong drive through the IDC to ensure that the Paris Declaration was being implemented at provincial and municipal levels and that those entities were accruing the benefits. As a direct response to the recommendations in the 2008 country evaluations the IDC spearheaded the processes of forming ODA Coordinating Forums in all provinces by convening several centralised meetings under their leadership. The effort even went further whereby the
IDC contracted a consultant to assist these entities to develop their own international relations strategies modelled on those at national level. The presumption here was that these would be cascaded down to the various departments in the provinces with these units forming a dedicated local ODA forum. It has been noted that in 2008 the IDC on behalf of the National Treasury produced a South African Aid Effectiveness Action Plan which was in 2009 crafted around the five key commitments in the Paris Declaration, again with specific indicators and targets (see Addendum 1: Aid Effectiveness Action Plan for South African 2009).

The Eastern Cape Province intensified its ODA coordination activities during 2009–2010 by forming a dedicated ODA Coordinating Forum located in the Office of the Premier (OTP) in Bhisho. Whereas the province has been a recipient of ODA through the various provincial departments and the municipality as well, mainly, through the twinning agreements as far back as 1996, the coordination thereof has been very haphazard (Lwanga-Iga, 2008:75). Each department at provincial level and the municipalities were left to manage and coordinate their own ODAs without any overarching oversight from any higher body. It is also interesting to note that through twinning arrangements with some 12 countries since 1995 the province has been receiving ODA in various modalities to the tune of about ZAR 7 billion, most of this being through grants or technical support (Lwanga-Iga, 2008:22-23, Sotondoshe, 2009:2).

In the process the ODA Coordinating Forum in the Province has produced a Provincial International Relations Strategy to assist all local entities in the province to maximise the opportunities from these offerings. The purpose of this strategy reads as follows:

The Eastern Cape International Relations Strategy (IRS) provides a provincial framework for engagement with International counterparts and strategic partners. This will be done within the broader foreign policy objectives in a coordinated and coherent manner in order to ensure that the Province moves in synchrony on international relations matters and maximized benefits regarding the provincial development goals. The Implementation plan will outline the modus operandi and the Process map in detail as well as the responsibilities
that will be undertaken by the OTP. The EC IRCF will be a vehicle of communication and information sharing (OTP, 2009:2).

Though well written, this document does not seem to put the right emphasis on ODA although it mentions it in passing: it concentrates more on protocol issues, as can be seen from the fact that it refers more to Foreign Affairs and there is very little mention of IDC in the Treasury. One can hope that as this is a draft document it will be improved on over time, and through the assistance and guidance from IDC as mentioned previously there is a likelihood that its focus could be influenced to have a section dedicated to ODA.

A positive dimension in this strategy is its bias towards “consolidation of its African agenda” which should then revolve around NEPAD, involvement in the Madagascar Development Cooperation Initiative, the bilateral commission with Lesotho, and the India–Brazil–South Africa (IBSA) relations”. This indeed brings out the question and the location of South Africa in the ODA arena. Is South Africa a Development Partner, a partner country or both? (OTP Eastern Cape, 2009:6-7).

Public participation is a process whereby the people are actively involved in the decisions, planning and delivery of services which affect their lives. The current government in South Africa sees this as “an open, accountable process through which individuals and groups within a selected community can exchange views and influence decisions which affect their lives” (DPLG, 2005:1). Brynard in Bekker (1996:133-134) suggests that another definition could be “purposeful activities in which people take part in relation to a local authority of which they are legal residents”.

Post-1994 the notion of public participation as a key process in the democratisation of governance at the local level is anchored in Chapter 2 of the Constitution, sections 151(1), 152 and 195(e); the 1999 White Paper on Local Government (Municipalities to develop systems to encourage citizen participation); the Municipal Structures Act 117 of 1998 as amended (Ward council formation, participatory democracy) and the Municipal Systems Act 2000 (Communities to work in partnerships with municipalities, community participation, participatory governance). The need for
public participation lies in the following areas: consultation as a legal requirement in South Africa, plans and services tailored to local needs, promotion of community involvement, and empowering people to have control over their lives and livelihoods (Craythorne, 2006:263-264).

Participation has been evolving in South Africa over the last two decades. During the apartheid years a system of “community management” prevailed, characterised by passivity and dependency. This was followed post-1994 by “project-based community participation” (government expected to deliver services) followed by the “community development approach” (government acts as gatekeeper) culminating in the status quo as of now, namely “partnerships or negotiated development” whereby the communities participate in the affairs of the municipality knowing their rights and responsibilities. In short, participation allows for policy to be influenced by the people’s needs, lives and aspirations and the reality of basic services on the ground.

On the other hand, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in development activities, according to the World Bank (2004:5), are processes “that can provide governments, development managers, or civil society with better means of learning from past experience, improving delivery, planning and allocating of resources as well as demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders”. This is achieved by use of various M&E tools and methodologies. These can be inter alia specific performance, logical framework approaches, theory based evaluations, formal surveys, rapid appraisal methods, participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, cost benefit or cost effectiveness analysis or impact evaluations (World Bank, 2004:6-25).

According to the OECD-DAC (2002:2), monitoring is defined as “the ongoing systematic collection of information to assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, outcomes and impacts”. This is an ongoing process whose focus is on “outcomes” of an intervention rather than on the intervention itself and therefore can be used as an early warning system to indicate whether the intervention is likely to achieve the expected results. Evaluation, according to the OECD-DAC can be defined as “the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, or programme, its design, implementation and results with the aim of determining the

Other studies even go further to rename M&E, ME&L (Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning), to bring the notion of learning in the whole process to the fore. The questions they ask are: “Are we doing the right thing? How can we do it better?” This pushes the debate towards a better understanding of what is effective, best practices and increase in accessibility (Social Impact, 2006:27).

2.13 The Conundrum
The conundrum between service delivery and ODA is the key focus of this study. If municipalities have a democratising and developmental role to play in society in South Africa then their key push must be towards achieving this by improving the standards of life and livelihoods in their respective areas. This is the only way the current persistent underdevelopment, poverty and inequality can be addressed and defeated with a view to meeting the eight MDGs among other things. The purpose of ODA or aid is to assist in development and eventually contribute towards poverty alleviation in the partner countries. It is also a fact that the two municipalities in this study, namely Buffalo City Municipality and Nelson Mandela Metro, are known to have been recipients of ODA in various modalities over time. It is therefore interesting to interrogate the above in view of the five commitments in the Paris Declaration to improve the delivery of ODA in terms of quality and quantity.

2.14 Conclusion
The researcher has attempted in the foregoing section to reflect on the various debates about ODA or aid and related commitments such as the Paris Declaration and the MDGs, in particular those which discuss the pros and cons and ultimately whether these interventions have worked or not. In the process, overall trends in ODA financing volumes as well as the way aid is disbursed by various countries and organisations has also been discussed. The collated views of most authors point to the fact that aid as it has been up to 2005 is ineffective and no longer sustainable, thus the resolve by both development partners and partners to introduce a system which would probably assist not only in making aid more effective but would also in introducing
monitorable actions to influence the way aid is delivered and managed (Woods et al., 2008:430).

This resulted in the Paris Declaration in 2005 with its five partnership commitments coupled with its 12 indicators on monitoring. South Africa, being one of the signatories, has attempted to embed the Paris Declaration and its commitments within its administrative system, especially at the national level, and in the process has been complying with the requirements therein, namely regular national evaluations as well as the prescribed internal country evaluations culminating in the prescribed country reports carried out in 2008 and 2010. The effectiveness of aid through the implementation of the Paris Declaration is the central point of this research work in view of the recent service delivery protests” which affected almost all municipalities in South Africa from 2006 but reaching a climax during 2009. Although beset with some specific problems as highlighted by Tandon in his 2008 article in the Pambazuka News, there is a real possibility of the Paris Declaration being effective provided certain key issues are addressed especially by giving this document the credibility and legitimacy it deserves and by taking it through the recognised United Nations processes particularly those of planning, implementation and evaluation as was the case with MDGs (Tandon, 2008b:5).

The question this research attempts to answer is that if ODA or aid is supposed to improve the milieu of service delivery, especially basic services, to communities by providing both individual and institutional capacity in these entities, why then did those uprisings occur even in those areas which are known to have been enjoying ODA and AID facilities over a reasonable period post-1994? This is precisely why a section of this chapter has been dedicated to the discussion on service delivery protests, especially those around 2009. It is interesting to understand the linkage between those protests and the existing ODA situation in the municipalities as the custodians of service delivery to the communities. The results of this would then enable us to find out whether indeed the Paris Declaration would live up to its expectations, whether the apparent optimism around it would be short-lived or whether indeed it might be the solution to all the ills which have befallen ODA or aid over the last 60 years. Finally, as proposed by many scholars and actors in the development arena, there should be an alternative to Aid dependency in its current
form; at best reform it, in the worst case scenario stop it (Tandon, 2008b:5, Mahbubani, 2008:1, Moyo, 2010:154).
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Whereas the previous chapter provided the theoretical background of this study by delving through the various arguments and works around Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) or aid, this chapter concentrates on defining a path or “road map” for this study especially on the research philosophy, the research strategy and the research instruments that were used to answer the three main research questions namely:

- What sort of international development aid (ODA) has been made available to these two metropolitan municipalities?
- How have the five elements of the Paris Declaration been implemented in the municipalities under study?
- Are these two municipalities under study better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration?

Research is anchored in three main criteria, namely the research philosophies, the research strategies and the research instruments. Philosophies refer to approaches used, for example quantitative, qualitative or mixed. Strategy is about determining the research questions and determining a way to find the right answers, and lastly the instrument refers to the means of collecting data, either primary or secondary. In short, research methodology is basically defining a path to answer a research question and, as mentioned before, this process gives the researcher a chance to draw a “road map” of methods, models and procedures out of a multitude of choices which would best assist him to achieve his goals and answer the questions at hand (www.ihmctan.edu).

It should be noted that this research is embedded in the classical four Ps which guide every research study, divided into two categories, namely the study population, which
is the main source of information (either given or collected), and the subject area comprising the other three Ps as follows:

(a) Problems – this has to do with needs situation,
(b) Progress – deals with structures, services, satisfaction, and
(c) Phenomena – the relationship between cause and effect


The purpose of this chapter is therefore to describe the methodology used to answer the three main research questions as well as the ensuing sub-questions by taking what has been mentioned earlier into consideration and at the same time by defining the setting of the research as well as the population involved in the study.

3.2 Research Design and Methodology

According to the current literature there are three main approaches to research and these are: quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. The differentiation within these methods as mentioned earlier is anchored in the philosophical assumptions of the study, the study strategies, methods of data collection, the position of the researcher in the study as well as the practices of research used (Creswell, 2003:19). Whereas quantitative methods are usually more associated with the natural sciences, involving measurements, statistics and experiments, qualitative research provides the researcher with a descriptive platform of occurrences which gives the issues at hand a deeper meaning.

The differentiation between these two strategies – qualitative and quantitative – goes beyond the collection and analysis of data, and the view of Bryman (2004:19-21) is that the difference also lies in the epistemology of the two methods. According to Scott and Marshall (2005:193), epistemology is, “the philosophical theory of knowledge of how we know what we know”. Table 3.1 chronicles the salient differences in the two approaches.
Table 3.1: Research Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Uses a deductive approach to test the theories</td>
<td>Uses an inductive approach to generate theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Based on a positivist approach inherent in the natural sciences</td>
<td>Rejects positivism by relying on individual interpretation of social realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Objectivist in that social reality is regarded as objective fact</td>
<td>Constructionist in that social reality is seen as a constantly shifting product of perception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Walliman (2009:36-37)

A number of scholars on the subject of social research, among them Walliman (2009:37), and Bryman (2004:19-21, 437-450), believe that not all research has to follow all the above, but that a combination of the two methods into what is called “mixed methods” (the method used in this study) is also recommended, and that one should not put so much emphasis on the differences in the two methodologies but rather understand that the properties of one can be used to enhance the other: for example, quantitative methods can be used in some qualitative research, and vice versa (Walliman, 2009:37).

The combination of the two in different measures into “mixed methods” allows for the exploitation of the symbiotic properties of both approaches to maximise the depth and validity of the outcomes. This study used more qualitative than quantitative methods utilising available literature, documentation and questionnaires as well as face-to-face interactions with development partners (donors), partner municipalities, sector department staff and actual community members (beneficiaries).

3.2.1 Evaluation Research

Evaluation research, according to Yegidis and Weinbach (2006:279), is “the systematic use of research methods to make judgements about the effectiveness and
the overall worth or value of some form of social work practice”. It can be further argued that programme evaluation, as is the case in this study, is suitable for collecting knowledge for purposes of decision-making rather than simple knowledge accumulation for future use. Walliman (2009:39) concurs with this, saying that indeed “evaluation research is to examine programmes or the workings of projects from the point of view of the following namely: levels of awareness, costs of benefits effectiveness attaining of objectives and quality assurance.”

Whereas the results of such a study can be used to provide concrete knowledge about a programme, the most common use is that of assisting to develop and improve on an ongoing or already established programme. Programme evaluation was initially used post World War two when the then politicians had to scrutinise their election promises in the 1980s, as newly implemented social programmes were failing to mitigate the then urgent social challenges of their constituencies, especially in relation to employment and poverty issues of the day. As time went on society as a whole began understanding the values of such evaluations and, according to Yegidis and Weinbach (2006:283-284), extended this to other areas, for example:

- Clients in consumer movements who needed proof that implemented programmes were providing results.
- Professionals to assist in investigating financial cutbacks.
- Health and social welfare programmes which wanted to check whether their programmes were both effective and cost effective.
- Taxpayers who wanted to know how their taxes were being used.

With time the focus of these evaluation programmes, especially in organizations, has progressed and became more multifaceted so that now they can address themselves to individual small areas of the whole so as to optimise the results. Yegidis and Weinbach (2006:283-284) provide a list of possible evaluation aspects as follows:

- Financial evaluations – *is the programme running as planned?*
- Time and motion studies – *how do staff use their time to optimize efficiency?*
• Administrative audits – are the key components of administration as a function being implemented, e.g., planning, organising and staffing.
• Audits – financial programmes.
• Social accounting – correct record keeping, reports and accuracy.
• Budget reviews – Are activities within budget? Is there no unnecessary expenditure?
• Structural evaluations – focuses on the organisation and staff qualifications, credentials, diversity, health and infrastructure especially the facilities and technology
• Cost effectiveness – Is the success of the programme at par with its cost?

Evaluation of programmes is further categorised into three distinct groups corresponding to the stages in the development of the programme or project, namely needs assessment, formative and summative (outcomes).

The OECD evaluation framework which was followed in this study emphasises the use of the last two evaluations, namely formative and summative. Initially needs assessment determines whether a programme is needed or not, that is why this part was not relevant in this study because the need for this programme, i.e., to introduce the Paris Declaration as an ODA or aid intervention had already been pre-determined by several preceding global consultative as far back as the First Sector Wide approaches in the 1980s culminating in the 2005 Paris High Level Forum meeting (Woods et al., 2011:1).

A formative evaluation looks at implementation and whether a programme is operating correctly and how well. According to Yegidis and Weinbach (2006:287), the same methods as used in needs assessment can be used here as well (interviews, questionnaire, etc.) but the difference between the two lies in the results. The results of formative evaluation yield the following:

• Confirmation that the programme is in place and operational.
• Challenges in implementation of the programme.
• Provide grounds to change course or institute improvements in the programme.
• Reasons why the whole or part of a programme is not functioning.

Formative evaluation in this study corresponds the the first phase of the country evaluation as recommended by the OECD–DAC Framework, which looked strictly at the implementation of the Paris Declaration (OECD, 2007:5).

The third part of the evaluation, called the outcome evaluation, is the most common and most important, in spite of the fact that it is also the most feared, because it can determine the future or the immediate death or closure of an intervention or a programme. In short, outcomes talks about the extent to which an intervention has succeeded in achieving its objective within acceptable costs. This refers to an important interplay between effectiveness and efficiency. The difference between efficiency and effectiveness is that whereas efficiency talks about outcomes vis-à-vis efforts and resources, effectiveness refers to how well the objectives have been achieved. Yegidis and Weinbach (2006:289) emphasise the importance of outcome evaluations in time-limited programmes being conducted towards the end of a funding life cycle. With respect to this study, outcome evaluation corresponds to the second phase country evaluation framework whose aim was also to find out whether the Paris Declaration had any effect on aid effectiveness and the development results (OECD, 2007:5).

The research design in this study is heavily based on the two evaluation frameworks as used during the 2005-2010 process of evaluating the Paris Declaration with particular reference to the independent country evaluations by the Organisation of Economic Cooperation Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (OECD 2009:3). Inherent in these frameworks was that the first phase framework looked specifically at the “HOWs” and “WHYs” of the Paris Declaration implementation whereas the second one zoned in on outcomes, results and the impact thereof (OECD, 2008:5), as illustrated in Figure 3.1.
In respect to this study the first and second research questions refer to the Hows and the Whys as shown below:

- What sort of international development aid (ODA) has been made available to these two municipalities?
- How have the five elements of the Paris Declaration been implemented in the municipalities under study?

Whereas the first question tries to put the research in context by defining the available ODA sources, the second question specifically refers to the implementation of the Paris Declaration which is the subject of this research.

The third research question corresponds to the outcomes, results and impact evaluation in the framework:

- Are these two municipalities under study better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration?

The researcher was confident that the use of both the primary (research instrument, interviews) and secondary (literature, reports) data and information would yield the information needed to answer these questions. In addition, the reliability and validity of the results was ensured by using multiple sources to collect data, which is referred to as triangulation.
The criterion used was to interrogate the implementation and status of the five key elements which underline effective aid in the Paris Declaration according to Wood et al. (2008:3):

- Ownership
- Alignment with countries’ strategies, systems and procedures
- Harmonisation of donor’s actions
- Managing the results
- Mutual accountability

Furthermore, this study is also anchored in the results of the four high level fora, namely:

- Rome in 2003,
• Paris in 2005,
• Accra in 2008, and
• Busan in 2011.

The results focus on the development of principles aimed to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of aid (www.oecd.org).

The study incorporated elements used in the first phase of the country level evaluations of the Paris Declaration (OECD/DAC, 2007b:8) as well as those used in the second phase which was completed early 2011 in preparation for the 4th High Level Meeting in Busan, Korea, in November 2011. While the South African country studies focused and limited themselves to the national sphere only, this research engaged local donor agents in South Africa and at the beneficiary levels, the local municipality functionaries and the communities themselves.

According to Patton in De Vos et al. (2005:369), programme evaluation is “a systemic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programmes to make judgments about the programme, improve its effectiveness and/or inform future decisions”. In their book Evaluation, – A systemic approach, Rossi et al. (2004: 62) highlighted the following as the main issues which are addressed by an evaluation process:

• Needs assessment,
• Assessment of programme theory,
• Assessment of programme process or monitoring, and
• Impact assessment
• Efficiency assessment

Predictability, country systems, conditionality and untying of aid, also-called “Agenda for Action Drivers”, was a means of putting more emphasis on the original five Paris Declaration Principles (www. aid. effectiveness). Guba and Lincoln (1989:8-11) and Robson (2002:201-15) refer to this type of study as evaluation research. According to them, the main purpose is to interrogate and make sense of complex social issues,
these could be projects or programmes, the results thereof could then be used to propose changes, improvements or even to understand the programme or project better.

Reflecting on the propositions from various authors in the previous paragraph, the researcher’s choice of programme evaluation, besides being the approach recommended by the OECD/DAC framework, provides the best setting for dissecting a social programme such as the Paris Declaration in the two municipalities under study. The objective of this study was to find out whether the Paris Declaration had been implemented in the specific metros, what had or had not been achieved, and to provide a future pathway by improving on what has happened thus far. With this in mind the researcher concentrated on the last three blocks of programme evaluation: assessment of the programme process, impact assessment and efficiency assessment as described in Chapter 4, the results from this study.

In assessing the programme process it was important to establish whether the Paris Declaration was known, had been implemented, and if so to what extent, which corresponds to the first two research questions in this study. Research question three was answered by scrutinising the impact and efficiency of the services being provided by both metros under their legal mandates as the coalface providers of services to the communities. In this instance, the researcher examined service delivery of both municipalities to ascertain the status quo as reflected by the relevant questions in the research instrument. This interrogation was done through the perspective of the beneficiaries on the ground as well as from the institutional capacities of the municipalities to deliver on their mandates as dictated to them by the Constitution of Republic of South Africa, 1996 and other relevant legislation pertaining to service delivery at the local level of government.

Research design is a framework governing a given inquiry with the major building blocks being the existing knowledge claims (the existing literature and theory on the area of research), the strategies (the choice of the study plan to get to the required outcomes) and methods (techniques or procedures to get to the results). Creswell (2003:5) and Walliman (2009:42) in their modification of Crotty’s proposal summarise this into three questions which are central to research design: What
knowledge claims are being made by the researcher? What strategies of inquiry will inform the procedures? What method of data collection and analysis will be used?

Considering the assertions in the previous paragraph combined with the discussion and views reflected in Chapter Two of this study (the appearance of the Paris Declaration on the aid or ODA stage was a result of the global consensus that there were no tangible and demonstrable results from the current aid or ODA processes) as well as the fact that there is currently no reliable information on the implementation of the Paris Declaration at either local level in the province or in the country as a whole, the researcher was further convinced that the inclusion of the views from the beneficiaries on the ground was critical if valid and reliable results were to be obtained. This in view of the fact that all independent country evaluations of the Paris Declaration globally and from South Africa to date, did not involve the “real” recipients on the ground, the communities. This study utilised the mixed research methodology, mainly qualitative with some quantitative, specifically to give the results of this study the depth derived from qualitative studies without losing the statistical attributes brought by qualitative studies.

Denscombe (2005:3) confirms that “there is no one right direction to take, a good social research is a matter of horses for courses where approaches are selected to fit the purpose”. In brief, the research design has to respond to the particular investigation and problem with a view of getting the best outcomes.

3.3 Research Approach

The choice of a research approach is guided among others by three main aspects: the research problem, the researcher’s experience and the audience at whom the research is directed. A mixed approach method has been employed for this study, because as several authors confirm, this is how to get the best out of both the qualitative and quantitative approaches. In this way, it is possible to start with a general picture and then zoom into the smaller detailed areas (Creswell, 2003:22). In addition to the consideration made earlier, this method is recommended in most participatory studies. A mixed approach was deployed in this study: mainly qualitative to yield descriptive data vital in understanding the dynamics of the research question, but in step with
Struwig and Stead (2001:61), some quantitative data was also used to complement the qualitative.

3.4 Population and Sampling

The impracticality of collecting data from every member of the community brings about the need to decide on a credible and representative sampling method which implies that the sample chosen would be a mini replica of the whole. Of the two well-known sampling methods, probability and non-probability, the former was chosen in this study because the researcher was confident that the population used would yield the answers to the research question because members of this population are the active actors in this process: the donor organisations, the recipients (municipalities or metros), the beneficiaries on the ground and the key players in the other two spheres of government-national and provincial levels (Flick 2002:68).

The researcher opted for stratified sampling because this process maintains the randomness which is needed when sampling the communities but at the same time allows selecting on the basis of identity and purpose (crucial people and factors), especially in the case of the donor and recipient administrators of offices (Denscombe, 2005:12; Kanyane 2006:48). Assistance was requested from Statistics South Africa and ECCSEC in the designing of a sampling frame, which is defined as “an objective list from which the researcher can make selections from” (Denscombe, 2005:17; Creswell, 2003). This was very relevant especially when dealing with the beneficiaries at ground level in both metros.

The target population in this study were the actors both in the development partner community (donors), as well as those in the partner countries groups (beneficiaries including those on the ground), namely metro officials, especially those dealing with ODA as well as the communities on the ground and NGOs in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro and Buffalo City Metro. It also included other target groups outside these two metros and the development partners, including the Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs in the Eastern Cape, the Office of the Premier as coordinator of ODA in the province, the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) and National Treasury as the custodians of ODA management and coordination in the country. Alrceck and Settle (1995:5) propose that population selection in a study must
take cognizance of the following factors: identifying people with the needed information as well as looking at all factors which make respondents eligible and clearly delineating the rules to guide the respondent selection.

Using the foregoing as a guideline in the choice of the study participants, the researcher identified the key respondents from the partner group using both the formal official administrative lists from the two municipalities as well as the province which clearly listed those officials who are key players in the aid or ODA areas. As a member of the Provincial International Relations Forum it was easy for the researcher to gather more information directly from the Premier’s office in addition to information which is distributed during the regular forum meetings. The targeted number in this case was 25 key respondents but only 18 of these responded to the request to participate in the study, yielding a response rate of 72%. During the planning of this study the researcher intended to have all developing partners in both municipalities participating in this study, about ten in all, but the reluctance of a number of them to be part of this meant that only half of them were eventually involved.

The approach to the community was more involved compared to the other categories in that the choice of participants needed to take into consideration the issue of representativity in general and those with the required information in particular. With regard to Buffalo City, five wards were identified because of certain properties which the researcher felt would produce the required information and yet be representative. Wards 7, 13 and 19 were mainly composed of a mixture of formal and informal residences, those on the boundaries of real need and relatively the poorest of the poor. Ward 11 consisted of established residential units (Native Units 2 and 5) as per the apartheid era classification of the erstwhile black residential areas. These are relatively well-established residential areas with services and amenities on a far better scale compared to those in the previous category. Ward 9 is composed of residential areas which were previously designated “White Areas” but which are now populated by a mixture of low and middle income people, with good basic service levels. The common denominator in these wards is that they all have been enjoying some sort of aid flowing from the twinning programmes though of varying degrees for some years now.
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Motherwell in Nelson Mandela was identified as the second study site with participants from wards 23, 54, 57, 58 and 59. Motherwell was a deliberate choice because this part of this municipality is one of the largest “black” residential areas. It is fast developing and enjoys a number of aid programmes including the Motherwell Urban Renewal Programme (MURP), which also formed a mini-case study in this study. The researcher is convinced that the variety in the composition of this group gives this study the required reliability, validity and representativity with respect to the community aspect. Kumar (2005:179) and Struwig and Stead (2001:123) refer to choosing subjects who can best provide the required information, a case of rich information informants. Whereas 75 respondents were targeted in both municipalities, only 45 of these were accessed giving the study a return of 60%.

The sampling frame assisted in determining the areas and numbers which would give the researcher the most representative data. The researcher involved at least one representative from each donor country or organisation, key actors in the metros were not limited to only those dealing directly with ODA, but included those in administration and finance as well as in the line functions. The sampling frame assisted in determining the actual areas and numbers of participants from the direct beneficiaries, namely the communities, including the NGOs.

3.5 Data Collection Methods and Procedures
Data collection methods and procedures are by and large dictated by the type of data required for the study and other practical and logistical considerations such as access to data, accessibility to the respondents, finances and time to carry out the work, but at the end of the day the choice should provide the best fit to answer the research question. In this study the researcher decided to obtain data from a variety of sources, different angles and perspectives, thereby allowing for cross-referencing and triangulation and consequently increasing the levels of consistency, reliability and validity of the data. This method is supported by Denscombe (2005:131-133), OECD (2009:11) and Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2004:77).

Official permission was obtained from the Metro Managers in both NMBMM and BCM as well as from the provincial Department of Local Government and Traditional
Affairs (DLGTA) to get access to the relevant actors in the organisations and the beneficiaries. This was done in the form of written letters which were cascaded to the administrators, politicians and beneficiaries for both consent and agreement to participate. The contact with the donors was secured through the IDC as the custodians of official development assistance at the national level in the National Treasury, represented in the province by the Office of the Premier as well as through the International Relations offices responsible for ODA coordination in the target metros.

3.5.1 Desk Research
The desk research section of this study involved documentary surveys (synthesis and meta-analysis) on both the current status of the metros as well as the aid scenario worldwide and in South Africa with specific reference to the two areas under study. Most of the local reports were available as hard copies from the two municipalities and the sector departments such as OTP, PDGLTA and in some cases use was made of their dedicated websites but with their express permission and knowledge. The following documents were consulted and accessed through various means:

- The Paris Declaration main document 2005,
- The Paris Declaration 2006, 2008 and 2011 evaluation reports,
- Synthesis reports on the Paris Declaration,
- Country evaluation reports on the Paris Declaration,
- Donor studies,
- Supplementary studies to the Paris Declaration,
- The Policy framework and Operational Guidelines for the management of Official Development Assistance ODA policy Framework and Guidelines 2007 and 2010,
- The draft provincial guidelines for the management of Official Development Assistance,
- International Relations Strategies in the two metros,
- Integrated Development Plans in the two metros,
- Periodic service delivery reports (monthly and quarterly),
- Financial reports as prescribed by both the PFMA and MFMA,
- Annual Reports from both the Development and Developing Partners,
- Memorandums of Understanding and the accompanying action plans, and
- OECD and metro reports on the Paris Declaration.

The information from these documents, as part of the secondary data, assisted in providing a base on which, together with the literature review, the study is anchored. It also assisted in giving the researcher an insight into the workings of the two municipalities vis-à-vis their ODA activities. This information was also useful in filling in gaps in areas where the population in the respondents were unable or afraid to divulge such information for fear of incriminating themselves. This information becomes anonymous material available for public consumption which is difficult to pin to a particular individual and therefore becomes a product of that institution from where the information originates. Most of all, this information was important as a strong base for triangulation.

3.5.2 Questionnaire Survey

An attempt was made to develop a questionnaire which encompassed the key components of a research instrument as proposed by Denscombe (2005:144). Denscombe insists that this sort of instrument should produce data that can be analysed, that it consists of a written set of questions enabling respondents to answer the same and identical questions, and that their purpose is to produce answers from a set of these questions. The questions in this questionnaire were a combination of closed and open types in order to collect both quantitative and qualitative data respectively (see Annexure B). All the questions were codified to assist in the subsequent handling of the results (Walliman, 2009:91).

A questionnaire was also self-administered to the donors, the actors in the municipalities, the beneficiaries and the communities. Questionnaires addressed to the donors were through telephones and e-mail. Whereas those for the actors in the metros were physically delivered to them as a group or individuals, those for the actual beneficiaries on the ground were distributed indirectly through the ward councillor’s offices, by Community Development Workers (CDWs) and Ward Liaison Workers (CLWs). The questionnaire was initially administered to a small group of participants
in each category to allow for adjustments and modifications to the questions. A total of 100 questionnaires were distributed in this study and the return count was 67%, most non-returns were from the communities (40%) and the development partners (50%).

The initial field survey took four months followed by a two month mop-up stint, from April 2011 to September 2011, which coincided with one of the most contested local government elections South Africa has seen since the dawn of democracy in 1994. In the Eastern Cape especially the two municipalities in the study, historically African National Congress (ANC) terrains, were now being challenged by the ‘new kid on the block’, the Democratic Alliance (DA). There was a lot of contestation in both municipalities, sometimes flaring up into violence. In fact the researcher experienced one of these occasions during a field visit to Motherwell in the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality just before the elections in June 2011, whereby the main access road to this township was blocked off for over four hours with the community demanding that it could only be opened once the President of the ANC, Jacob Zuma, had addressed them.

The period before, during and after the election meant that access to the community was sometimes difficult, resulting in the low number of responses. The prevailing political “hype” could also have influenced the type and nature of responses because the political climate at the time was very charged, especially in most of the areas which formed part of this study. Access to municipal and provincial officials was also limited over this period, and face-to-face interviews were delayed because the relevant officials were involved in the organisation of the elections, because they did not have time, or because they seemed afraid of giving interviews at this time because of possible political consequences. The developing partners were unfortunately not as cooperative as would have been expected of them. In spite of several reminders and appeals to them as well as to their direct counterparts (partners) in the municipalities the return rate was only 50%.

In spite of these challenges the overall return rate from the research instrument was about 67% which, according to Babbie (2007:62), from the work done on social research literature, is good and usable. Babbie asserts that a 50% response rate from a
questionnaire is adequate, 60% is good and 70% is very good. With a return rate of 67% the overall response can then be classified as nearly very good.

### 3.5.2.1 Piloting of the Questionnaire

According to de Vos et al. (2006:209), “the prospective researcher should also test the measuring instrument”. When using a questionnaire to collect data, it should be pilot-tested to ensure that the respondents will not have problems in answering the questions and that the data so collected is reliable and solid. Pilot-testing the questionnaire assists the researcher in obtaining an assessment of the questions’ validity and likely reliability of the data that will be collected (De Vos et al., 2006:172). This process obviates possible vagueness and ambiguity that could lead to wrong findings and eventually skewed conclusions. The feedback received can then be used to refine the questionnaire.

The number of pilot tests to be done depends on the research questions, the objectives of the study, the magnitude of the project and the available resources, especially budget and time. Yegidis et al. (2006:248) believe that the feedback from such a pilot would address the following issues:

- Clarity,
- Items that could bias measurement,
- Potential offensiveness of items,
- Redundancy that may annoy participants,
- Indication that more structure is needed,
- Indication that less structure is needed, and
- Time required to complete the questionnaire.

The researcher piloted the questionnaire in this study by initially discussing it with two academic colleagues and two other people involved in the ODA arena at national and provincial levels, and the feedback from these inputs was used to revise the questionnaire.

Thereafter a statistician was consulted to ensure that the questionnaire passed the rigours and tests of a statistical analysis, and only then was it then piloted to three
community members, four officials in the two municipalities and four Local Economic Development (LED) workers in the provincial Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs. These were then requested to appraise this questionnaire with regard to the following criteria: Were the questions clear and, if not, which ones were unclear? Was the questionnaire encompassing, and if so were there any questions which were difficult to answer? Lastly, it is important to ascertain if the layout was good and to find out how long it took to complete the questionnaire.

The feedback and comments from this group of ten in addition to the inputs from the researcher’s supervisor were used to refine the draft questionnaire and prepare the final instrument which was used in the study. All the participants in the pilot study were informed about the purpose of the exercise to ensure that the final product would be useful as a data collecting instrument.

3.5.3 Interview Survey

Face-to-face and individual telephonic or group interviews were carried out with some selected key respondents from the development partners, the partners, the community, the national and provincial treasuries, the Office of the Premier, and the Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs in order to enrich the data from other sources. A combination of structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews were carried out to maximise their individual effects and to derive the maximum depth from the various research questions.

Structured interviews are very tightly controlled, almost similar to questionnaires, whereas the semi-structured and unstructured interviews give the researcher and respondent more latitude to explore the various areas more deeply. Most donors were subjected to a one to-one interview, while the use of group interviews and focus groups were more beneficial when dealing with actors in the metros and the communities. Manning in Holstein and Gubrium (1995:3) refers to interviews as a process of creating meaning from the interviewee, whereas Bergum in Morse (1991:61) describes this as a conversation which has a central point to which both parties contribute. This approach was invaluable, especially in the communities where, in most cases, the collective was paramount to the individual and was therefore more likely to mirror the situation on the ground. The total field activities
were spread over six months although it had initially been planned for four months. As previously mentioned, the second democratic local municipal elections post-1994 presented some challenges which necessitated prolonging the field work period from four months to six.

3.5.4 Focus Groups

This is a type of interview dealing with a group of people in a community. Such a group can comprise either people with a deeper knowledge of the subject being mitigated or those with a concerted interest in it (Walliman, 2006:207). Powell and Single (1996: 499-504) refer to this as “a group of individuals selected and assembled by a researcher to discuss and comment on a thing that is the subject of research”. This type presupposes a deep interaction with the subjects in the research and the value of this type of interview is embedded especially in the group’s dynamics.

Group dynamics in such a group mirrors the real situation on the ground, there is a rich interaction between the members being interviewed, new ideas and pointers are developed as the discussion develops, and it should give the researcher a deeper understanding of the people or subjects involved in the research. This was the method used when dealing with groups of citizens involved in both the Mndatsane Urban Renewal Programmes (MURP) and the Motherwell Urban Renewal Programmes (MURP) in Buffalo City Metro and Nelson Mandela Bay Metro respectively.

When dealing with the urban renewal programmes the researcher used the services of the local Community Development Workers (CDWs) or the Ward Liaison Officers (WLOs) well known to the communities to guide groups of beneficiaries. Permission was requested from the Manager of the LED office in Nelson Mandela Bay, who kindly made two officers from the Motherwell field office available to assist with the collection of the data in this area. After introducing the topic to the participants, the researcher left the discussions to flow freely, allowing for very robust discussions and thereby getting a deeper insight into the subject because the discussion leaders, the CDW and the WLO were known in the communities and therefore the participants were free to air their views and did not have any issues with them.
Four focus groups composed of four community members were used in Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay. One prominent and influential councillor in Motherwell was very helpful in arranging access to these focus groups and also assisted the researcher by providing suitable premises for the interactions and by making himself available in one of the focus groups. Whereas the discussions were led by the two officials from LED, a CDW and a WLO, the researcher was available during these sittings to give the necessary guidance but without being too obtrusive or influencing the discussions in any way. The focus groups ensured that the gender issue as outlined in the introduction of this study was taken care of by ensuring that there was a 50% participation of women overall. The normal group dynamics, such as participants who felt better than others in the group because of their social status or standing in the community, richer versus poorer and other traits were in almost in all cases neutralised by the way the CDW and WLO chaired and steered these meetings. At the end of every session the researcher came out with a view of groups where every participant was able to air views openly and independently with minimal peer pressure or influence from other members of the group.

3.5.5 Mini-Case Study

A specific mini-case study and examples about the big Urban Renewal Programmes (URPs) in both metros was carried out during this study. Reports on the development of these areas were perused and actors engaged. This was also an important source of information because these tracer indicators were widely used in the current Paris Declaration Country Reports, thereby contributing to the results in the individual country evaluations. The IDC (2011:62) in its Development Cooperation Report 111 continuously used this method to emphasise a phenomenon/point or to underline and illustrate a particular issue.

The purpose of carrying out this mini-case study was based on the researcher’s realisation that it was of paramount importance to enhance the ensuing results by investigating a common area which talks specifically about ODA as defined by the IDC in the treasury in South Africa as well as the fact that urban renewal programmes through their mandatory and comprehensive six result areas focus on the main service areas which are supposed to be delivered to the beneficiaries and de facto refer to those areas in which the Paris Declaration is supposed to be operating. These six
result areas are: Improved Local Economic Development (RA.1), Habitable Human Settlements (RA.2), Improved Social Development (RA.3), Improved Public Participation (RA.4), Improved Strategy, Programming, Project Implementation/Coordination and Service Delivery (RA.5) and Improved Municipal Institution, relating to financial management, audit, procurement, project management and integrated planning (RA.6) (IDC, 2011a:3).

This study was carried out by going through specific reports and studies, including theses on the topic, by interviewing specific actors in the programmes in both municipalities and lastly by engaging some community members in the areas where these programmes are supposed to be established, namely in Mndatsane in Buffalo City and Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay. Whereas the communities were excited to see a person (the researcher) investigating these programmes, the officials or actors in the metros were not always very welcoming save for two officials in Nelson Mandela Bay who were very accommodating and provided detailed information about their programme as well as facilitating two field visits to some of the areas where the programme is supposed to be operational.

The results from this mini case study enhanced the results in this study because currently both municipalities do not report assistance flowing from their twinning programmes to the IDC as ODA. The only real common ODA reported from both metros to the IDC was the Urban Programmes, a joint project with the European Union.

3.6 Data Analysis and Interpretation

The distinction between analysis and interpretation lies in the purpose and processes, whereas analysis establishes cause, interpretation elucidates meaning. At the end of the data collection phase, the researcher had to carry out two main exercises to analyse the available information both qualitatively and quantitatively. Walliman (2009:112) talks about the purpose of research being “to describe data and thereby discover relationships among events in order to describe or explain their occurrence”. It must be indicated up front that the bulk of this study was qualitative because of the nature of the study but a certain amount of quantitative data and results were also used and produced to enhance the study.
After collecting all the information (raw data) the researcher went through a process of ensuring that this data was complete and devoid of inconsistencies and, if inconsistencies were present, ensured that they were at a minimum. The researcher checked all responses especially in the research instrument for gaps and inconsistencies and these were cleared up especially with key respondents where they were contacted telephonically or by e-mail. This process, known as data cleaning, has to precede data processing (Kumar, 2005:220). In cases of the communities, some questions especially on service delivery were asked from different angles in both research questions two and three in the research instrument which assisted in ensuring that there was consistency in the answers given in this part.

- **Qualitative Data**

Normally the analysis of qualitative data follows four steps: identifying the themes, assigning codes to these themes, classifying the responses under new themes and finally integrating the themes and responses (Kumar, 2005:240-241). According to de Vos (2006:338), this can be done by abbreviating the key words, colouring, using dots, or even numbering. Meaning was then given to this area by integrating the themes with the responses to reflect on the results to the key questions in this study. There are many ways of identifying themes and these can be through word repetition, i.e., words which keep recurring in a conversation. They could also be key words, referred to by many researchers in the social sciences as “Key Words in Context” (KWIC). Here one looks at the way a word is used to understand a context (www.anlytictech.com).

The main themes in this study were developed using the former method mentioned earlier, namely word repetitions from analysing the meaning of the answers and categorising. This process was mainly used to analyse the texts especially in the qualitative areas of the research instrument as well as during the focus group sessions. In this case the main themes were on delivery, especially of the basic services to the community namely, water, electricity, housing, toilets and waste disposal, especially in respect to the communities, the beneficiaries on the ground.
Although some key respondents also mentioned similar themes as the beneficiaries, the emphasis in this group focused on rather more important aspects from their view such as governance, corruption, capacity building, challenges at the politico-administrative levels, capacity to deliver on the local government mandate and institutional development. The coding was done by attaching a number to the relevant theme. The responses were then classified under the themes and discussed. As described in Chapter 4, the researcher opted to integrate the answer to each research question by using these themes and also in some cases by using some verbatim responses from some of the participants in the study.

- **Quantitative Data**

The quantitative analysis in this study involved mainly looking at the frequencies, cross-tabulations and distributions. In frequency, it was mainly ascertaining how often a certain attribute occurs. For example, the statement in research question 1 “we have Aid projects in our Municipality” was used to ascertain how many people in each category in this research were aware of the presence of aid projects in their municipality. During the processing of the limited qualitative data, cross-tabulation was employed to identify, describe and analyse some important variables in this study. In agreement with Kumar (2005:240), cross-tabulation was used in this study with caution to avoid a barrage of results which could emanate from such data presentations, and which could easily complicate the interpretation and presentation of the results.

The field data from the returned questionnaires was entered into a statistical, analytical software programme as a tool to search and generate relationship criteria as set by the researcher in order to detect trends and behaviour patterns in relation to responses to the research questions (quantitative analysis). The statistical package used was SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), thereafter frequencies and cross-tabulations were carried out between groups and various responses to questions. In agreement with Robson (2002:393-98) this data was captured into the computer since all the questions had been pre-coded. It was then easy to enter the pre-coded answers into a database which was further analysed for the relevant relationships pertaining to the research questions.
During the later period of this research, Buffalo City Municipality evolved into a fully fledged metro immediately after the announcement of the results of the second truly democratic municipal elections of post-apartheid South Africa held on 18th May 2011. Therefore the study which began as an interrogation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration in one metro and one municipality in 2009 ended up being a study involving two metros.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

According to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1978:346), ethics can be defined as “moral rules or principles of behaviour guiding a person or a group”. The researcher ensured that strict ethical behaviour towards the main stakeholders – the researcher, the participants and the colleagues of the University of Fort Hare – were upheld during this study.

With regards to the researcher, care was taken to avoid bias of any nature by reporting the findings as generated through the various sources, both primary and secondary, and no attempt was made either to modify this information or to influence the outcomes in any way. The methodology chosen by the researcher in this study was sound, tried and tested and the research instrument was valid (see Annexure B). The researcher undertook to be fair to the participants as well as the municipalities included in this study by assuring them that the information gathered would be used for this study only and that it would not be provided to a third party without their express permission. A copy of the research report would also be provided on request to both municipalities.

To comply with the research ethics in respect of the research participants, in the first instance, consent was requested from the two municipalities to carry out the study in their areas of jurisdiction. Individual respondents were briefed about the purpose and usefulness of the final product of this study in their day-to-day activities, their participation was requested and not coerced in any manner, and they were assured of the confidentiality of the information they would provide. The researcher also made sure that the questions posed and the nature of data collection was not carried out in an obtrusive manner.
Overall, the researcher adhered to the research conditions as set out by the University in respect of higher degrees, especially with regard to plagiarism. The work presented in this research is original and not copied from any book or existing publication. Where materials from existing publications have been used, this is properly acknowledged.

3.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, the road map of how this study was conducted was described. This involved outlining the reasons for the choice of the strategy and methodology. The choice of a mixed methods evaluation study (mainly qualitative with some quantitative) was chosen because it has been recommended by the OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in previous and very current studies around the Paris Declaration and ODA. This approach has also been recommended as the methodology and strategy of choice when dealing with complex social issues which go beyond just getting the facts to include cost, benefits and attainment of objectives, and also in cases where changes and improvements are needed.

The chapter concludes by outlining how the data from the study was handled and analysed. The next chapter, Chapter 4, presents the data and results from both the primary and secondary sources of this study.
CHAPTER FOUR

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses the findings from the primary sources in relation to the three main questions in this study and presents it in a quantitative manner. Whereas quantitative analysis interrogates the statistical findings, the qualitative analysis discussed in Chapter 5 breaks the study into themes and sub-themes.

- What sort of international development aid (ODA) has been made available to these two municipalities?
- How have the five elements of the Paris Declaration been implemented in the municipalities under study?
- Are these two municipalities under study better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration?

The researcher felt during the field exercises, that all respondents across the board knew either very little or nothing at all about the Paris Declaration. It was a “shock” to most of them to hear that this programme or intervention had already been in existence since 2005 and that it should have been implemented within their programmes a while back. In the main, this chapter presents and analyse the findings to inform the subsequent concluding chapter, chapter six.

4.2 Quantitative Data Analysis

For purposes of data analysis in this area the respondents were divided into three categories corresponding to the three distinct target groups in this study as follows:

- Partners – functionaries from the two municipalities, sector departments, provincial and national departments, namely those officers who deal with ODA or aid.
- Development Partners – normally known as the donors.
- Communities – beneficiaries on the ground, including the NGOs. Although they also belong to the partner group in the wider sense of the word, it was very important in this study to disaggregate the grouping so that the real feeling of aid
on the coalface would be understood. There are also indeed some members of the communities who are also in the partner group by virtue of their employment status. This has been mentioned and taken into consideration during the analysis where such cases occurred.

Figure 4.1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Development Partners</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Questionnaires returned</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Total targeted</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.1 describes the relationship between the targeted population and their response in relation to the research instrument. The research instrument was forwarded to 25 partners, 10 developing partners and 65 members of the community in both municipalities. The overall response rate from the research instrument was 67%: 68% of community members targeted, 50% of development partners and 72% of partners. The individual response rates are indicative of the perceptions and attitudes of the three groups towards aid on one hand and the Paris Declaration as an instrument to enhance aid delivery on the other, which is also confirmed in the qualitative part of this study.

The quantitative data analysis follows the structure of the research instrument by grouping the questions into three main categories responding to each of the main research questions. While general responses were analysed in blocks or groups, specific selected
responses fundamental in answering important parts of the question were examined in greater detail and cross-tabulated to the respective target groups.

The overall view was that aid is a desirable intervention by all parties, but with differences occurring in the expected outcomes and impact. All respondents in this study gave the researcher the impression that they found it desirable for various reasons, including possible material gains expectations such as improving their livelihoods, improved services and infrastructure (communities) or, for the developing partners, philanthropic reasons, political correctness or self preservation as described in Chapter 2 (literature review). For the partners, it was mainly because of financial gains, both personal and organisational, or the speeding up of services in areas they were working in.

4.2.1 Availability of ODA in the Municipalities (Research Question 1)
The purpose of research question 1 in the study was to ascertain the following:

- Whether the participants in the study were aware of these programmes;
- Whether there was sufficient political and administrative support for these programmes from all three spheres of government; and
- Whether these projects had coordinated support at the local level.

4.2.1.1 Development Aid Programmes Exist in Both Municipalities (Metros)
The existence of development aid programmes in the two municipalities is a key aspect in answering Research Question 1 and therefore received specific and more thorough in-depth analysis than the other eight questions in the block.
The overall participation rate as reflected in Figure 4.2 by all groups in respect to the existence of ODA programmes in the two municipalities was 49%. This could be interpreted in several ways: those who did not respond either did not know, were not interested in responding, or were afraid of responding because of various reasons, either personal or otherwise. As mentioned before in Chapter 3 (research methodology), the field part of this study was done before, during and after the second post-apartheid municipal elections, a period that was relatively politically loaded and could have easily influenced the respondents and the way they responded to some of the issues presented in this study.

On the other hand, the relatively low participation rate overall can be explained by examining the participation rate within each of the target groups.

Figure 4.3 goes further to interrogate the participation within the respondent groupings. Of those who responded to the presence of ODA in their municipalities 52% came from the communities, 33% were partners and 15% were in development partner groupings. These percentages are based on the absolute numbers of participants answering the respective question. It has to be noted that the community group is the largest in absolute
numbers while the development partners is the smallest of the three target groups in numbers. Therefore fluctuations in participation in the community grouping have a significant but potentially misleading effect on the total overall percentages of participation and representation.

**Figure 4.3**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Participation</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Development Partners</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Participation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.4 shows the participation breakdown within each of the target groups. The highest response came from the development partner group with 100%, followed by the partners group with 56% and finally the community group with only 27%. The individual participation rates of both the development partners group and the partners group were well above the average of 40% while the community group is significantly below the average.

This could mean that the awareness about ODA Aid programmes in the two municipalities was greater on the side of the facilitating/implementing parties as compared to the coalface beneficiaries on the ground (communities). What is also significant here is that a substantial proportion of both the communities and partners did not respond to this particular area.
Figure 4.4

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.5

Source: Questionnaire results
Whereas the previous discussion focused on overall participation and representivity of the target groupings, Figure 4.5 examines the overall actual response to the question of whether development aid programmes exist in the two municipalities. It can be seen that 82% of the 49% who responded (see Figure 4.2), agreed and only 18% disagreed with the statement that ODA/AID programmes exist in the two municipalities.

**Figure 4.6**

![Development AID programmes exist in Municipalities (within group)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree (in % WITHIN Group)</th>
<th>Agree (in % WITHIN Group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Partners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.6 shows that 100% of all participating development partners agreed that there was ODA in the areas they were working in, compared to 91% of partners and only 71% of the communities. This response reflects an overwhelming acknowledgement that ODA/Aid development programmes existed in the two municipalities under study. It is worth noting that the 71% response by the community group has to be seen in the context of the poor participation rate of only 38.8% within this group.
4.2.1.2 Political and Administrative Support from the Relevant Stakeholders (perceptions from the three respondents)

Figure 4.7

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.7 shows the overall response/participation rate for these questions as being between 40.3% and 44.8%, therefore with an average of 42.5% lower than that in the previous question (Q1.1.1) in Figure 4.6, but the results appear to be representative for all target groups with most answers (in absolute numbers) belonging to the community group, followed by the partner group and lastly the development partners group.

Figure 4.7 further reveals that the response participation within each respective target grouping reflected a similar pattern as that in Question Q1.1.1. It shows that 76% of the smallest group, the Development Partners, 63.3% of the partner group and 30.5% of the community group answered these questions, the latter staying again well below the average of the participation rate of 42.7% within groups.
A closer look at the responses given by development partners in Figure 4.9 indicates that 66.7% of the participating development partners agreed that the national sphere (Q112) and the province (Q113) were providing reasonable political and administrative ODA support in the two municipalities. They further believed that the principals as well as their colleagues in the municipalities were providing outstanding support, which is shown by an overwhelming 100% agreement. It is also noteworthy that the Development Partners claimed here that the communities were also backing up ODA adequately.

Figure 4.7 demonstrates that the communities believed that there was sufficient support from the national and provincial spheres. They felt that the support from the municipality (the municipal functionaries) and even from the communities themselves was not adequate. Whereas support from the national and the province was rated at 83.3% and 64.3% respectively, that at the municipality level principals, functionaries and communities were rated at 53.8%, 50% and 50% respectively. This issue points towards a possible major problem inherent in the initiation of most ODA projects in that although the partners and the development partners are supposed to be driving these projects hand-in-hand with the communities, the beneficiaries at the coalface are not actively involved
in this process. How then are these interventions supposed to be successful and effective in such a milieu? This brings back the old view, pre-1994 of doing things on behalf of the communities without allowing them to be active participants or having a say in these processes.

Figure 4.9: Communities

![Community responses to Stakeholder Support (in%)](image)

Source: Questionnaire results

Of notable interest in Figure 4.10 is the way in which the partners (functionaries from all levels of government) responded in this part of the study, which again brings to the fore the manner in which ODA projects are being implemented. Over 60% of all the respondents were convinced that support from the three spheres of government – national, provincial and the municipalities in which they were operating – was below the required levels. The support from colleagues within the municipalities was around 50% and that of the community was recorded at only 30%. This again underlines the same problem as discussed in the previous paragraph that the functionaries are trying to implement ODA projects in communities which do not support either these interventions or the way they are implemented. This could be a reason why development projects seem to stagnate and with time become completely non-functional. This lack of support could also be the reason why ODA in most government structures is seen as an “add on”, ODA is not completely or adequately, at best superficially, integrated in the policies and plans.
of these organisations including the IDPs as is apparently the case in the two municipalities in this study.

**Figure 4.10 Partners:**

![Bar chart showing partner responses to stakeholder support (in %)](chart)

Source: Questionnaire results

**4.2.1.3 There is coordinated support for projects within the two municipalities**

Figure 4.11 depicts that 61.9% of communities believed that ODA projects which they see on the ground are well coordinated within the municipalities. Seventy five percent of the development partners agreed that the projects they were involved in were well coordinated, while the partners maintained that this was not the case with only 33% agreeing. This seems to be a big indictment of the ODA projects, and it further backs up the findings in the qualitative part of the study as shown later that most ODA projects are haphazard and are not coordinated. This is further reflected in the fact that the projects which the researcher looked at in the course of this study lacked a central point of coordination and most were spread over several directorates in the two municipalities. The way in which ODA projects were reported on, especially in the annual reports of the two municipalities, was normally very superficial and fragmented in nature, even the Urban Renewal Programmes in both municipalities were experiencing similar problems.
4.2.1.4 There are behavioural changes in Aid Activities

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.12 demonstrates that there was minimal behavioural change since there had been no conscious implementation of the whole or some aspects of the Paris Declaration as reflected in the responses provided in this area. All three respondent groups confirmed
that they had seen no overall change over the period in the way ODA projects were being managed. The Developing Partners disagreed totally (100%) that there had been any behavioural change, the communities by 66.7% and the partners by 54.6%. This confirms the results in the qualitative part of the study and also the researcher’s experiences during the field part of this study in both municipalities.

4.2.2 The implementation of the five elements of the Paris Declaration in the two Metropolitan Municipalities

The purpose of this part of the study was to confirm the following:

- whether the respondents in this study were aware of the Paris Declaration (2.1.1);
- whether they knew and understood its five principles as well as the original 12 indicators and the extra indicator (Gender) (2.1.2);
- whether the Paris Declaration had been established in the two municipalities (2.1.4);
- whether the implementation of the Paris Declaration had an effect on aid programmes in the metros under study (2.1.5); and
- whether the Paris Declaration had ever been officially and properly introduced in these two municipalities (2.1.3).

Figure 4.13 shows that the respondents were not very eager to answer this question for obvious reasons, the responses ranging from 13% for the development partners, 41% for the partners and 46% for the communities. The researcher’s reference to “obvious reasons” is in relation to the fact that five years down the line, since the advent of the Paris Declaration, most respondents especially those from the development partners and partners should have known about it. Since most respondents in the two previous groupings were not aware of the PD then it is again no wonder that the communities were also in a similar position.
Figure 4.13: Group participation: Whether the respondents have ever heard of the Paris Declaration (2.1.1)

Source: Questionnaire results

4.2.2.1 The respondents were aware of the Paris Declaration

Figure 4.14 Paris Declaration awareness (2.1.10)

Source: Questionnaire results
Figure 4.14 reflects a disheartening status of the awareness of the Paris Declaration in Municipalities: 60% of the development partners disagreed, 56.2% of the partners and 22% of the community. It was interesting to see that only 40% of the development partners and 43.8% of the partners had ever heard of the Paris Declaration. This result was not expected because by its nature the development partners should have known more about the Paris Declaration since in the main, ODA is still driven from their side. The slightly lower percentage of 43.8% in the partner group was expected because, as shown in the later sections of this study, the Paris Declaration had never been consciously implemented in the two municipalities and therefore the probability of its being known was expected to be very low. From the researcher’s experience during field work most community members in the two municipalities had never heard of the Paris Declaration.

4.2.2.2 The Paris Declaration is known and understood

Figure 4.15 (2.1.2)

![Bar Chart](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Partner</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.15 displays an expected and realistic pattern in that only 19.2% of the community knew anything about the Paris Declaration, only 60% of the development partners and 50% of the partners did. As described under the previous section, this pattern is consistent with the qualitative findings to be discussed later because the Paris
Declaration had never been consciously implemented in the two municipalities. The way in which the ODA projects are cascaded down to the coalface must without doubt have negatively influenced the implementation of the Paris Declaration. The obvious question which arises from the results shown in Figures 4.14 and 4.15 is “How could the Paris Declaration been implemented when very little is known about it by either the Partners (the functionaries supposed to drive the programme) or the beneficiaries on the coalface (who are supposed to be the receivers and co-implementer), let alone the fact that only 60% of the Development Partners did know and were interested in this intervention?”

4.2.2.3 The Paris Declaration was workshoped to the relevant stakeholders

Figure 4.16 (2.1.3)

![Bar chart showing Paris Declaration workshoped (in %)]

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.16 indicates from all respondent groups that there had been negligible efforts to cascade the Paris Declaration from national to the other spheres of governance namely the provinces and the municipalities on the coalface in a coherent and organised manner. The results in Figure 4.16 show that 100% of the Development Partners were convinced that the Paris Declaration had not been workshoped through. This is followed by partners at 89.9% and 80.8% of the communities. These sad figures reflect what the core of this research has discovered during this study: that in spite of this intervention (the Paris Declaration) having been unveiled in 2005 there had been no real and meaningful efforts to efficiently implement this programme where it should have provided the highest benefits, namely on the coalface of development, in the municipalities. Further,
workshopping a project or intervention is the best means not only of selling a product but it ensuring maximum participation and involvement of the target groups.

4.2.2.4 The Paris Declaration is well established in the two municipalities as a development aid tool

Figure 4.17 (2.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results

There was a resounding “NO” from all respondents as indicated in Figure 4.17. Seventy three percent, 100% and 83.3% of development partners, partners and the community respectively attested to this from their responses. This finding concurs with the results in the qualitative part of this study and confirms the experience of the researcher on the ground that the Paris Declaration had never been consciously introduced in the two municipalities since its inception in 2005 in spite of the fact that South Africa is a signatory to the original accord and has participated in the two country studies of the Paris Declaration in 2008 and 2010.
4.2.2.5 The Paris Declaration has changed the way Development/Aid programmes function in both municipalities

Figure 4.18 (2.1.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%_Disagree</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%_Agree</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results

As shown in Figure 4.18, 100% of the Development Partners, 82.4% of the Partners and 73.9% of the Community who answered this question did not see any changes in the way aid programmes were being run over the period covered in this research. This finding was also expected because, as discussed in Figure 4.15, neither municipality had implemented the Paris Declaration within their ODA programmes.

4.2.3 The five principles of the Paris Declaration

In spite of the fact that, as previously discussed, the Paris Declaration had not been implemented in either of the two municipalities, the researcher found it prudent to test the presence or absence of any of the elements of the Paris Declaration, namely ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and mutual accountability. As mentioned earlier and as discussed in the qualitative findings, the evaluation of the Paris Declaration is not supposed to be a simple linear exercise but rather a process which takes cognisance of the fact that there are other programmes and policies which are operating in the ODA
arena, and which in themselves could bring about changes which are not necessarily a result of the implementation of the Paris Declaration. The presence of other variables – capacity, political or institutional – as well as the understanding that there is a possibility of anticipated development results in the making but not fully present during the time of this study, makes it even more appealing to investigate this area. The researcher is well aware that there had been no conscious efforts to implement the Paris Declaration in either of the two municipalities over the period of the study.

In short, the researcher found it interesting to investigate the presence of any of the five elements or their vestiges, however rudimentary, well aware that these had not been implemented consciously but in the hope that the findings would not only contribute to the body of knowledge but would also give an indication of the presence of some of these elements in the process already, i.e. before 2005. Should this be the case, then this would assist in crafting the best and most appropriate method of rolling out the next phase of the Paris Declaration after 2011, combined with the proposals from the Busan High Level Forum from November 2011.

4.2.3.1 Ownership
The purpose of this section was to ascertain whether the municipalities had taken ownership and stewardship of their ODA projects and the question was specifically posed to the Partners and Development Partners only. During the processing of this data it was discovered that a number of lower level employees of the metros involved in this study were also living in these communities, and these were for purposes of this study taken as members of the partner group. The analysis of ownership in this study, as expressed in Figure 4.19, was undertaken by looking at the individual elements which contributed to ownership, and in this case these varied from partner ODA policy in place (Q221), partners formulating their development needs (Q222) and setting the priorities without neglecting the development partner’s side (Q224), as well as having internal mechanisms to assess ODA funding (Q224), ensuring that the partner and its staff are capacitated in ODA programmes (Q226) and lastly that gender equality is not forgotten (Q2211).

Figure 4.19 projects the responses in respect of these elements. 75% of the Development partners claimed that partners had an ODA/AID policy in place (Q221), whereas only
35% of the partners themselves agreed with this. Presented in a different way, 65% of the partners said that there was no ODA/AID policy in the two metros. When asked who defined the needs in these projects (Q222), 75% of the development partners again said that the partners did, whereas only 53% of the partners agreed with this statement. On the question of whether the municipalities take leadership in ODA projects (Q223), 60% of the development partners agreed, but only 42% of the partners were of the same view. In this case both groups agreed that this area had not been given the prominence it deserved. Eighty percent of the development partners believed that these municipalities formulated their needs in regard to the ODA projects whereas only 65% of the partners in the municipality thought that they are doing this. Both the development partners and partners went further to say that the municipalities or metros were really identifying the development needs themselves (2.2.4) as reflected in the 80% and 65% response to this question respectively. With regard to funding (2.2.5), 100% of the development partners said that their funding was directly coupled to the development needs of the partners but the partners were of a different view, with only 47% of them saying that this was the case.

Although capacitation of both the individual and the organisation is a key component in all development initiatives the partners feel, as shown by their 30% response, that they are not capacitated to run ODA projects (Q226) as shown in Figure 4.17. This is in sharp contrast to the development partner’s view with 80% that the partners who are involved were capacitated. Both the development partners and partners agreed that there were efforts by the development partners to mitigate in cases of low capacity (Q227) at 60% and 40% respectively. On the question of listening to each other’s needs (Q228), 100% of the development partners were convinced that they did listen to the partners and took cognizance of their needs, whereas only 55% of the partners thought that the development partners listened, but went on to say with an overwhelming 70% that for their part, they did listen to the development partner’s concerns (Q229).
Figure 4.19 (221-2211)

Ownership Elements in the Paris Declaration implemented (in %)

Source: Questionnaire results
The issue of gender (Q2211) does not seem to feature prominently in ownership, only 50% of the Development Partners and 55% of the Partners saw this as playing a big part in ODA programmes. This becomes a big issue because the Accra High Level Meeting brought this to the fore, and the Millennium Development Forum of the United Nations even developed a special task team to mainstream gender, and on the local scene in South Africa almost all policies in all the three spheres of government have an obligation to be very sensitive on this issue: there is almost an order to consider gender issues all the time.

In summary, the views on ownership were very varied between the development partners and partners and are also indicative of the constituency and the expectations of either party. The overall picture and perception from the development partners is that the partner owns the ODA projects whereas the partner himself feels that this is not the case as shown by the very low percentages in all the sub-questions compared to the higher ones from the development partners. Since the question of ownership is a key factor in the *de facto* support to new or already ongoing ODA activity, could it be that both parties are answering this question in a way which would satisfy own constituencies? For example the development partners being over positive in order to justify the continuation of what they are doing or as shown by the partners to bring the point home, that “all is not well in the ODA arena”.

### 4.2.3.2 Alignment

According to the Paris Declaration, the elements of alignment as a principal, are embedded in the following as reflected in Figure 4.20: presence of functional and effective systems to manage ODA (Q231), these could range from procurement (Q234) to finances (Q235), and that these are being used by the developing partners (Q233). These elements also foresee the presence of conditionalities which should not be widespread in nature and if present the partners should have influence over them (Q236, Q237 and Q238) respectively. This principle also emphasises the point discussed in ownership that the partner defines the direction of ODA but this must be within a very strong M&E system (Q239, Q2310). From Figure 4.20, it can be seen that the development partners felt overall that there is alignment in the programmes in which they are involved in the two municipalities, as shown by the high percentage in each of the elements, between 60% and 100%.
Figure 4.20 (2.3.1-2.3.10)

Alignment Elements in the Paris Declaration implemented (in %)

Source: Questionnaire results
The partners seemed to disagree with this, again as reflected by the very low scores in percentages for each element, between 20-47%, other than in conditionality (Q236) and that these are not widespread (Q237). This very high visible divide demonstrates the big differences which still mar ODA at this level depending on whether you are a development partner or a partner.

Another important observation in this part of the study was the relatively high participation rate of both parties in responding to this question. Whereas the development partners agreed that there were effective and functional systems to manage ODA in both municipalities, as shown by the very high score of 80%, only 44% of the partners thought that these did exist and only 25% thought that they were effective and functional. The partners went on to confirm that the little that there was, including the procurement (Q234) and financial systems (Q235), were not used (Q233) by the developing partners as they should be, as shown by the low percentage of those who agreed: 25% and 30% respectively. Both groups, the development partners and the partners, agreed that they were conditionalities in their ODA programmes: 100% and 63% respectively (Q236). Further, both were of the view that those present were not widespread (Q237). Whereas the development partners believed that the municipalities could influence these conditionalities (75%), the partners disagreed as shown by the low 40% (Q238).

Both parties however agreed that the M&E systems in both municipalities were not strong and effective by the low 50% from the development partners and the 20% partners (Q2310). The very low ranking by the partners indicates that this problem is known and acknowledged in both municipalities. The findings shown in Figure 4.18 are that, whereas the development partners believed there was individual alignment in their projects, the partners representing the beneficiaries on the ground indicated that this was not the case.

4.2.3.3 Harmonisation

The elements in this principle which are important in this study are presence of common arrangements for joint planning and implementation of projects (2.4.1) and ensuring that the development partners were harmonising their activities (2.4.3).
Figure 4.21 shows that development partners believed with 100% that effective common arrangements for planning of ODA projects existed in both municipalities, compared to only 35% for the partners (Q241). There was consensus between the developing partners and partners that the former do not work with each other closely in the various projects (Q242). This is reflected in the very low scores of 40% and 47% respectively when responding to this area. One of the key elements underlying harmonisation as a principle is to ensure that this is implemented at project level, especially during the various activities (Q243). The development partners were not denying this (25%) because they feel that they have not been requested to do so, whereas the partners felt that this request had been made (55%). Through the low percentages from both the developing partners and partners, 33% and 37% respectively, there was overall agreement that the current ODA projects were just not effective (Q244) and they both agreed again that this was due to several constraints, which were preventing harmonisation. The presence of constraints in this area was further underscored by the high participation rate in responding to this area as well as the high response scores of 100% and 83.3% for the development partners and partners respectively.

Figure 4.21 (2.4.1-2.4.5)

![Harmonisation Elements in the Paris Declaration implemented (in %)](chart)

Source: Questionnaire results
4.2.3.4 Managing for Results

The elements in managing for results are anchored in the following: the partners have their own model to allocate development resources which is clearly linked to the development needs of the municipality. This model has to be backed up by strong management tools in the key areas of finance, planning and reporting. In addition, capacitation of the individual and organisation must be prioritised by ensuring that shortcomings are mitigated by effective capacitation and retraining programmes.

From Figure 4.22, it can be seen that 79% of the Partners were of the view that the municipalities had a development model to allocate resources (Q251), 75% believed that this model did indeed provide a strong linkage between the available ODA resources and the expected development results (Q252). Seventy percent of the development partners agreed that this linkage existed but they are not convinced that it is this model which is being used entirely in their dealings in their municipalities (50%).

It is very interesting to note at this juncture that, although both parties agreed on the presence of this important linkage between resources and development, they said that in spite of this they were still a range of constraints which were preventing the actors within the municipalities, both developing partners and partners, to focus on the development results (Q257), as shown by the two high percentages of 100% and 79% respectively. From Figure 4.22 it is clear that the development partners were of the view that the municipalities had a system to manage for results (Q258), 75% but the question arose, as discussed in alignment, why these systems are not being used. The answer could well lie in the response from both the developing partners and the partners who indicated by their 50% and 47% responses respectively to the same issues that the system could be there but was perhaps not optimally functional.

Staff capacitation (Q254) is an issue about which the partners had very strong feelings and Figure 4.20 shows that only 26% of the respondents felt that the staff in these two municipalities was capacitated enough to drive ODA projects forward. This is in contrast to the development partners who thought (75%) that partner staff was indeed capacitated to do this. But both development partners and partners conceded that there were no effective systems or plans to train or retrain staff in ODA programmes as reflected in
their 33% and 53% responses respectively. The response from the partners was very optimistic in view of what really obtains on the ground.
Figure 4.22 (2.5.1-2.5.10)

"Managing for Results" Elements in the Paris Declaration implemented (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q251</th>
<th>Q252</th>
<th>Q253</th>
<th>Q254</th>
<th>Q255</th>
<th>Q256</th>
<th>Q257</th>
<th>Q258</th>
<th>Q259</th>
<th>Q2510</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results
Ideally the results emanating from aid should be feeding into policy planning implementation and improvements (Q258). In this study the developing partners and partners concurred that this was not happening as it should be by 50% and 47% respectively. This is an indictment on ODA, because if this is not happening how is improvement expected to be achieved? But it also goes on to confirm the lack of M&E in these programmes as outlined and discussed in the elements of alignment. Again gender (Q2510) did not seem to be playing a major role in ODA as reflected by the 100% of development partners saying that no sex data was disaggregated and analysed for decision making and 63% of the partners also agreeing. On results-orientated reporting (Q259) 100% of the development partners and 63% of the partners said that this was happening. The principal of Managing for results presents a bag of mixed responses from the two parties but the feeling is that the process has still a long way to go and if the principle of “distance travelled” as applied in evaluation of development processes to measure achievement is used, the researcher feels that this principle is still at the lower end and has a long way to go.

4.2.3.5 Mutual Accountability

Mutual accountability refers to both the development partners and partners being equally responsible for the development process in respect of their own constituency as well as to each other. This reciprocity stretches from the use of development resources (2.6.1) and the preparation of aid project documentation (2.6.3), including implementation dossiers, to reports ensuring that these processes are built into the municipal IDPs and are freely available to all stakeholders.

The results in Figure 4.23 show no significant challenges with mutual accountability between the two groups, the development partners and partners. The two groups alleged that ODA implementation was built into the municipal budgets and IDPs (Q261) by 100% and 70% respectively. This could unfortunately not be confirmed in the qualitative results. The partners were skeptical in answering this question by 70% which might support the qualitative finding in this area, as will be discussed later. The quality of the project documentation including structure, content and presentation is rated relatively low compared to the other elements in this principle. The development partners agreed that this quality can be tagged at about 75% and the partners at 63%. The issue of gender (Q265) again did not seem to be very important in ODA activities. The development
partners said that women were part of the periodic reviews at 67% but the differed with this view, as indicated by 33% who agreed. So the gender issues here were again in the balance and they did not seem to elicit any direct and specific significance in this element either.

Figure 4.23: (2.6.1-2.6.5)

![Chart showing mutual accountability elements in the Paris Declaration implemented (in %)]

Source: Questionnaire results

4.2.4 Targets

The purpose of this part of the study was to statistically zoom into some of the twelve, later thirteen, indicators in the Paris Declaration which had specific parameters in the original baseline study of 2005 coupled with the anticipated targets in the 2010 final Paris Declaration evaluation as indicated in Figure 4.24. The use of the periods 0-50% and 51-100% was not only to facilitate the interpretation of the data in this area but also to provide some progress on the indicators, the so-called “period of travel” as described in all Paris Declaration studies in the current literature.
Source: Adapted from PD (2005)

For the purpose of this study the choice of elements from the 13 elements of the Paris Declaration was as reflected in Figure 4.24.

As reflected in Figure 4.25 the participation in this question was very poor with only 60% of the development partners and 75% of the partners responding. The difference in the group ratings is also interesting. Whereas the majority of the development partners responded at the rate of 67% with the exception of two areas, aid co-ordination (Q276) and aid flows on budget (Q271), the partners rated all the targets higher, between 73-85% with the exception of two targets, the use of municipal finance systems (Q273) and use of municipal donor systems and reduction in the parallel project implementation units (Q274), which were at 54% and 55% respectively.

A clear pattern can be seen in Figures 4.24 and 4.25 which shows that the two municipalities were still not yet in a position to reach these targets as was envisaged for 2010 in the Paris Declaration. There is a lot of improvement needed still in predictability of Aid (Q275), mission co-ordination (Q277) and country study coordination (Q278).
Figure 4.25 (2.7.1-2.7.8)

Comparative Evaluation of PD Target Achievements
(2005-2011) (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Q271</th>
<th>Q272</th>
<th>Q273</th>
<th>Q274</th>
<th>Q275</th>
<th>Q276</th>
<th>Q277</th>
<th>Q278</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DevPartner_0-50%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DevPartner_51-100%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner_0-50%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner_51-100%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results
4.2.5 Provision of services (basic and community), community participation and satisfaction

As reflected in Figure 4.26 the communities in both municipalities were the only respondents expected in this part of the study. This part consisted of 12 sub-questions and it was designed to gauge the views of the community with regard to the basic services which are provided by the municipalities as well as the community satisfaction in relation to these services. This part can very well be equated to the well known “Quality of Life” (QoL) studies made from time to time to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of local government in meeting their mandates. This particular part of the study also highlighted the uniqueness of this study in comparison to other similar studies which have been made to evaluate the implementation of the Paris Declaration to date, both globally and specifically in South Africa. Whereas those studies have only looked at both the development partners and partner dynamics, this study may be one of the first to investigate the implementation of the Paris Declaration with the involvement of the coalface beneficiaries, namely the communities.

The frequency analysis results in Figure 4.26 above show that this particular area was responded to by all the community members in the study, giving it a 100% participation level. The community’s interest in issues involving basic services, participation and satisfaction is shown by the high level of participants who answered the sub-questions, ranging from 81% to 92.9%. From Figure 4.24 it is clear that the majority of the respondents in the community group were aware of some development projects in their midst with response of 89.7%. When it came to participation and soliciting their views, the community members felt that these two areas were not adequately addressed with only 53.8% and 54.1% respectively agreeing that this did take place. This is also consistent with the qualitative findings in this study. There is generally lack of participation and consultation with the communities in the planning and implementation of most projects, especially the development projects. This could easily be one of the possible reasons why community protests occurred amidst perceived progress in the infrastructure and delivery of basic services. This point is adequately highlighted by these findings.
Figure 4.26 (2.8.1-2.8.12)

Community Perceptions on Municipal Services, Participation & Satisfaction (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.8.1</th>
<th>Q2.8.2</th>
<th>Q2.8.3</th>
<th>Q2.8.4</th>
<th>Q2.8.5</th>
<th>Q2.8.6</th>
<th>Q2.8.7</th>
<th>Q2.8.8</th>
<th>Q2.8.9</th>
<th>Q2.8.10</th>
<th>Q2.8.11</th>
<th>Q2.8.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Community participates</td>
<td>Partners solicit views</td>
<td>Projects Running Change</td>
<td>Delivery Improved</td>
<td>Housing improved</td>
<td>Electricity improved</td>
<td>Water improved</td>
<td>Sanitation improved</td>
<td>Refuse improved</td>
<td>Job opportunity improved</td>
<td>MDG's achieved in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Agree in %</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disagree in %</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaire results
A striking finding in the study was that 84.2% of all community members who participated in the study felt that there had been marked improvement in both the universal and indigent basic services since 2005. This confirms what the data in Figure 4.24 shows with respect to housing, electricity, waste management and sanitation, where these range from 81.6% to 97.2%. This is also at par with the qualitative results in this study as well as with various Quality of Living (QoL) and service delivery studies which have been done in both municipalities between 2005 and now.

The marked improvement could result from the community seeing new houses being built, houses being electrified and waste collection being provided. Refuse collection is also relatively underrated in comparison to the other services which concur with several other service delivery and community satisfaction studies in the two municipalities in which this service has always been irregular and unreliable. In spite of striking improvements in provision of basic services to the communities, the municipalities have not yet dented the nagging and perennial issue of jobs, employment and business opportunities. The figure shows that 64.8% of the participants from the community felt that there was no improvement in this area. The qualitative results confirm this and the picture on the ground is not any different. Only 35% of the respondents here felt that there were some improvements.

The eight Millennium Development Goals are a practical approach to improve the lives of people, especially in third world countries, by the year 2014. Contained therein are strategies to eradicate poverty through human capital and infrastructure development and ODA is one of the instruments which is supposed to support this process. It is interesting to note from Figure 4.26 that in spite of ground-breaking improvements in infrastructure provision 70.6% of the participants from the community were still convinced that certain MDGs will not be achieved by 2014. The most obvious finding here is that, should the status quo pertain, goal number one, target one, “Halving between 1990 and 2015 the proportion of people whose income is less than a dollar a day”, will not be met.

4.3 The Metropolitan Municipalities capacity to deliver on their mandates
The evaluation of this area of the study was limited to the responses from partners and development partners only. The assessment was premised on the hypothetical question:
“what would have been the outcomes in both municipalities had the Paris Declaration been implemented?” Responses were grouped into the following categories:

a) Outcome 1: Evaluation of the institutional capacity.
b) Outcome 2: Evaluation of the internal operational environment of the institution.
c) KPAs: Improvement in the mandatory KPAs of a municipality as stated in both the IDPs and the Municipal Finance Management Act.
d) M&E: Improvement in the application of M&E across the board.

4.3.1 Outcome 1 (Evaluation of the Institutional Capacity)

Figure 4.27 (3.1.1 to 3.1.4)

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.27 displays the perceptions of the partners and development partners in respect to the capacity of both Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipalities to deliver on their mandates. Four main areas were investigated with regard to better capacitation of these two metros to do the following:

- Make development plans
- Implement these plans
- Manage aid finances
- Focus on development results.

The participation levels were high with figures of 72.2% for partners and 75% for development partners. A general positive perception was put forward by the partners’ results in relation to this area, between 52.9% to 66.7%, indicating that the two municipalities were indeed capacitated whereas the development partners with a range of between 17.6% and 22.2% were of the view that this was not the case. This is in marked contrast to the findings in the qualitative part of the study, whereby the evidence on the ground shows the exact opposite. This result was expected because the Paris Declaration had never been implemented either in full or partially in either of these two municipalities in this study over the period.

4.3.2 Outcome 2 (Evaluation of the operational environment)

Figure 4.28 (321-324)

Improvement in the operational environment of the two Municipalities as a result of the PD implementation (in %)

Source: Questionnaire results

Figure 4.28 provides the results of the evaluation of the inherent operational environment of the two Metros in respect of:
Better delivery of services to the community (quality and quantity) (Q321)
- Equitable services (Q322)
- Improved institutional development (Q323)
- Co-ordination of institutional programmes PPP and LED (Q324)

Whereas Figure 4.25 indicates a general perception of improved capacity in the two municipalities, these have not translated into improvement in deliverables as shown across the board in Figure 4.26. Both the development partners and partners indicate that that there was no marked improvement in any of the areas in investigated here. The rating for both parties in all these activities is below 50% and the development partners’ rating is even lower.

4.3.3 Municipal KPAs

Figure 4.29 (331 to 336)

Source: Questionnaire results

The Key Performance Areas (KPAs) in every municipality signifies those areas in which that particular municipality’s capacity to deliver is measured. These are deliverables which each municipality without exception is expected to deliver on as prescribed in the
relevant IDPs as well as in the Municipal Management Systems Act of South Africa. This part of the study, as shown in Figure 4.29, was exclusively targeted towards the two municipalities as institutions themselves, a sort of self-evaluation with the purpose of gauging their performances against these mandatory five key municipal deliverables:

- KPA 1 – Institutional organisation and framework
- KPA 2 – Service delivery
- KPA 3 – Local economic development
- KPA 4 – Financial management
- KPA 5 – Good governance

The findings were not very surprising as all self-evaluations tend to work positively towards the subject being evaluated. Overall 62.5% of the partners agreed that there were visible improvements in the way they were delivering on their KPAs whereas only 37.5% felt that this was not the case. This question was well responded to with 70% of the target groups having participated. 69.2% of the respondents felt that the their respective municipalities were performing very well in respect to KPAs 1 to 3, 66.7% in KPA 4 and a resounding 75% felt that they were even doing better in terms of KPA 5 – good governance. The last finding is in strong contrast to what is described in the qualitative part of this study.

4.3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

This self-evaluation as displayed in Figure 4.30 was again targeted at the partners only, namely the functionaries in the two municipalities. Most respondents agreed that there were marked improvements in the areas outlined below with the exception of the audit outcomes which came out with a meagre 23%.

- Audit outcomes
- IDP
- LED strategy
- Budget management
- Revenue collection
As expected, most of the respondents viewed this area with overwhelming positiveness. They would have been putting their own careers on the line if they answered otherwise! It was however striking to note that in relation to audit outcomes 76.9% of the respondents agreed that there had been no improvement, and this concurs with the qualitative findings as well as other findings on the ground as reflected in the various Auditor General’s Annual Reports in respect to the two municipalities in this study over the years. The opinion on revenue collection was divided at 50:50%.

**Figure 4.30**  (3.4.1 to 3.4.6)

![Figure 4.30](image)

Source: Questionnaire results

### 4.3.5 Impact

The evaluation of the impact in this area was obtained by reflecting whether there has been a change in the basic services as delivered by the municipalities and whether there has been any notable general development and poverty reduction. The respondents here were the Partners, Development Partners and the communities. The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English defines impact as “a strong or powerful influence or effect caused or produced by an idea, innovation or event” (Longman, 1987:523). The purpose of investigating this area was to find out what effect the Paris Declaration would have had on key activities in the two municipalities had it been implemented. This is in
relation to both the basic services (water and electricity) as well to the expected outcomes (sustainable growth, transformation).

Figure 4.31 represents the views of the respondents in respect of

- Sustainable growth,
- Transformation,
- Optimal delivery,
- Housing,
- Water,
- Sanitation/sewage,
- Electricity,
- Refuse remedies,
- Jobs, and
- Roads

The overall response in this part was very high: about 72% of all valid returned questionnaires. There was also adequate representivity of the researched groups as follows:

- 74% of community members,
- 64% of development partners, and
- 70% of partners

It is important to note that the responses in Figure 4.30 were also indicative of the positions of the participants in this study, whether a community member, a partner or a development partner. For example in relation to (3.5.1) sustainable growth and (3.5.3) optimal delivery on the ground in Figure 4.27, only 9.8% of the participating development partners agreed that ODA projects had assisted the municipalities, whereas the communities and the partners disagreed with responses of 53.8% and 42.9% respectively.
Figure 4.31 (Q351-3510)

ODA projects have assisted Municipalities in the provision of Basic Services/ Growth (in %)

Source: Questionnaire results
The results in Figure 4.30 further demonstrate that with respect to basic services (Q354 to Q358) the communities agreed to levels between 33.3% and 47.9% but when it came to optimal service delivery they rated it with a very low 19.1%. The partners believed that basic services (Q354 – Q358) were minimally implemented and rated them at 16.7% to 18.4% and optimal delivery at 17%. The development partners rated these even lower at between 2% and 2.2%.

It is clear from Figure 4.30 that most members of the community in both municipalities did not believe that the ODA projects had made significant dents in sustainable growth, transformation optimal delivery or the provision of jobs in their respective municipalities. They confirmed that these projects had contributed somewhat to the provision of water, sanitation, electricity refuse removal and roads. The majority of development partners felt that the projects had contributed more to sustainable growth, optimal delivery of services, provision of jobs and roads, but their answers remain guarded in respect to transformation, housing, sanitation, electricity and refuse removal. Most partners felt that these ODA projects had assisted more in transformation, optimal delivery of services, housing, water, sanitation, electricity and refuse removal. The majority felt that these projects had contributed very little to sustainable growth, or to jobs. What is striking here is that whereas most partners felt that ODA projects were assisting in the provision of basic services in concurrence with the communities’ views, the development partners were of the view that this was not the case.

4.3.6 Status quo of certain Development Markers in the two municipalities (in the absence of the implementation of the Paris Declaration)

The areas in which the Paris Declaration could have been expected to make a difference had it been implemented at the local governance level (municipalities) are:

- Roads,
- Poverty reduction,
- Capacity development,
- Increased economic growth,
- Inequalities,
- Meeting service of the MDGs, and
- Notable development
In Figure 4.31, the majority of community members in both municipalities were very negative in relation to the current status quo and their responses in this area (Q3510-Q3516) reflected an enhanced dissatisfaction with what was happening in the two municipalities, the exception being in the provision of roads (Q3510). The majority here felt that very little was being done in relation to poverty reduction, capacity development, economic growth, reduction in inequalities and meeting the MDGs but surprisingly the part in the community which saw some notable development was about 35.4%.

The notable development in this case could have been referring to the provision of basic services as discussed in Figure 4.30. The majority of the development partners were very negative about the status quo in a similar manner tp the partners. The exception in this case was in relation to roads and to overall notable development wherein the opinion of the partners was almost split 50–50 between “yes” and “no”.

### Status Quo of certain Development Markers in the two Municipalities (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Marker</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads Improvements</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Economic Growth</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Inequalities</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting some MDGs</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable Development in MUN area</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source: Questionnaire results       |

| Community AGREE in %               | 51.0       |
| Development Partners AGREE in %    | 4.1        |
| Partners AGREE in %                | 14.3       |
| Community DISagree in %            | 16.3       |
| Development Partners DISagree in % | 0.0        |
| Partners DISagree in %             | 14.3       |
4.4 Conclusion

In conclusion this chapter has presented the statistical research findings, specifically those emanating from the research instrument which was designed for this study. These findings underscore the partisan nature of ODA activities in the two municipalities and go further to show how this influenced the perceptions of the various participants in this study in respect of their groupings and standing in society. Highlighted from these findings is the fact that the Paris Declaration as an aid intervention mechanism was very little known in both municipalities across all groupings which participated in this study namely the communities, the partners and the development partners. It is therefore not very surprising to see that there was no conscious effort to implement this intervention by either municipality. This could be attributed to an extent to the inability of the responsible institutions, both national and provincial, to implement this programme at the local level. At the same time the municipalities cannot be completely exonerated from this failure. The results show that their weak governance structures both institutionally and capacity-wise could not have provided fertile ground for this intervention to thrive. The development partners, who should have known better, also seemed to be paying only lip service to the Paris Declaration whereas they should have been the main co-drivers. The communities were even worse off because the findings show that they knew very little about an intervention which was geared to benefitting them as active participants because it was supposed to be implemented in projects operating in their midst.

The next chapter, Chapter 5, presents and interrogates the qualitative findings in this study and together with this chapter resonates from the major component of the “mixed methodology” in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER FIVE

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF QUALITATIVE DATA

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents and discusses the second part of the data from this study in a qualitative manner. This is data gathered mainly from secondary sources; which is broken down into themes and subthemes so as to provide this study with the necessary descriptive analysis and depth so as to answer the following key questions in this study:

- What sort of international development AID (ODA) has been made available to these two metropolitan municipalities?
- How have the five elements of the Paris Declaration been implemented in the municipalities under study?
- Are these two municipalities under study better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration?

5.2 Qualitative Data Analysis
This section presents and analyses the qualitative findings of this study. The combination of this chapter and the quantitative results presented in Chapter Four provide answers to the three research questions a stated at the beginning of this chapter.

5.3 International Development Aid (ODA): Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipalities
From the qualitative part of the study, there is evidence that both metros received ODA in various modalities, varying amounts and from different development partners over the period in question, and continue to do so. There was an indication from various documentation that these relationships were being maintained in Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality as shown by the International Relations (IR) inbound/outbound calendars between 2005 and 2010 which indicated that bilateral visits had been planned embracing all the cities with which firm working relationships had already been
established. What was evident was that there was a lot of emphasis put on these visits and the responsible officer seems to be spending a lot of her time handling these issues.

Similarly, Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality has also anchored most of its ODA through the twinning and other programmes through direct funding, especially with the EU to support the Motherwell Urban Renewal Programme (MURP). NMBM boasted a total of nine international working relationships of which seven were active and the rest were dormant (NMBM, 2010a: slide 6).

Further, the metro had over time and through coordination by the office responsible for International Relations also benefited from other associations. It is also important to note the ODA funding that flows into these two municipalities other than through the two Urban Renewal Programmes (URPs) in Mdantsane in Buffalo City and Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay was not strictly handled as ODA funding according to the National Treasury regulations as well as the IDC directives on the management of this type of funding. Ideally all ODA funding should be deposited in the RDP fund at National Treasury from where it is channelled to the relevant destination, be it a province or a municipality. This was unfortunately not the case in both municipalities under study. The interplay between twinning programmes vis-à-vis the ODA concepts did not seem to be very well understood by the internal relations functionaries in these two municipalities. But this omission could also be a result of the way in which these twinning programmes are introduced and run in these municipalities.

An interesting finding in the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality Turnaround Strategy of May 2010 was a list of intentions to counteract the service delivery shortcomings in all spheres of the metro, among them in the area of External Relations. According to the IR Strategy of this Municipality, aid and ODA projects fall under this portfolio and should ideally be coordinated from here. In the list of six possible interventions (Turnaround Strategy) from External Relations not one of them ever touched on either AID or ODA as a factor which could assist in alleviating some of those challenges (NMBM, 2010b:29). Further there was no mention of what role aid or ODA could play in the turnaround
implementation, in spite of the fact the municipality continued to have an IR strategy, coupled with a number of twinning programmes from which Aid activities were flowing.

5.3.1 The implementation of the five elements of the Paris Declaration in Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipalities

5.3.1.1 Background

The purpose of interrogating this area was to find out the following:

- Whether the respondents knew anything about the Paris Declaration;
- Whether they understood the 5 principals and the 12/13 indicators;
- Whether they had been work-shopped through the Paris Declaration;
- Whether the Paris Declaration was established in their municipalities; and
- Whether the Paris Declaration had made any changes in the current ODA programmes in their Municipalities.

There had been no strong will or conscious efforts to implement any of the five principals or elements of the Paris Declaration in either of the two municipalities according to this study. If any of these elements were present in the ODA functions of either of the two municipalities, then these were either coincidental or a result of pre-existing programmes of government, either national, provincial or local as the case has been in many areas because of the relatively well-developed governance structures in South Africa compared to other aid recipients worldwide. Secondly South Africa did not commit itself to implement all the principles of the Paris Declaration in a stand alone manner like Namibia (Windhoek Declaration) or the Jakarta Commitment (in Indonesia), rather it chose to put emphasis on the principles of effectiveness. Whereas Namibia and Indonesia decided to implement the Paris Declaration as per document, South Africa rather synthesised an own operational document from the Paris Declaration called the Aid Effectiveness Action Plan for South Africa 2009 which was specifically geared towards optimising the issue of effectiveness. The thinking was that a dogmatic adherence to the Paris Declaration could have easily compromised both South Africa’s and the Developed
Partner’s commitment to the whole issue of aid effectiveness; IDC 2009, Personal Communication with staff of IDC Pretoria – 2011).

South Africa, a relatively well-developed middle income country located strategically in the southern part of Africa and very central in the continent’s activities, sees ODA as making a very small addition to its national resources available for development. The country plays a dual position as a partner in the North-South relationships and as a development partner in the South-South relationships. South Africa is able to embrace this position because of its geo-political and strategic position globally as well as the fact that post-1994 the country became an active and sometimes a leading member of various development initiatives in the aid environment (OECD, 2011:6; Wood et al., 2011:7).

The fluid nature of the political and administrative set-up in a democracy such as South Africa, where there are constant changes at both levels and in all spheres of Government (Polokwane issues and the recent municipal elections), mobility of staff, constant restructuring of ministries and departments made proper implementation of the Paris Declaration an impossible task (OECD, 2011:61).

5.3.1.2  Paris Declaration awareness by all respondents in the study
The key respondents in the OTP (responsible for ODA coordination in the Province) as well as those specific members of staff in the municipalities who are managing and working with twinning or ODA programmes agreed that they were aware of the Paris Declaration and its five principles and 12 indicators. The researcher noted with interest that in spite of this, with the exception of the actors in the OTP, most participants in the study confirmed that there had been no formal introduction of the Paris Declaration at the local level, in this case the municipalities, in the form either of workshops or one-to-one implementation and knowledge exchange. No project reports or any other municipal reports examined mentioned anything about the Paris Declaration or any of its elements.

This indicated that there had been no conscious efforts to implement the Paris Declaration or any of its elements in either of the two municipalities over the period of this study. Further, the Paris Declaration was not mentioned in any of the IDPs of the two
municipalities since 2005. Besides the fact that there was scanty mentioning of twinning programmes and how useful they had been in some areas, there was nothing which showed that the Paris Declaration had been discussed in or during the implementation of the various projects and definitely not in any of the Urban Renewal Programmes. These findings were further proven during the group and one-on-one interaction with the various respondents in this study.

The officials in the OTP responsible for International Relations and ODA coordination in the province confirmed having some idea of the Paris Declaration, and that they had been trained on it at different levels by the IDC in Pretoria. In spite of this, they all agreed that there had been no conscious effort from their side to implement the PD either at provincial level or at the municipal/metro level. Most of the partners at provincial level other than from OTP, namely those in the Treasury and the Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs (DLGTA), had never heard of the Paris Declaration and were not aware that such a programme existed. All staff members in the DLGTA LED section responsible for overseeing LED programmes in the municipalities who participated in this study, had never heard of this intervention and confirmed that it had not been implemented in their work areas.

At the municipal level the researcher got the impression, especially from those officers dealing with ODA in the two municipalities, that the Paris Declaration had never been established in their respective areas either, and this was very evident from the way the whole issue of ODA management was being handled during the one-to-one interviews. These officers conceded that their activities were more to do with twinning per se. During the one-to-one sessions with those officials in the two municipalities responsible for IR and ODA it was palpable from the researcher’s position that the Paris Declaration intervention was not immediately relevant to the functioning of their offices. They felt that it should have been implemented directly in the areas where the projects are managed. The belief that twinning activities were not a necessary part of ODA is clearly entrenched in both municipalities. There is evidence to show that most of the funding flowing through twinning programmes in both municipalities was not even reported to
the IDC in the Treasury, the unit responsible for ODA coordination in the country as a whole. It was also apparent that the Paris Declaration was not mentioned in any of the IDPs or annual reports of either of the two municipalities over the period of this study (2005–2010).

Information gathered through the interactions with community members in both municipalities as well as in the focus groups confirmed the fact that not only was the Paris Declaration not known, but that almost all of the participants in this group were not even aware that there was an international/national programme which was supposed to assist in the way projects were implemented on the ground. During one of the focus group discussions in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro’s Motherwell Urban Renewal Programme, a member of the group said:

These projects are faceless, they come with their big cheques at the initiation of a Project and this is the last time you see them.

This point is well captured in the MURP report of 2009/2010 in Buffalo City Metro where it was reported that:

In the past it has become clear that the community is not aware of whom or what is MURP! What MURP does, its mission, objectives and benefits to them. (BCM, 2009:58)

The statement above refers to the Mndatsane Urban Renewal Programme (MURP), a national project important not only in the country but also in the province. There were clear allegations of its not being known by the beneficiaries some four years after its launch, and also surprisingly shortly before it comes to an end in 2012. The MURP in Buffalo City Metro is supposed to end during 2012, and it is important to mention that MURP is an EU-sponsored project, which by its nature should have already had elements of the PD implemented in it (BCM, 2009:56-58). This finding is also mentioned in the work done by Uithaler (2008:38) in his assessment of the Motherwell Urban Renewal
Programme in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro where he says that there was “lack of information transfer, lack of information to the public, what services MURP provides”.

The researcher went through similar experiences to the consultants tasked to write the South African Paris Declaration evaluation phase two country report in relation to the developing partners. Out of more than 12 developing partners in both municipalities, most of them made themselves unavailable either by refusing to attend to the questionnaire forwarded to them, not answering it in full, or just refusing to make an appointment. Their veiled excuse was that they were apparently always “very busy”. The unhelpful “protection” accorded to some of these development partners by the International Relations functionaries in the two municipalities also made them very inaccessible and did not make the researcher’s work any easier. Of the 12 developing partners in both municipalities, contact was made with only ten, and among these ten only five bothered to respond to the requests to assist in providing the required information. Incidentally two of these were local representatives of the Development Partners (Wood et al., 2011:1:18:18).

It was surprising to find out that among the Development Partners who participated in this study, only very few had ever heard of the Paris Declaration, and its principles. They all confirmed that the Paris Declaration had never been implemented consciously in either municipality in which they were operating. It was also noteworthy that two out of the five development partners who participated in the study were local representatives of EU programmes, specifically the MURP in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro and Sinako. Sinako is an EU programme coordinated at the provincial level but operating in various municipalities and metros in the province. They were also not aware of the Paris Declaration and confirmed that no implementation of this intervention had ever been implemented in the programmes or projects they were party to.
5.3.1.3  Implementation of the five elements of the Paris declaration in the two Metropolitan Municipalities

5.3.1.3.1  Ownership
The purpose of investigating this area was to find out whether the two municipalities had an ODA/AID policy in place and whether they had taken leadership and ownership of those ODA projects. This sub question was specifically posed to only the Partners and Development Partners. According to the Paris Declaration of 2005, this is one of the most important principles expected to make Aid/ODA more effective and it is defined as follows by various sources:

Developing Countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption (www.oecd.org).

But according to the “Aid Effectiveness Action Plan for South Africa 2009” it is defined as:

Aid is more effective when it supports Partner country’s own development efforts and policies to which the country is committed (IDC, 2009c:1).

Both definitions capture the essence of this principle: that partner countries need to show leadership and stewardship in these projects, that ODA should be addressing own needs in the recipient country and that the recipient country must have strategic and administrative capacity to absorb this aid profitably.

The two definitions are further strengthened by the proceedings from the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) in 2008 which further said that in order to strengthen and provide the necessary speed for implementation thereof the following also has to happen:

Countries have more say over their development processes through wider participation in development policy formulation, stronger leadership on aid
coordination and more use of country systems for aid delivery (www.oecd.org).

Post-1994 and during the period 2005–2010 (the period covered by this study), South Africa as a young nation developed several strategies, policies and programmes to ensure that the development trajectory is well supported and possesses the right momentum and speed. There are strong policy documents such as the Public Finance Management Act (No. 1 of 1991) and the Municipal Finance Management Act (No. 56 of 2003) which guide the budget processes in the country and local government, the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in terms of policy, budgeting, implementation and M&E of these interventions (aid projects). In South Africa ODA is coordinated at the national level by the IDC within the national treasury. The IDC has developed an Aid Effectiveness Action Plan 2009 and updated its old Policy Framework and Operational Guidelines for ODA Management, initially drafted in 2003 and revised in 2011 (Wood et al., 2011:131).

At the provincial level, two policy documents, the Policy Framework and Operational Guidelines for ODA Management and the Aid Effectiveness Action Plan for South Africa of 2009, were only effectively cascaded down to the provinces during 2009 and 2010. The Eastern Cape Province attempted to develop its own IRS incorporating some of the principles enshrined in the national policy documents. To emulate national, the province held at least two consultative meetings between 2010 and 2011 with the local sector departments and some municipalities including the two municipalities in this study. The provincial IRS including ODA management was discussed, concrete proposals were made, and an ODA coordinating forum formed in the province. The whole strategy is still in draft stage and the meetings and their effectiveness can best be described up to now as patchy with a need for a more concerted and inclusive approach (OTP, EC, 2011).

Whereas the province has a draft IR Policy incorporating ODA activities, its effectiveness is not yet felt on the ground. Ownership of projects in the Province was not yet a very strong attribute, in fact even in the twinning arena the development partners
still have the upper hand in what, where, who and how much in respect of various development projects. This was the view from most respondents at the provincial level including the key officials responsible for ODA coordination in the OTP.

Interestingly both municipalities have International Relations policies in place, though varying in detail and depth. These IR policies are all originally anchored in the Municipal International Relations Policy Framework for South Africa of July 1999, initially published by the Department of Provincial and Local Government, now the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA). Whereas both documents from the two municipalities mentioned the involvement of COGTA and DIRCO (Department of International Relations and Cooperation) as their main contacts nationally, neither talked about the National Treasury or the IDC, the two bodies responsible for ODA nationally in South Africa (NMBM, 2011:9-10), although Buffalo City briefly mention the IDC’s Policy Framework and Procedural Guidelines for the Management of ODA (BCM, 1998:21).

IR activities in municipalities as envisaged in the Municipal International Relations Policy Framework (MIR) (MPLG, 1998:8-9) were reflected as follows:

Participation in representative associations of municipalities worldwide and these could be:

- IULA – International Union of Local Authorities,
- UTO – United Towns Organisation ,
- Metropolis,
- Summit,
- International Association of Cities and Ports,
- International Council for Local Environment Initiatives,
- Organisation of World Heritage Cities, and
- Sister Cities Intervention
Twinning arrangements:
- Friendly engagements with other cities with mutual interests and needs.

Memberships network
- These go beyond the traditional twinning to carrying out different programmes in different fields.

Municipal marketing and global presence
- Especially metros which market themselves as “world cities” by hosting major conferences, exhibitions and trade fairs.

According to SALGA as quoted in the Buffalo City Metro IR Plan 2 “the role of local government in IR has moved significantly from the symbolism of the past to meaningful interaction of mutual benefit with far-reaching implications for the image of South Africa and the development agenda at a local government level i.e. attainable economic benefits”. SALGA outlines its perspective with regard to IR for municipalities as follows (BCM, 2008: 6-7):
- To strengthen institutional capacity for local development.
- To secure, in consultation with all non-government/government stakeholders, South African local government access to international aid and support for human resource and technical skills development as well as funding for community development projects and programmes;
- To contribute to the sustainable development of Africa through the consolidation of democratic practices, technical excellence, skills, and service delivery by African local government; and
- To enhance the profile and image of South African local government continentally and globally.

SALGA talks about the “Developmental Agenda” which in this context could also mean issues of ODA. The question is whether indeed the two municipalities in this study are seeing their mandate in the same way and are acting accordingly.
From the available documentation, especially those from municipal officials, most ODA assistance flowed through the twinning programmes with the exception of the MURPs which received their direct funding from EU resources. The way twinning arrangements were introduced in most municipalities or in the province did not give these host institutions enough room to determine their own needs. Most twinning programmes were cascaded from either national or provincial level, therefore experiencing what many researchers have referred to as a “compliance mode” rather than a commitment (Badroodie and McGrath 2005:6, Lwanga-Iga. 2008:73). In this case, a programme is taken on or accepted because the officials at a lower level, in this case the municipalities or metros, are scared of disobeying a higher official at national level.

The inherent capacity problems both at the political and administrative levels in both municipalities in this study resulted in relative instability at all levels of these organisations during 2008–2010. As a result it was highly improbable that they could have played a leading role in some of the available ODA projects. Partners in the two municipalities as well as at the provincial level confirmed that the current projects in both municipalities were scattered, most did not have a “home” and that they were disconnected and dysfunctional. The best examples were again the two URP in Mndatsane, BCM, and Motherwell, NMBM (BCM, 2009/2010:56-58, Uithaler, 2008:42).

The development partners or their local representatives who participated in this study all felt that ownership from the partner’s side is lacking and they apportioned the blame to lack of capacity, general malaise and instability in the municipalities in which they were operating. One of them, representing one of the EU projects, even went further to say that:

the apparent success in their projects was as a result of her having her finger on the pulse of the projects all the time.
The IDC Development Cooperation Review 111 agrees with this finding in that they too found, especially in the case of the Eastern Cape Province, that “donors are still dominant in ODA relationships” (IDC, 2010:58). The general finding from this document is that whereas ownership is strong at the macro level (national), it is very low at the micro level (provinces, departments and municipalities). Again the main reasons also confirmed in this study of the two municipalities in the first instance, are: Institutional instability (infighting at both the political and administrative levels), capacity to manage the programmes (neither municipality had a strong structure to manage ODA over the period) and lack of leadership and interest from the host institutions because of the apparent low level of financial contributions from ODA generally (IDC, 2010:37, 38).

5.3.1.3.2 Alignment
Alignment can be defined as:

Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems (www.oecd.org).

According to the Aid Effectiveness Action Plan for South Africa, in a local context this is defined as

Aid that is aligned to the policies and systems of Partner countries making bigger contributions to development than donor driven and fragmented aid (IDC, 2009).

The Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) goes further to say that this means:

more use of country systems for aid delivery (www.oecd.org).

At a national level South Africa has developed systems which are generally reliable, the problems are always at implementation (OECD, 2007: 29:1).
There was no evidence at the provincial level to show that there was any integration of ODA in the budgets at the OTP level and as a result almost all ODA projects were not properly captured or reflected in the strategic and operational plans of the province. Twinning was sometimes mentioned in passing during the State of the Province Addresses (SOPA) or individual Policy Statements from sector departments at the beginning of the financial years. This could maybe be interpreted as a friendly gesture or courtesy to our development partners in the province, but hard outcomes and numbers in contributions were hardly talked about or mentioned (Province of the Eastern Cape, 2009 and, 2010).

This finding is confirmed in the IDC Development Cooperation Review 111 (2010), where of all provinces which received ODA in South Africa only KwaZulu-Natal provincial departments reflected ODA in their documentation. This report goes further to say that in fact during their study, the Eastern Cape was not yet incorporating ODA in their budgets because in most cases and in almost all departments ODA was being managed as an *add on* (IDC, 2010:41-42).

A similar picture was reflected in the two municipalities in this study. The little aid which flowed into the two municipalities, with the exception of the EU-sponsored MURP projects in Mndatsane and Motherwell, came in through twinning programmes. The researcher found that because of the nature of the twinning programmes most of this aid was tied to the development partner’s systems. As observed by the IDC in their Development Cooperation Report 111 of 2011, most of this aid is coupled to Technical Assistance (TA), where by default or design the funding is automatically tied or linked directly to the development partner, specifically to make the technical expertise (manpower) available as well to procure machinery and equipment from the Development Partner’s side or country of origin (IDC, 2010:46-47).

It was also interesting to note that most members of staff in the two municipalities in this study preferred to use development partner systems to obviate the rampant bureaucracy in
their Supply Chain Management offices which have been instituted in the provinces and municipalities all over the country. One key respondent remarked that:

The Supply Chain Management and the Municipal Finance Management Act were so cumbersome and involved that they defeated the purposes of why they were developed: whereas the donor systems are fast and almost … instant.

The development partner’s blatant unwillingness to use the municipal systems were observed by the researcher in a number of cases. For example, the development partners tended to choose their own areas of operations (own interest) instead of focusing on key areas in which these two municipalities were deficient, such as strengthening their political and administrative arms. A number of development partners chose to participate in what could well be described as “superfluous” projects which could support an area for a while then but were not sustainable if they were operating at an institutional level. The immediate question which arises here is why do the development partners, though aware of the niggling issues in all these municipalities, not engage themselves in the more important areas of administration and governance? They rather conveniently engage themselves in non-crucial projects which contribute very little to the well-being of these organisations as a whole (IDC, 2010:47-49).

The reluctance of development partners to use the local procurement and financial systems was partly due to the fact that certain development partner’s regulations do not allow use of local systems in their projects (OECD, 2006:29-5).

5.3.1.3.3 Harmonisation
Harmonisation can be defined as:

Donor country coordinates, simplifies, procedures and shares information to avoid duplications (www.oecd.org).
But the AID Effectiveness Action Plan for South Africa says the following:

Harmonisation would not be an issue if there was perfect alignment, but because there is no perfect alignment donors need to harmonize their efforts, be more effective and less burdensome on partner countries. It calls for more co-ordination; it calls for strong partnerships where the lead of the Partner country is followed (IDC, 2009:3).

The actions expected here would be to determine areas of co-ordination, especially at the MOU level, the public must participate and ensure that aid practices are in sync with the community needs which would result in aid projects complementing each other, so that the apparent rampant fragmentation in development assistance is brought to a stop. (IDC, 2009:3). The IDC talks about “a degree to which South African Institutions (Partners) manage ODA together with the Development Partners to ensure that ODA was well mapped against areas of high need (IDC, 2010:50-51). Harmonisation has an inherent property of co-ordination in it, hence one talks about harmonisation and co-ordination. The IDC goes further to say that strong leadership and co-ordination from the partner’s side would without a doubt force the development partners to harmonise more.

At national level there was an attempt to harmonise but this was still rudimentary with examples of the Nordic countries or the EU with UN. Efforts to harmonise driven by development partners have most times been thwarted by the unwillingness of South African organisations to be part of this (IDC, 2010:50). It is also because both the partners and development partners did not think that this was very significant in the case of South Africa where one is clearly dealing with very low volumes of aid, which minimised the cost-benefits of such an undertaking. There was no evidence to show that there was any semblance of co-ordination of ODA at all in the two municipalities in this study. Most respondents from this group agreed that Development Partners were still working in silos. The reasons behind this were to try to outperform their peers and to have a better standing in the eyes of the partners and the communities in comparison to other development partners in the area: an apparent struggle for positions in the donor hierarchy. An IDC report (2010:8) confirms the findings in this study when it says that
“donors were still dominant in the ODA relationships resulting in weaker alignment and poor co-ordination of aid with the department’s own activities”.

The harmonisation and co-ordination mentioned from the centre (national) was completely absent in the two municipalities. Although there was a cluster of Nordic countries twinned with both BCM and NMBM they seemed to be running “solo” shows with no signs of projects being run from a mutual central point in the municipalities. The researcher could not find the alignment of projects at the local level as reported by the IDC (2010:59), but concurs with its comment that, whereas things might be happening at national (central) level, these are invariably not being cascaded down to the provinces or the municipalities in a proper manner. This leads to failure of co-ordination at this level.

5.3.1.3.4 Managing for Results

The Paris Declaration of 2005 defines Managing for Results as:

Developing countries and Donors shift focus to development results and results get measured (OECD 2005).

The Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) sees this as:

Aid is focused on real and measurable impact on development (www.oecd.org)

Whereas the Aid Effectiveness Action Plan for South Africa of 2009 says that

Donors and Partner countries should work together to manage resources for the achievement of development results by using information on results to improve decision making, look at quality of information, access to information and country level monitoring and evaluation (OECD, 2007:34).
The key consideration here is to manage ODA in such a manner that the focus is on the results. In the case of municipalities this would translate into linking the needs and wishes of the people to the strategies and the budgets in the Integrated Development Plans (IDPs). This in turn requires a very high degree of M&E. The state of most projects and delivery in both municipalities over the research period shows that this was either very weak or just not functional. Practical examples to illustrate this point are the two URPs in the province, Mdantsane in Buffalo City and Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay, as reflected in the following mini case study;

5.3.1.3.5 Mini case study of the Urban Renewal Programmes in the Eastern Cape

Introduction

The researcher decided to use the Urban Renewal Programmes in the province as a mini case study, because most of the ODA funding coming to the two municipalities under the twinning programmes was not always reported to the IDC as ODA but the finances coming to the two URPs in Mdantsane and Motherwell were recorded at the IDC as such.

South Africa’s eight URPs as shown in Annexure D Map 4.1 are located in the following provinces:

- Alexandra in Gauteng
- Galeshewe in Northern Cape
- Inanda and KwaMashu in KwaZulu Natal
- Mdantsane and Motherwell in Eastern Cape
- Khayelitsha and Mitchells Plain in Western Cape

The creation of URPs in South Africa was specifically to mitigate the socio-economic ills of globalisation and migration of people from the rural areas to the cities in search of work and better living conditions. Lessons learned from elsewhere in the world prompted the then President Mbeki to initiate this project in 2001. The thinking behind this was an attempt to combat urban poverty and to integrate national, provincial, and local level
government service delivery activities in order to ensure a sustained fight against underdevelopment as well as urban and rural poverty. An EU midterm review of URPs in the Eastern Cape (EU, 2009:4) described these areas as “nodes for special attention in the effort to reduce poverty and develop the former townships created by apartheid planning into areas of economic and social well-being rather than dormitory towns for the unemployed and the poor”.

The two nodes identified in Eastern Cape Province are Mndatsane in Buffalo City Metro and Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro, and the financing of these programmes is done through the EU under the Sector Policy Support Programme (SPSP). The EU describes this as “an aid modality that provides a transfer of funds for use in the implementation of the beneficiary’s own strategies. As is the case with all sector budget support programmes, activities are not defined; outcomes, and measured by agreed indicators, form the basis of monitoring the financing agreement” (EU, 2009:4).

This support is recorded at the IDC and classified as ODA, and there are six mandatory result areas as follows:

- Result Area 1: Improved Local Economic Development
- Result Area 2: Habitable Human Settlements
- Result Area 3: Improved Social Development
- Result Area 4: Improved Public Participation
- Result Area 5: Improved Strategy, Programming, Project implementation, coordination and Service Delivery
- Result Area 6: Improved Municipal Institution

Financial management, audit, procurement, project management and integrated planning renders these programmes as possible evaluation instruments had the Paris Declaration or any of its five principals and twelve indicators been implemented (IDC, 2011a:6-7). The six result areas (RAs) as listed above clearly crystallise what is expected of the municipalities in terms of their mandates on one hand and also brings to the fore those
things which are encapsulated in the Paris Declaration to make aid or ODA delivery better and more efficient on the other.

Reports from various sources, even internal ones from the metros themselves, corroborated the researcher’s findings and the sentiments from the communities, (which people these programmes were intended to assist) that the URPs were doomed from the start and that their likely success under the circumstances was minimal. The 2009/2010 Buffalo City Metro Annual Report remarked that “the EU has not been satisfied with the performance of the Municipality in implementing its SPSP and MURP broadly that the EU strongly considered closing the programme as a result” (BCM, 2010:56). The EU Midterm report on the two URPs in the Eastern Cape confirmed that although the initial planning, including outcomes, performance indicators, baselines and targets was done properly, the two municipalities did not have enough internal M&E capacity to oversee these processes. Even when revised indicators were requested by the EU these were also not forthcoming. The situation was further exacerbated by the continuous staff fluidity and institutional instability at both political and administrative levels. The efficiency of these programmes was further compromised by weak capacities in the project and financial areas resulting in unnecessary implementation delays (Uithaler, 2008:40-41, EU, 2009:4-6).

Most of the respondents on the ground in the community, particularly those in Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro, confirmed that they were not involved in these projects. They were not seeing anything on the ground and what they saw were white elephants such as clinics, libraries and Thusong centres which were non-functional, not completed and, in some cases, standing empty.

This situation was best summarised in the 2009 EU Mid Term review of Mndatsane and Motherwell Urban Renewal Programmes (EU, 2009:5-6) as follows:

- Infrastructure development and service delivery was taking place in both of the nodes;
• Effective communication and co-ordination, the chief value-adds through MURP, was not in place;
• Activities in the nodes were much the same way as in other areas of the municipality yet the MURP units, if suitably skilled and effective, were supposed bring significant innovation to the process;
• MURP did not have an ‘organisational profile’ in the municipality to give it the required level of respect and authority necessary for efficient engagement;
• Outcomes were inadequate to achieve purpose and goal.

From the above, those attributes anchored in the Paris Declaration with regard to improving the delivery of AID or ODA were all missing in these two projects and yet both South Africa and the EU were signatories to the Paris Declaration and prescribed to its contents, albeit from different perspectives.

In spite of the fact that there is a new fully fledged ministry of Monitoring and Evaluation in South Africa at national level housed in the Presidency, the advantages of such a stand-alone ministry for the purpose have not yet trickled down to where they are mostly needed, that is, the provinces and municipalities. Kanyane in (Kondlo & Maserumule, 2010:92) confirms this finding and doubts the ability and locus of this ministry when he says that:

the decision to locate the monitoring and evaluation aspect of public service delivery in the office of the Presidency is an experiment, still to be scientifically tested to see if it can yield results ... Perhaps the monitoring and evaluation function should have been decentralised to Provinces and Municipalities.

The Project Mid-Term Reviews as shown in the preceding MURP case study showed that M&E was a very important component of any project, but this was either completely absent or just not effective. The IDC (2010:53) Report on Development Cooperation 111 called this “program designs paying lip service to M&E”. Uithaler (2008:38) in his thesis
on the Motherwell Urban Renewal Programme in Nelson Mandela Bay confirmed this finding in his comments about the uncoordinated running of this project. The culture of a weak M&E in most South African country programmes post 1994 referred to in the same IDC report (2011:53) has unfortunately permeated through most municipalities, including the two in this study, hence the near-chaotic situation in almost all projects in these municipalities: projects failing to take off, unfinished projects or projects finished but faulty as in most housing projects to date.

5.3.1.3.6 Mutual Accountability
The Paris Declaration of 2005 defines Mutual Accountability as

Donors and partners are accountable for development results (OECD, 2005).

Whereas the IDC goes further to define this in local terms and from an aid effective perspective by saying that:

Aid is more effective if donors and partner countries are more accountable to their own constituencies and to each other (IDC, 2011a:3).

The above two statements try to encourage both Development Partners and the Partners to work in such a way that their individual constituencies are aware of what they are doing in the aid arena. At the same time the two partners should be in constant touch with each other so as to know what the other is doing. This calls for joint project sessions from planning, through implementation to completion coupled with regular joint audits. In brief this means that the partners have to be accountable to each other as well as to their own citizens or countries. The researcher found this area to be much contested among the various respondents who participated in this study: whereas some development partners believed that there was mutual accountability in the engagements in which they were involved in or operating in, the partners on the other side believed otherwise.
Although joint audits were encouraged and did take place at the ODA centre (national) in South Africa, this was not happening in the other two spheres of government, that is the provinces and the municipalities, and specifically not in the two in this study. Individual reporting from either partner was still the order of the day. The researcher could not find enough evidence in either municipality to show that there was transparency whereby reports to be sent to own constituencies or countries by either party were passed through the other for comments or otherwise.

Looking through the IDPs from the two municipalities during the period of study 2005–2010 there was a glaring gap concerning twinning or ODA in these documents. The IDPs in both metros mentioned both twinning and foreign assistance as “desirable actions” in the functioning of their organisations, especially on project delivery, but they all fell short in delving into the details and mechanisms including the budgets (BCM 2011a:11). Although the twinning partnerships in both municipalities mentioned a number of active engagements with other countries, these were not brought out clearly in the IDPs. Normally if a project or programme does not appear in the IDPs, the chances of its being acted on under the multitude of competing demands and needs from the beneficiaries (communities) are almost nil.

The same also applies to the two municipalities’ annual reports. Again important issues such as ODA and twinning were mentioned just in passing. An example of this was one of Buffalo City Municipality’s annual reports where these were mentioned in only two pages in a report of about 312 pages. Even then, the subject was just brushed over, devoid of actual details and specifics on the functioning of the project and trends therein (BCM, 2009:212-213). The issue of gender is also not disaggregated or seriously mentioned in respect to twinning projects where some ODA flows into the two municipalities. Although South Africa has a real positive bias towards women empowerment, it is difficult to assess the contribution of the various twinning projects towards gender mainstreaming.
These findings concur with those in the second phase evaluation report of the Paris Declaration where it says that “there is no evidence that the PD has been a determinant factor in influencing Mutual Accountability due to the asymmetric accountability relationships between governments and the Development Partners” (Wood et al., 2011:45) It was also apparent that the involvement of the CSOs and NGOs remained very poor.

5.4 Capacitation of the two Municipalities to deliver on their mandates (as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration)

5.4.1 Introduction

This issue refers explicitly to development outcomes and results. The response in this part of the study was complicated by the fact that neither of the two municipalities in this study had consciously implemented any of the elements of the Paris Declaration. (The Paris Declaration in Perspective) in the research methodology chapter (Chapter 3) clearly reflects that the Paris Declaration was not supposed to be working in isolation or to be the only intervention in the overall development programmes. Besides, even before this Paris Declaration initiative was instituted in 2005, there were already programmes on the ground in every country, including South Africa, designed to improve the delivery of certain developmental programmes. The OECD (2009:7) in its joint evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase 2 Terms of Reference (ToR) document referred to this as:

one vital starting point is to recognise that the 2005 Declaration itself brought together a variety of reform and initiatives that had been underway in different settings for some years before. Thus each evaluation should explicitly include assessment of these upstream or precursor steps as an integral part of its scope.

The same document OECD (2009:7) proposed that among others the following must be considered when doing this evaluation:
• A theory based approach which recognises that outcomes / results from the Paris Declaration implementation may not be fully visible by the time of the Evaluation – so focuses instead on identifying the chains, directions, causes and trends of causality and the linkages involved

• A theory of change which anticipates and explores complexity rather than expecting to apply simpler one dimensional models of attribution.

In view of the above and also in relation to the introduction to this study and the purpose thereof there is clear evidence of: The litany of lack of capacity both at a communal and institutional level, accompanied by failure to deliver on local commitments like, social services, health, housing, sanitation coupled with a multitude of failed projects warrants a deeper investigation into the way Development Aid is influencing capacity in the municipalities under study.

Seventeen years down the line not much change can be seen on the ground. In fact Municipalities reports are full of cases of inefficiencies, corruption, inability to deliver and lack of both human and institutional capacities. This has been of late especially in the mid-2009, reflected through community strikes, crumbling services, like water, sanitary, health and inadequate social services.

The hypothesis of this study is that improved capacities at both the individual and organisational levels would inevitably lead to improved service provision. This would in turn lead to improved livelihoods, which would contribute towards poverty alleviation, culminating in the so-called development. ODA or aid programmes should ideally focus on anchoring social development, poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability in whatever relationships are built.

Kanyane (in Kondlo & Maserumule, 2010:77) comments about transformation of the public service delivery into real tangible and intangible outcomes, referring to issues such as housing, sanitation, water, health as tangibles and if these are delivered in a dignified and respectable manner as intangibles. In view of this, and of various
community satisfaction studies carried out in both metros over time (IDP delivery study in BCM in 2008, Customer Satisfaction Survey in BCM 2006, Quality of Life Study in BCM in 2007 and the Service Monitor of Wards in NMBM in 2011) the researcher found it opportune to investigate this area. Use was made of the parameter of service delivery to look at the status quo even in the absence of the PD because the findings thereof would be very relevant in explaining, for example, why these two municipalities experienced bouts of community strikes although they have had longstanding ODA programmes in their midst.

The researcher decided to focus on the capacity of the municipalities to deliver on their mandates: delivery of basic services as well as other community services. It was important to look at both the tangibles and intangibles in the process and for this purpose the above-mentioned satisfaction surveys coupled with the direct interaction with the communities (beneficiaries) in these two metros yielded the presented results.

5.4.2 Delivery and Performance Management at the Metro level

Figure 5.1: Performance Management in a Municipality

![Performance Management Diagram]

Source: NMBMM: IDP Plan 2006-2011
Whereas the IDP is the road map to service delivery in any metro or municipality (to ensure co-ordination and integration in projects, programmes activities and budgeting), the Municipality Performance Management (MPM) document ensures that these plans or the road map are properly implemented. In a way the overall picture is that of summing up or elevating the individual contributions of each employer to provide the gross performance of the institution as a whole. The total performance then translates into service delivery on the ground encompassing all services including the basic services as enshrined in the mandate of local government in the pursuit of fulfilling the needs of its citizens (NMBM, 2011:331). The interlink between the organisation and its employees in local government service delivery is very important, as shown in Figure 5.1.

5.4.3 The linkages between the IDP, PMS and Budget in Service Delivery

Figure 5.2: IDP, PMS and Budget in Service Delivery

Example: “Delivery of Water”
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<tr>
<th>KPA 1</th>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Programme

Provision of water

BUDGET FOR WATER PROVISION
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Number of Households connected
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Source: Adapted from BCM IDP Plan Review 2006-2011
For service delivery to succeed specifically at a local level three things must be in place: a strategy and plan, an implementation road map and the resources (budget) to implement this plan. These are fulfilled respectively by the presence of an IDP, an MPM and a well-endowed budget in a municipal set-up (NMBMM, 2011:8, 335). Figure 5.2 illustrates an IDP KPA under which a certain service is delivered e.g. water. The Performance Management plan defines the indicators, e.g. the number of households, and the target, e.g. number of households connected. This in turn is linked to the available budget earmarked for this activity. In short, Performance Management is a good indicator of how well the intentions of the IDP have been implemented and whether the funds have also been used for the purpose for which they were intended, thus translating into delivery or service delivery.

5.4.4 Service Delivery

Table 5.1 Some interesting and relevant statistics in these two municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Buffalo City Metro</th>
<th>Nelson Mandela Bay Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>724,306 Mio</td>
<td>1.1 Mio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households, formal</td>
<td>208,389</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,515 sq km</td>
<td>1,950 sq km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigent households</td>
<td></td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Households with grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HIV Positive</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With no education</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Social Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Capitalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>R5.3 Billion (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>R2.3 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay IDP Reviews 2006–2011
The information in Table 5.1 captures the basic milieu in which service delivery is provided in the two municipalities and it is important to show this up front so that the reader of this study can understand why to an extent certain things in respect to delivery are happening and others are not. The high percentage of unemployment in both municipalities coupled with a correspondingly large number of grant beneficiaries, indigent households and HIV positive people already puts a large demand on the service provision from the two municipalities in the light of internally compromised institutions over this period (capacity issues, political and administration problems). A combination of these factors could also easily assist to an extent in explaining the gripes the communities have with local government in their respective areas as attested to by the service community uprisings which were seen over the period in the study.

Basic service delivery can be defined as “the provision of water, sanitation, electricity/basic energy, refuse removal and shelter/housing” (BCM, 2009:5) The second part of service delivery concerns other issues which could be designated as community-based services, such as access roads, sidewalks and footpaths, storm water drainage, public transport infrastructure and services, greening, numbering/naming of streets, and community facilities such as play grounds, clinics, community centres.

In view of the above and in spite of the fact that the Paris Declaration had not been implemented in either of the two municipalities, it was nevertheless interesting to find out what the status quo was in this area. This was especially important because the study also looked at the latest service delivery protests. This is in agreement with the spirit of the Paris Declaration, which recognises the presence of other developmental interventions, some of which might have preceded the appearance of the PD in the development arena in 2005 (OECD, 2009a:10). This is also in agreement with the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32, 2000) Section 25 which defines an IDP and also lays down the purpose of any local government organisation as “a single, inclusive and strategic plan for the development of a municipality”.

151
The key deliverables according to the Municipal Systems Act are the A and Z of any municipality / metro or similar organisation’s business and these are:

- Provision of a democratic and accountable government for local authorities,
- Encouraging community participation in local government matters,
- Ensuring the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner,
- Promotion social and economic development, and
- Promotion of a safe and healthy environment.

Some community satisfaction studies have been done in both municipalities over time and these should normally indicate the way the community views the services being offered by their relevant municipalities. Some of the studies consulted during this study were:

- The Service Monitor of Wards in 2011 (Nelson Mandela Bay)
- The Quality of Life Study in 2007 (Buffalo City)
- The IDP Service Delivery Impact Study in 2008 (Buffalo City)

It was therefore pertinent during this study to let the communities – the beneficiaries on – the ground air their views, especially on the provision of basic services, as a barometer of municipal delivery, namely, housing, water, sanitation, electricity and refuse removal. These were dealt with both in main research question 2 sub-questions 2.8.6-2.8.10, which was the community perspective, and in main research question 3, sub-questions 3.5.4-3.5.8, reflecting the total response from all participants in the study.

Whereas Table 5.2 shows the status quo of the basic services from the document research confirming that indeed certain services are being provided in the two municipalities, different groups see the outcomes from different angles and perspectives. A significant finding here was that the community saw a marked increase in the provision of basic services (introduction of new services), which was also observed by the researcher during the field visits with mushrooming toilets, social housing and reticulation. All participants in the study agreed that there was service being provided but
it was not as highly rated by the communities themselves. This could perhaps be explained by the inclusion of intangible issues as propounded by Kanyane (in Kondlo and Maserumule, 2010:78) whereby some respondents felt that though these basic services were being provided the issues of speed, quality and dignity, especially in housing and electricity, were not being looked at seriously.

In the case of housing, a lot of houses though built were, wet, defective and most times they needed to be rebuilt. Servicing and maintenance of already existing infrastructure was also mentioned as a key challenge by most members of the communities, the functionaries in the two municipalities and in the province. The IDP impact study on service delivery done by Buffalo City in 2008 confirmed some of these findings. There was a view that indeed more houses had been built (1,900 low cost houses in 2007/2008) but the problems were the slow process, small sizes, shoddy workmanship and incomplete units. Most respondents in both the BCM and FHISER studies said that “the RDP houses were too small” (FHISER/BCM, 2008:52, FHISER, 2007:12).

According to the communities in the two municipalities electricity provision had improved a lot, the only problem being the manner in which the installations were done, showing no respect to the people being served. You only have to go to areas such as Mndatsane in Buffalo City, or Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay, to see low-hanging electric cables criss-crossing from one house to another. Most of these houses are fitted with only one plug from which all electric equipment in the house was being run. The BCM study on Impact of Service delivery in 2008 found out that although the introduction of street lighting in several wards and subsidisation of electricity to the poor was seen as a very positive action, street lighting was only available in a few areas and even then this infrastructure was badly maintained (FHISER/BCM, 2008:56).

Water provision was also been hailed as an area where notable improvements had been made. The researcher’s observations on the ground were that although water was there often this water was not directly in the houses but rather provided from a communal standpipe, a distance away from most households. Further, most of these facilities were
very badly maintained, dirty, shabby and almost always continuously dripping. Sanitation was also highly lauded by the communities. This in itself is an admission by all that something has happened and is still happening. It is also no wonder because this is one of the key issues of contention in the erstwhile black townships of the apartheid era, namely the bucket system which was not only bad but was also very dehumanising.

All three satisfaction surveys mentioned above agreed that there had been visible improvements in certain wards in both municipalities. These apparent improvements were quickly annulled by the additional demand on the system from people migrating from the rural areas into these two municipalities aggregating in the so-called ‘informal settlements’ which are mushrooming everywhere in the peri-urban areas. These are people in search of a better life and livelihoods who inevitably end up living in shacks with no amenities, as also mentioned in the available satisfaction study reports (FHISER/BCM, 2008:26; FHISER, 2007:15).

Refuse removal remained a very contentious issue from all participants and from all quarters. A number of community satisfaction studies done in both municipalities reflected a view that migration of people from rural areas to metros looking for work compounds this issue. Increased migration results in informal settlements mushrooming everywhere. These naturally have no infrastructure or reticulation resulting in haphazard refuse dumping areas being created which are indeed difficult to service regularly (FHISER/BCM, 2008:57). The following discussion further discusses the issue of service delivery and the inherent challenges therein.

In addition to providing basic services as reflected in Table 5.2 the challenge is to create so-called sustainable human settlements with access to social, economic, transport, health and employment facilities with a good transport and road system. Nelson Mandela Metro lists its other service delivery challenges as the following:

- Integrated human settlements – meeting the backlogs of informal areas and all backyard shacks
- Inferior housing projects, (wet and defective houses).
- Aging and poor infrastructure – coupled with persistent backlogs.

Table 5.2 Basic Services Delivery in Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Buffalo City Metro</th>
<th>Nelson Mandela Bay Metro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water: Direct</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside yard</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside yard</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush toilet</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucket</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity: Formal Household</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated: Human Settlements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Backlog</td>
<td>88,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>35,772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backyard shacks</td>
<td>49,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Backlogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peri-Urban and Ward Information</td>
<td>No Baseline data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Integrated plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No reliable data to identify extent of real need for Basic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay. IDP Reviews 2006–2011
5.4.5 Basic Services vis-à-vis Community Based Services

An interesting factor in delivery of services at the local level is to be able to create a healthy balance between the provision of basic services versus community-based services. Basic services are those community needs, such as water, sanitation, electricity, waste management and housing. Community-based services are things such as playgrounds, parks, sports fields, schools, clinics, community centres, municipal offices, hospitals, fire and police services. The provision of these services is guided by prescriptions from the Sustainable Communities Planning Guidelines. Table 5.4 outlines acceptable indications in distance from a household to any of the given facilities, and Table 5.5 outlines all the things that fall under community-based services and which are covered under most IDPs, not forgetting that both these lists are enshrined in the South African Bill of Rights, also known as Chapter 2 of the Constitution.

Table 5.3: Acceptable distances from a household to a service facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground Park</td>
<td>50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>1,000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>1,000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>1,500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre/Library</td>
<td>1,500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Sports field</td>
<td>1,700m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal office</td>
<td>1,850m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2,000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Police Station</td>
<td>200m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A ward-based study done by the GIS unit of NMBM in Port Elizabeth about community-based services produced some interesting findings as shown in Table 5.4 and Map 2 in Annexure D. Whereas this municipality boasts of being at the top of their game in terms of providing both basic services and community-based services in the category “Well serviced” and above, the contrary is shown in the categories moderately, poorly and very poorly serviced where there are glaring and marked differences in the two services as shown in the tables (NMBM, 2011:8).

### 5.4.6 Community Based Services in NMBM

Table 5.4: Community Based Services in NMBM (see Map 5.1 in Annexure D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Wards</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>No of Wards</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>Very Poorly Serviced</td>
<td>148354</td>
<td>14.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
<td>Poorly Serviced</td>
<td>222820</td>
<td>22.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>Moderately Serviced</td>
<td>261801</td>
<td>26.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>Well Serviced</td>
<td>173370</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>Extremely Well Serviced</td>
<td>199443</td>
<td>19.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1005788</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 5.4.7 Basic Services in NMBM

Basic services include water, sewerage, electricity, refuse collection, storm water and road type (gravel and tarred) the map. The Map 5.2 Annexure D) and Table 5.4 illustrate the situation in Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality in respect of basic services. All the areas depicted as red-brown are poorly serviced. That means that reliable services are mainly around the main towns and townships.
The differences shown in Tables 5.3 and 5.4 raise some alarm in that whereas a relatively high proportion of the community do receive basic services, a significantly lower proportion receive community based services. This is an area which is in all cases either neglected or taken for granted and needs urgent attention. Perhaps some of the causes of community protests in the two municipalities in this area could be attributed to this (NMBM, 2011:13; BCM 2007/2008:192).

Table 5.5: Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality (Water, Sewerage, Electricity, Storm water, Road types, and Refuse Collection). (Map 5.2 in Annexure D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Wards</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>Very Poor Service</td>
<td>71,752</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>Poorly Serviced</td>
<td>96,531</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>Moderately Serviced</td>
<td>273,040</td>
<td>27.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>Well Serviced</td>
<td>330,764</td>
<td>32.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>Extremely Well Serviced</td>
<td>233,701</td>
<td>23.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,005,788</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NMBM Service Monitor of Wards 2011

The following statement underlines the importance of this relationship:

Whilst BCM delivers basic services (Water, Sanitation, waste removal and electricity) to about 70% of households, many households still lack adequate, transport, social services, economic opportunities and an enriching environment (BCM 2008:1)).

In addressing the requirements of the Local Government Turnaround Strategy of 2009, Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality emphasised the following:
Municipal Turnaround Strategies should be customized and informed by the local environment and local challenges … A one size fits all approach is not practical for the successful development and implementation of a turnaround strategy in brutal honesty on the part of the relevant institution regarding its challenges both political and administrative (NMBM, 2010).

Besides the direct service delivery and basic services shortcomings which have been discussed, the institutional challenges (external and internal) in the two municipalities over the research period at the political as well as the administrative levels were immense. These precipitated into an organisational “lameness” which permeated throughout both institutions to the extent of impacting on each and every citizen in these metros in one way or another and in varying degrees. This was brought to light by the affected communities in various ways, through community protests by the have-nots, and by withholding of municipal rates by those who have. Several NGOs consistently complained about these issues on behalf of the sometimes ‘voiceless communities’, and even the municipalities themselves have acceded to these problems. Clear examples are to be found in the State of the City Report of 2010, the IDP Reviews of Nelson Mandela Metro 2006-2011 and Buffalo City Metro 2007/2008. The communities in some cases brought these things to the fore as illustrated below:

Census 2011 enumerators were prevented from conducting their duties at NU 10 in Mndatsane informal settlement and Silverton informal settlement in KwaZulu-Natal till Service Delivery would come their way.

Young and Old take to the street against corruption in BCM, we must seek radical change, and we must fight corruption.

Winnie Madikizela-Mandela on sanitation in the Eastern Cape: “I have been quite shocked at how grave these shortcomings are.”
5.5 The two Municipalities as Institutions

The status quo of both municipalities as institutions able to deliver on their mandates was gauged in this study through the category “Impact”. This was deliberately done with the awareness that the Paris Declaration had not been implemented in either of the municipalities. The category was responded to by everybody participating in the study and the emphasis was on:

- Sustainable growth
- Economic growth
- Poverty reduction
- Job opportunities
- Capacitation
- Achievement of MDGs
- Reduction of inequalities
- Transformation

The researcher found out that most respondents in this study felt that although there was some sustainability in the two municipalities, poverty was becoming worse by the day. Capacity development was seen as a major problem and little was being done in this area. Again most participants in this study confirmed that economic growth was not improving and that the inequality gap was widening further. Most participants were also convinced that the MDGs would not be met and that there was also no notable development in the two municipalities in many areas where there should have been. These wide-ranging views on various issues were expected because of the two municipalities’ capacities to deliver on their mandates as seen from documental evidence (Annual reports, IDP Reviews) and also because of the fact that the field work was done in the period preceding, during and after a heavily contested local municipality election of June 2011.

There is a very big likelihood that some of the responses were influenced to an extent by the prevailing situation in the two municipalities at that time. Job creation presented one of the major challenges, as most respondents felt that not enough job opportunities were
available. This sad fact on employment is confirmed in BCM where in a study in 2007 it was found that one in every three adults between the ages of 15-65 was unemployed (this figure includes 15-year-olds still in school as well as under 65s who go on early pension) (FHISER, 2007:11).

5.5.1 Institutional Challenges in the two Municipalities
This study scrutinised some institutional areas which were experiencing perennial challenges in both municipalities. These can be categorised as internal (with subgroups political, governance, strategic, socio-economic and financial) and external (with subgroups IGR, projects, and lack of progress in projects).

5.5.1.1 Political
Since 2003 Buffalo City Metro has had five mayors (Sindisile Maclean 2003-2006, Zintle Peter 2006-2008, Sakumuzi Caga 2008-2009, Zukisa Faku 2009-2011 and Zukiswa Ncitha 2011 to now) and several acting and Municipal Managers, while Nelson Mandela has had two mayors since 2006 (Nondumiso Mphanzi 2006-2008 and Zanoxolo Wayile 2008 up to now), and several Municipal Managers appointed during the period 2005-2011. The working relationships between the political actors (the Mayor, the Speaker and the Chief Whip) and the administrative arm (the Municipal Manager and his functionaries) have provided fertile ground for never-ending conflicts. These revolve mainly around accountability, roles and responsibilities which are not always clear and often very blurred. This, coupled with the so-called “political appointees or deployed cadres” with political mandates, lack of proper delegation, and absence of a functioning oversight body in the municipalities (SCOPA style) has resulted in never-ending political infighting, lack of institutional direction, and malaise culminating in lack of or poor service delivery (NMBM, 2011:7). Cakata (2011:56) in his studies in Mquma Municipality Cakata 2011 made similar observations in this area. Many commentators have coined this as “municipal governance distress”.

Provincial assessments according to a COGTA report exposed those causal reasons for distress in municipal governance pointing towards the following (COGTA, 2009:10):
• Tensions between the political and administrative interface;
• Poor ability of many councillors to deal with the demands of local government;
• Insufficient separation of powers between political parties and municipal councils;
• Lack of clear separation between the legislative and executive;
• Inadequate accountability measures and support systems and resources for local democracy;
• Poor compliance with the legislative and regulatory frameworks for municipalities.

The above is further confirmed by various observations from social and political commentators as follows:

Political Interference has even affected refuse collection in East London with Rate payers threatening a Political March.
Municipality cannot function; Eastern Cape resolves to fix Buffalo City Problems.
ANC admits infighting stalling Development.

In February 2010 the provincial government in the Eastern Cape was even anticipating invoking Section 154 of the Constitution in Buffalo City Metro, which empowers the province to “Provide administrative support to an affected Municipality”. This was as a result of, among others, the inability of this municipality to deliver on its mandate because of constant infighting among councillors and administrators. Twenty two city councillors were expelled from their mother party for supporting the appointment of a Municipal Manager who was not their party’s choice. The then leader of the opposition in the Provincial Legislature,

5.5.1.2 Governance
Over the period of the study both municipalities reflected themselves as enclaves of poor organisation and poor delivery although both of them have at one time or another
received accolades and awards such as Vuna or others for Service Excellence, these achievements are all neutralised by those things which these municipalities either do not do at all or did not do properly according to the perceptions of the communities on the ground. A glaring example is that of Buffalo City Metro receiving the Provincial Award for being one of the best performing municipalities in the province in 2011 in the very same year that all service delivery efforts were failing dismally, including the so-called “MAD Project” (“Make A Difference”). This apparent failure resulted in the then acting Municipal Manager being fired and several of her Managers being put under suspension or precautionary leave of absence for squandering million of rands on poor or non-existing projects.

The “MAD” Service Delivery Campaign was launched with all the fanfare, whistles and bells by the then Mayor in Mdantsane spearheaded by the Acting Municipal Manager who had just been seconded from the National Department (COGTA) to accelerate service delivery and turn things around in Buffalo City Metro Municipality. The projects concerned were R400 million over 5 years to upgrade roads in townships, R4 million to upgrade Mdantsane highway, R1 million for safety and R3 million for waste management. The results from these projects do not match the Mayor’s words at the project launch:

    Today marks the beginning of our commitment to pledge our efforts to put our people first regardless of obstacles. We want to bring back the confidence that our constituencies showed us by putting us where we are. (Buffalo City Mayor at the launch of MAD (BCM Newsletter 2010))

From the point view of governance and from various reports, BCM annual reports (BCM 2009:197), both metros were saddled with so many problems that the chances of their meeting their mandates were very slim. Human resources problems manifested themselves in several ways in both municipalities, especially in Buffalo City Metro. Staff morale was low as a result of skewed staff recruitment, and appointment and retention policies based on things other than qualifications, and lack of experience especially in the skilled and technical areas. Non-filling of key posts on the Metro’s structures over long
periods was also a challenge. This was the case in both municipalities where Municipal Managers up to 2010 were in acting positions for very prolonged periods according the municipal documentation examined. Because of the inability to advertise vacant posts during September 2010, the Buffalo City Metro opted to fill their 450 vacant posts on the Organogram by carrying out internal reorganisations without going through the proper procedures. Poor labour relations activities have result in several work stoppages followed by rolling mass action and industrial work disruptions (Toyi-Toyi).

Corruption allegations have been levelled at all levels of the metro, from traffic officers and tendering systems to delivery systems, because of the inability of the metros to implement existing anti-fraud and anti-corruption strategies. It was noted, for example, that the political instability in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro between 2009–2010, escalating in the first six months, prevented both Mayoral and Council meetings from taking place over the period (NMBM, 2011:9).

5.5.1.3 Strategic Planning

Although both municipalities, like any other municipality in South Africa, did have some very well authored and detailed IDPs, these failed at the implementation level for several reasons. A three-year budget cycle operating within five-year IDP goals obviates continuity because the vision and focus tend to change every time a new political head is ushered in. This was evident in the recent 2011 local government elections where everything was thrown into limbo because both the politicians and the administrators were in the process not only of finding their feet but also trying to find each other soon thereafter, and during this period very little delivery took place. But probably one of the major issues in this area was the lack of reliable meta-data and community inputs on which future developments could be based. This was clearly seen in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro where there was no reliable data or ward-based information for most of the peri-urban areas (NMBMM, 2010:11).
5.5.1.4 Socio-Economic Development

The Eastern Cape is the poorest province in South Africa with a Gross Geographic Product (GGP) of 13,511 compared to the South African average of 23,203. Unacceptable levels of poverty and unemployment are the order of the day in both municipalities. What is also striking is that these values not only cut through the colour lines, but they are also well embedded in our gender as well according to the Stats SA Census of 2001 and the Community Survey of 2007 (ECSECC, 2009:25).

5.5.1.5 Budgetary constraints

According to COGTA (2009:54) one of the major hurdles facing all municipalities in South Africa is financial management and fiscal discipline as a result of the following:

The growing economy has resulted in increased demand for economic Infrastructure:

- Ageing assets are increasingly requiring upgrading, rehabilitation or replacement;
- Urbanisation means the location and nature of poverty is changing.

This is confirmed by the observations in the financial activities of both municipalities. They were also guilty of the inability to spend on capital items in spite of the fact that the budget was available, as per the IDP. This was the case in NMBM during the 2009/10 financial year as well as in Buffalo City where they incurred wasteful and fruitless expenditure in various directorates during the World Cup and MAD projects in 2010. In the World Cup saga the tendering for the erection of viewing venues was marred by irregularities of all sorts, and in the MAD project, the then the Acting Municipal Manager was involved in dishing out unauthorised tenders in defiance of the Municipal Management Finance Act (Act No. 56 of 2003). Both cases ended up being investigated and the acting Municipal Manager being fired.

Municipal documents also highlighted a financial crisis within Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality around September 2010 which was dubbed probably the worst financial
crisis in the 10 years of the municipality’s existence. Reports highlighted the fact that funds were being diverted from infrastructure projects to foot salary bills. The opposition parties in the municipality described this disaster as a result of haphazard, unauthorized expenditure, unfunded mandates and the inability of the Municipality to collect own revenue. It was said at the time that various departments both nationally and provincially owned the Municipality over R221 million.

This catastrophic situation in the two municipalities seemed to be the rule rather than the exception as confirmed by COGTA (2009:54) in their State of the Provinces report. This report submitted that this was due to poor skills levels, poor monitoring and evaluation as well low levels of support from the provinces. This finding is confirmed by Kanyane in (Kondlo and Maserumule, 2010:88) where he says that:

manifestations of local government’s problems is provided by their financial vulnerability … Some municipalities have inadequate financial management capacity, the result being that budgeting, accounting, credit control and financial reporting systems are weak and have loopholes.

5.5.1.6 Projects
It is evident from various projects and project reports perused during this study that most of these were either too slow or they were not yielding the expected results. Two of the most glaring examples of this were the Urban Renewal Programmes in Mndatsane in Buffalo City Metro and Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro. It is clear from the Mid-Term Report of the Projects (EU, 2009), as well as the researcher’s own investigations in the course of this study, that the speed with which these projects were initiated by former President Thabo Mbeki seems to have dissipated as soon these projects were launched. The six encompassing outcomes and the Key Performance Areas had the potential if well implemented of changing the livelihoods of the people in these areas. Because of their nature, the Urban Renewal Programmes have formed a thematic study in this research to illustrate some of the pros and cons of Aid or ODA. The assertion that there are problems with the URPs is confirmed by the synopsis of the
Turnaround Programme Strategy for Nelson Mandela Bay Metro. This document suggested that “a diagnostic study must be developed and an intervention strategy implemented to accelerate visible development with regards to Projects” (NMBM, 2010:1430). The researcher’s findings are complemented by those of COGTA (2009:63) where it is asserted that municipalities need more technical assistance to counteract the effects of their inherent weak systems.

An application for MURP funding by Buffalo City Municipality in 2008 was turned down on the grounds of poor performance of the municipal projects in Mdantsane, as well the instability in the BCM due to the political and administration chaos. A certain councillor reported that “MURP was a complete failure”. One does not actually see the outcomes of this project in Mdantsane. Although some trees have been planted, and there have been some low key capacitation programmes and a local community radio, this has done very little to change the livelihoods of people in Mdantsane per expectations from the URPs as outlined by the former President Thabo Mbeki at their launch.

The following discussion in this paragraph further illustrates the inherent weaknesses in project implementation in the two municipalities with an example from Buffalo City as shown in Table 5.6. BCM had only spent 76% of its Municipal Infrastructure Grant budget for 2009/2010, and to make things even worse its 2010/2011 MIG Budget indicated only R30 million of the R190 million allocation had been spent by September 2010. According to the Director General of COGTA, municipalities are unable to spend because of “shortages of skills and capacity”. This is also precipitated by poor project planning knowledge and, lack of expertise as well as spending the funds on so-called “unauthorised purposes”.
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Table 5.6: Underspent BCM Projects 2010/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>KWT- Fire Station</th>
<th>Zwelitsha Waste Management</th>
<th>Mdantsane Roads</th>
<th>Scenery Park Community Hall</th>
<th>Clinics Upgrade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Budget</td>
<td>MIG 4,000,000</td>
<td>MIG 8,000,000</td>
<td>MIG 50,000,000</td>
<td>MIG 4,5000,000</td>
<td>MIG 692,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,074,961</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>5,925,039</td>
<td>6,639,319</td>
<td>4,497,312</td>
<td>690,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIG (Municipal Infrastructure Grant, Council and COGTA Reports)

Figure 5.6 illustrates just one example from about 33 projects in which further underspending is reflected, with BCM’s excuse being that “Most of these projects were still in Supply Chain or designing and planning.”

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the findings of this study emanating from the qualitative data thus complementing the statistical findings presented in Chapter 4 and confirming the presentation in the Research Methodology that the approach of this study would be that of a mixed methodology. The introduction in Chapters 4 and 5 provided the setting of the study by reflecting briefly on the methodology used in the study, followed by a presentation and an analysis of the quantitative results illustrated with various graphs and then presenting the qualitative results followed by the relevant interpretations. The triangulated results are then discussed in this conclusion in an attempt to explain the three areas from which the three main research questions were constructed, namely

(a) International Development Aid (ODA) which has been made available to the two Metropolitan Municipalities (Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay);
(b) the implementation of the five elements of the Paris Declaration in both Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipalities;
(c) these municipalities under study are better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration.

Whereas the quantitative data was entered into a statistical programme, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), in order to arrive at the required relationships and results, the qualitative data in this chapter was broken down into thematic areas to augment the quantitative findings. In spite of the fact that the Paris Declaration had not been implemented in the two municipalities, the researcher found it imperative to look at the key developmental issues in the two metros, especially with regard to service delivery. In the spirit of the Paris Declaration which says that there are other development programmes which operate in the development arena, some of which precede the Paris Declaration, the chapter concludes by reflecting some of the key challenges which these municipalities were facing and will continue to face over time as institutions at the coalface of delivery in the municipalities.

The results from this study infer that ODA projects existed in the municipalities in this study. As the development partners who participated in this study were all very aware of the presence of ODA projects in these municipalities as expected, they were not as well-known as they should by the actual beneficiaries on the ground. This was an indictment on the ODA programmes in their current state in that the very people who are supposed to be benefiting from these programmes are hardly aware that they exist in their midst. Whereas the responses from the three groupings around the subject of support were very varied and brought about the notion that the trajectory of ODA would for a long time still be determined by partisan interests and positions, the ODA is still supported politically and administratively by all three spheres of government even though it was not adequate. However, the communities felt that national support for ODA projects at the local level was either non-existent or absent. As such, one draws an inference that a lack of support
from the communities was expected and can be explained by the fact that people cannot support projects they know very little about.

All the respondents in this study confirmed with a resounding “NO” that the Paris Declaration or any of its elements had been consciously implemented in either of the municipalities in this study. The lack of knowledge and understanding about the Paris Declaration across the board was also reflected in the “cagey nature” of the participation and responses mainly by the development partners. All three respondent groups further agreed that neither the province nor the principals in the two municipalities had made any recognisable efforts to raise the awareness of the Paris Declaration as an intervention in ODA programmes in their respective municipalities. This was confirmed in the qualitative part of this study through the lack of substantial ODA information in the IDPs, other strategic documents and even in the annual reports. Most of these documents were devoid of key aspects on ODA save for mentioning it as a “desirable intervention in development” but completely failing to provide details around it. One has a feeling that the manner in which ODA was normally cascaded down to the provinces and municipalities could be one of the reasons why the Paris Declaration implementation at the local level has not occurred yet specifically in the municipalities in this study.

Well aware that the Paris Declaration had not been implemented into the ODA activities of the two municipalities, the researcher found it interesting to see if there were any semblance of its individual elements which might have been implemented unconsciously through other pre-existing or concurrent programmes in the development arena. Unfortunately both municipalities showed that neither of these were present in their ODA activities and as a result the possibility of gauging some anticipated development attributable to any of these elements in the PD was not possible.

The impact area was responded to by all the groupings which participated in this study. The overall participation in the quantitative investigation was very high, indicating the interest all parties had in this area. What is striking here are the very clear partisan views expressed in the various sub-questions. The communities indicated that ODA in its current
form had not contributed to sustainable growth, optimal delivery of services or even to the creation of jobs.

Emerging from the study, the ODA had little impact on poverty eradication and job creation. Whereas there had been some positive movements in the provision of basic services as indicated by their relative happiness, probably in quantity but certainly not in the quality and the way these services are provided, it is inferred that issues of poverty and unemployment among others brought about the appearance of community service protests in these two municipalities in particular and in the whole of South Africa in general.

It is also clear that the current neglect of the contributions of the NGOs in the ODA arena was critical. Whereas during the apartheid days, and also as recently as 1994, most of the ODA disbursed in South Africa was channelled through NGOs to prevent the apartheid regime from getting its hands on it, and also because this was the safest and most efficient way to assist the then impoverished communities, after 1994 and specifically during the period of this study, the NGOs no longer seemed to be playing a prominent role. Is it possible that their modus operandi has changed? Or is it failure by the powers that be to recognise these organisations as important players in this field? Or is it possible that they are busy working behind the curtains but the administrations in both municipalities are ignoring them? Either way there is a need to bring these organisations back into the ODA arena. Their contributions are very community-based, they normally have the community trust, they are most times very experienced and they have a “reach” no other sphere of government has now or is likely to have in the near future.

In the main, this chapter has underlined among other things the partisan nature of ODA activities and how this influences the perceptions of the key participants in this field. One of the most important findings from this study is that ODA remains a much contested area, very partisan in nature and still skewed towards the development partners. The partners are being towed along partly in the know, and the beneficiaries on the ground the
communities are almost in the dark about programmes designed to assist them and which should be operating in their midst.

The next chapter, Chapter 6, presents the conclusions in the light of the findings in this chapter and thereby provides compelling recommendations to bring a resolve to the ODA problems and challenges posed. Areas of future research in the light of this work are also proposed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study was to evaluate and understand international aid (ODA) in two metro municipalities in the Eastern Cape, Nelson Mandela Bay and Buffalo City, during the period 2005—2010 coinciding with the period covering the initial implementation of the Paris Declaration and the bi-phased evaluations leading to the two very important High Level Forums (HLFs): Accra HLF in 2008 in Ghana and Busan HLF in 2011 in South Korea. The results from this study would also be important in understanding its usefulness and complexity as well as the possible effect of introducing the Paris Declaration in its operations in the light of the violent service delivery protests which engulfed almost all municipalities in South Africa including those in the study beginning in 2004 and peaking around 2009.

6.2 Concluding Issues Emerging from the Chapters
Chapter 1 introduced the study by underlining the purpose of aid or ODA in a development milieu, that development can alleviate poverty, but this can only occur through a synergistic interplay of improving the capacities of the individual and the organisation (service provider) within a conducive enabling environment. Post 1994, several development partners (country and multilaterals) prioritised South Africa because of its previous immediate past as a very unequal society and its present poverty and inequality situations. Local government is perceived as a coalface actor and therefore aid or ODA should be targeted towards these areas. But in spite of this and in agreement with the international views on aid operations, no real visible changes could be seen in the way the coalface actors are operating in the presence of this aid, during the last 17 years generally, and specifically between 2005 and 2010.

The inherent and persistent problems with both the implementation and results of aid or ODA globally, led the developing partners and others to agree in a watershed meeting in Paris, France, in 2005 to come up with a roadmap or intervention to address these deficiencies, appropriately named the Paris Declaration. South Africa was a signatory to this instrument from its inception in 2005. The eruption of violence and vandalism out of the service delivery protests in almost all municipalities in South
Africa from 2004 to 2010 brought the issue of service delivery at various municipalities under the spotlight and by default the usefulness of ODA or aid at this level became the critical issue under study.

Based on the objectives of the study to evaluate the effectiveness of the ODA processes in relation to the individual, the organisation and the enabling environment and in view of the service delivery protests in the areas, the results from this study have achieved these objectives as reflected in Chapters 4 and 5 whereby the Paris Declaration parameters of ODA efficiency were tested against the delivery in the two metropolitan municipalities under study both at an individual and an organisational level. A mixed methodology enabled the researcher to get a deeper understanding of the community perceptions which are a very important indicator of how the services were being delivered.

The results clearly show that current aid available to these two municipalities was just not effective. Global efforts to improve on this had never been implemented (the Paris Declaration) and therefore the current persistent problems in service delivery were more or less pre-programmed. The challenges in these two municipalities as they are further reflected in Chapters 4 and 5 all pointed to weaknesses in both the individual and organisational capacities operating in a very politically and administratively unstable environment. This inference confirms the uniqueness of this study which lies in the heart of the local municipalities as opposed to most studies which concentrated on issues and happenings at the centre or the national sphere of government.

In **Chapter 2**, aid or ODA was defined according to the DAC-OECD standards and the never-ending and contentious debates from aid, aid management, outputs, outreach and impact were argued. These are debates about ODA or aid and related commitments such as the Paris Declaration and the MDGs, in particular those which discuss the pros and cons, and ultimately whether these interventions had worked or not.

The chapter further explored the trends in ODA financing as well as the reasons for giving aid which is a hot-bed for very involved debates within the development arena, but at the same time it brought in the notion of real aid vis-à-vis aid, a debate which
originated mainly from the NGOs or CSOs. By 1970 aid to Africa stood at US$300, this declining to about US$105 billion, but real aid from this accounted for only about 30% because some 70% of this went into debt relief.

The real debate why aid is given varies from the theoretical framework underpinning the study on the moralists, the (neo) colonialists, the bankers, to the activists. This is reflected in the views of various actors in the development field as discussed earlier on in chapter two of this work. These are: “donors donate because of internal guilt and political correctness, they reward favourable countries, Aid exacerbates dependence and is an employment agency for Developing Partners, Aid is a silent killer, liberalising trade is allowing the developing countries to maintain what keeps them poor … doing the same thing over and over again and finally that … real Aid reduces inequality and Poverty” Calderisi 2006:6; Collier 2007:4-10; Sachs 2006:5 Therien 2002:449.

The collated views of most authors and actors in the aid arena point to the fact that aid as it had been delivered and managed up to 2005, was ineffective and no longer sustainable worldwide. The chapter delved deeply in understanding the delivery protests between 2004 and 2010 characterised by violence and vandalism, the magnitude of which is being comparable to those before 1994. There was a feeling that though these protests were sparked off by real service delivery issues or lack thereof (water, sanitation, housing), the other view was that it was a call-out by the communities to be “heard and seen” because of extreme marginalisation and social exclusion. This was characterised by cases of “insiders” who had reaped the benefits of systems such as Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and Affirmative Action (AA) and “have nots” being the “outsiders”. It also brought about a need to look among others at intrinsic issues or intangibles as opposed to the tangibles during service delivery.

The cascading of the Paris Declaration from national level to the provinces and also metropolitan municipalities is mentioned and the step the province has taken to digest and absorb this process is outlined. The striking feature here is that the process, probably mirroring the results of the second phase evaluation of the Paris Declaration, has been very disappointing and very ineffective. The implementation has ranged
from absent to haphazard, there was no substantial local roll-out programme in place and the officers responsible for ODA both in the municipalities and in the province (OTP) were more occupied with protocol issues, with ODA as a pro-poor intervention enjoying the least of their attention.

Finally the chapter confirms the conundrum between service delivery and ODA as the key focus of this study. If ODA is supposed to improve the milieu of service delivery in areas in which it operates, why then did service delivery protests occur in the two metropolitan municipalities under study where we know that some sort of ODA or Aid had been in place for some time now especially through the twinning programmes and the Urban Renewal Programmes (URPs)? This is the hard question which the study probed in Chapters 4 and 5.

The research methodology of this study clarifying the choice, the path and the reasons why this route was chosen among others in answering the research questions is addressed in Chapter Three. Most authors insist that a research methodology is never pre-determined but allows the researcher to use methods and models which are most likely to yield the required answers. The challenge in this type of evaluation is that the Paris Declaration was not being implemented in a vacuum but was introduced in the presence of many other development initiatives, most of them predating the 2005 Paris Declaration itself. Further this evaluation cannot be linear, but is complex and very involved so as to take into consideration the various factors and linkages which come in play in realisation of such an investigation, but the key guiding factors in this type of evaluation remain relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

The research approach chosen for this study was that of a mixed methodology, because it is recommended in most participatory studies as the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative approaches yielded rich data which is useful in understanding the social phenomena of the study. The mixed method was also chosen because it has been recommended by the OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness in the previous and very current studies around the Paris Declaration and ODA. More importantly, because of its ability to deal with complex social issues which go beyond just getting the facts to include cost, benefits, attainment of objectives and also cases where changes and improvements are needed. The real
beneficiaries at the coalface of delivery were also targeted mostly because current studies to date, including the Paris Declaration independent country evaluations, were reduced to the central level as opposed to provincial and local government.

To ensure validity and reliability of the results, a triangulation process was employed in this study to collect data and test the results from different sources against each other, these being mainly documentary surveys, statistical records, field questionnaires and one-to-one interviews with different stakeholders. Based on these mixed procedural methods, data collection was a very extensive and onerous process involving visiting both metropolitan municipalities under study a number of times, which at the end made the fieldwork credible. Consequently, data analysis was employed with the assistance of statistical computer tools of the social sciences and the thematic approaches.

The findings of the study were split into two parts, presented in Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 dealt with quantitative data analysis, interpretation and discussion mainly drilled from the statistical data. This quantitative data collected using the various methods was then graphically analysed. Chapter 5 presented the findings of this study emanating from the qualitative data thus complementing the statistical findings as presented in Chapter 4. Both chapters raised the following critical issues:

- **Existence of ODA programmes in the two municipalities**

It becomes apparent from the findings presented in Chapters 4 and 5 that ODA programmes were present in these two metropolitan municipalities although they were not as well known as they should by the actual beneficiaries on the ground. This was an indictment of ODA programmes in their current state in that those very people who are supposed to be benefiting from these programmes are hardly aware that they exist in their midst. The development partners who participated in this study were all very aware of the presence of ODA projects in these municipalities, as expected. The qualitative part of this study confirmed that most of this ODA is through twinning with other countries, the exception being the two Urban Renewal Programmes, Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Municipality and Mndatsane in Buffalo City, which are financed through a European Union programme. It was also interesting to find that
both municipalities were also engaging in South–South partnerships though most of these programmes were still in the initial stages.

- **Political and administrative support for ODA**

The basic requisites for success of ODA programmes globally are a solid political sound politico-administrative environment. The responses from the three groupings around the subject of support were very varied indeed and brought about the notion that the trajectory of ODA would for a long time still be determined by partisan interests and positions. The development partners felt that ODA was well supported politically and administratively by all three spheres of government as well as by the communities. The partners and the communities indicated that this support though present, was inadequate. The communities singled out national support for ODA projects at the local sphere of government as non-existent or absent. It was interesting to find that the partners as co-implementers of these projects were of the view that community support was lacking in most instances. The lack of support from the communities was anticipated and can be explained by the fact that local people cannot be expected to support things they know very little of.

- **Implementation of the Paris Declaration in the two municipalities**

All the respondents in this study confirmed in the negative that the Paris Declaration or any of its elements had been consciously implemented in either of the two municipalities in this study. The lack of knowledge and understanding about the Paris Declaration across the board was also reflected in the “cagey nature” of the participation. The participation rate was in all cases very low, indicating either that most respondents did not know about it or they just avoided it for fear of self-incrimination.

All three respondent groups further agreed that neither the province nor the principals in the two municipalities had made any recognisable efforts to raise the awareness of the Paris Declaration as an intervention in ODA programmes in their respective municipalities. This was confirmed in the qualitative part of this study, through the
lack of substantial ODA information in the IDPs, other strategic documents and even in the annual reports. Most of these documents were devoid of key aspects on ODA save for mentioning it as a desirable intervention in development but completely failing to provide details around it. It was observed by the researcher that the manner in which ODA was normally cascaded down to the provinces and municipalities could be one of the reasons why the Paris Declaration implementation at the local sphere of government had not occurred especially in the two metropolitan municipalities under study.

- **Gauging “anticipated development”**

Being well aware that the Paris Declaration was not implemented in either of the two metropolitan municipalities under study, the researcher found it still interesting to see if there was any semblance of its individual elements which might have been implemented unconsciously through other pre-existing or concurrent programmes in the development arena. Regrettably, the two metropolitan municipalities under study showed that none of these Paris Declaration elements was present in their ODA activities and as a result the possibility of gauging some anticipated development was therefore not possible.

- **Five elements of the Paris Declaration**

In spite of the fact that the Paris Declaration had not been implemented in these two municipalities, the researcher found it imperative to look at the key developmental issues in the two metropolitan municipalities under study especially with regard to service delivery. There are critical issues emanating from the five elements of the Paris declaration, as detailed below.

(a) **Ownership**: The results show that ownership of ODA projects still resides in the hands of the Development Partners although their responses indicated the opposite. The responses from the partners as well as the situation on the ground confirm this, especially the anecdotal evidence from the two Urban Renewal Programmes.
(b) **Alignment:** The ODA in these two metropolitan municipalities did not seem to be aligned to either the critical needs of the municipalities under study or to the needs of the communities on the ground. The chaotic governance situation and general administrative malaise in these two institutions coupled with their inability to deliver on their mandates as stated in their IDPs is clear evidence that alignment is lacking in the ODA of these two municipalities.

(c) **Harmonisation:** Harmonisation was missing in most of the ODA projects. There was consensus again from the stakeholders, including the communities, that the ODA projects in their midst were not effective. It was evident that the development partners continued to work in silos and that projects were not designed to assist partner institutions to obviate their constraints nor to address the immediate needs in the communities, specifically those dealing with service delivery.

(d) **Managing for Results:** The pre-requisite for managing for results is the presence of a model to manage ODA resources. The municipal governance distress witnessed in the two metropolitan municipalities during the period in this study could not have allowed such a system to exist in the first place. This was underlined by lack of proper governance, inability to implement strategic plans, compromised budgetary processes and difficulties in managing own projects including service delivery.

(e) **Mutual accountability:** Whereas the development partners alleged that ODA was built into the IDPs of the two municipalities, documentary evidence shows that this was not the case. The superficial mentioning of ODA as a desirable activity in some institutional reports neglected to give the mandatory details about operations and budgets in this area. Further, joint reporting on projects between the partners and development partners was non-existent in most cases, and this is a cause for concern.

- **Community satisfaction with the level of service delivery**

A section in this study was dedicated to community satisfaction perceptions on service delivery as a barometer of the delivery abilities and performance of the two metropolitan municipalities in respect to basic services and general development. Notable here was that the results from the quantitative and qualitative areas showed
that there had been marked improvements in the delivery of basic services and less in the delivery of community-based services. Further, the communities felt that the quantity of services delivered were devoid of quality and respect. This is where the issue of tangibles versus intangibles came into play. Whereas there was an increase in the number of houses built and water and electricity provided, the quality and manner in which this had been done was a major problem because it compromised human dignity. Another outstanding exception was the unhappiness about job creation and a conviction that most MDGs, especially those to do with poverty, would never be achieved by 2015.

- **Key Performance Areas (KPAs) / Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**

The municipal KPAs are those indicators which COGTA uses to gauge the internal capacity of any municipality in relation to their IDPs in South Africa. Whereas the quantitative part of this study indicated an overall high participation of the respondent groups that they were indeed capacitated, the qualitative results indicated that this was far from the truth. According to available documentations, the two municipalities were riddled with all sorts of difficulties in meeting their mandates adequately over the period. The study found that there had been no notable improvement in this area, as reflected in the near chaotic situations, these two municipalities found themselves in over the period. This was attributable to challenges at the politico–administrative interface. It was also striking that two municipal functionaries insisted, through their responses that they were on the top of their game in these areas, yet this was far from the reality.

There was overwhelming evidence to show that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes in both municipalities were given a very low priority. This was illustrated by the mini-case study of the two urban renewal programmes. It was clearly shown that M&E was basically given lip service leading to the apparent inefficiencies in these projects. The inability of the two municipalities to implement projects properly as reflected in their annual reports is to a large extent because of the absence of a functional and effective M&E system.
• **Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs or CSOs)**

The failure to recognise the net effect and contributions of the NGOs in the ODA arena was also clearly illustrated in these findings. During the apartheid days and also as recently as 1994, most of the ODA disbursed in South Africa was channelled through NGOs to prevent the apartheid regime from getting its hands on it. This was also the safest and most efficient way to assist the impoverished communities because most NGOs were then operating within these very communities. However, after 1994 and specifically during the period of this study the NGO’s role was seen to be diminishing. Is it possible that their modus operandi has changed? Or is it failure by the powers that be to recognise that NGOs or CSOs as important players in this field? Or is it possible that they are busy working behind the scenes but the administration in both municipalities are just ignoring them? Either way there is a need to bring these organisations back into the ODA space, because their contributions are very community-based, they are experienced and they have earned the trust of the community.

• **Gender sensitivities**

The study shows that gender did not seem to play a big role in the ODA activities in the two metropolitan municipalities under study. There was no evidence of disaggregated data in the reports to highlight this issue either. Although gender mainstreaming is a buzz word and a key desirable indicator of equity in South Africa, this was not neglected. There is also a possibility that gender focus being politically driven, might be common knowledge within the political and administrative domain but certainly not in the wider communities.

6.3 **Possible Recommendations**

Based on the critical issues raised mostly in the greater part of Chapters 4 and 5, the following recommendations are made:

a) *A more efficient and effective process must be devised to cascade ODA or other ODA improvement initiatives from national to the other two spheres of...*
government where it is mostly needed. If the Paris Declaration or similar development programmes are supposed to improve service delivery and contribute to alleviation of poverty by improving the way aid or ODA is implemented and managed, then the International Development Cooperation, which is responsible for coordination and management of ODA in South Africa, must devise a new method of cascading the programme down to the coalface of service delivery, mainly the provinces and local municipalities. The IDC must insist on municipalities participating in any ODA programme ensuring that this is contained in their strategic and operational plans. Specific capacitated manpower must be identified to run these programmes and preferably not in an “add on “fashion. This needs an intensive roll-out of the programme which must include regular inservice training and contacts between the municipalities and the IDC. This must be a comprehensive drive from planning to implementation. One of the initial weaknesses in the initial roll out of the Paris Declaration in South Africa was the absence of local political buy-in in this intervention. This study strongly supports the view that political willingness and support is a key factor in the success of this intervention.

b) Community participation and buy-in by the local people is a must if ODA is to be felt where it is needed most to address poverty and related inequalities. This should be part of the agreement which is legally binding. This study clearly found that most current ODA interventions and programmes in the two metropolitan municipalities came in top-down fashion without the involvement of the actual beneficiaries on the ground. Active citizenship, defined as “involvement of individuals in public life and affairs”, has to be built into all ODA activities, especially at the local sphere of government. Some political commentators even go so far as saying that in a democracy, government business is like a company where the communities are the main shareholders whilst the bureaucrats are the trustees.

This conventional thinking emphasises the issue of participation, having a say in the choice of services (which, how, where) and the direction of the development trajectory. This choice could easily put the recent service delivery protests to rest because in this case the communities would be taking ownership of these
services through direct responsibility and accountability as envisaged in the new National Growth Path (NGP) driven by Minister Manuel in the Office of the President.

c) **South Africa must decide on what it wants to be in the global ODA arena, either a Development Partner or Partner.** From this study, South Africa has not yet decided on what it wants to be in the ODA arena. Continuing to sit on the fence by not clearly defining its position confuses issues and weakens the development processes in ODA. In the process it must refrain from its current ambivalent position on ODA which sends a wrong message to those development partners who would like to assist but are confused by the muddled signals originating from the country. South Africa should take a conscious decision to implement ODA not because of financial gains in the first instance but because of its ability to leverage innovative changes where it is implemented. This is an issue which is clearly and well embedded in South Africa’s own ODA policy. South Africa as a country must decide whether it wants to continue being an ODA recipient or ODA graduate. The importance of aid in South Africa cannot be measured in monetary terms but rather in social transformational terms. It is for this reason that South Africa should resist the temptation of becoming a middle man between the north and other aid recipients in the south. It cannot be in South Africa’s interest to be concentrating on putting out fires elsewhere in Africa when our own backyard is burning.

d) **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) must be built into all ODA programmes in South Africa as an early warning system.** This study has shown that a number of well-intended projects in the two municipalities failed because of lack of monitoring and evaluation. The reasons why newly built houses were crumbling soon after completion, water installations were leaking all the time or electrical installations were badly done is mostly because there were no mechanisms to check on these project activities ex ante, per and ex post. This study has shown that flagship projects such as the Urban Renewal Programmes in the two metropolitan municipalities under study were failing simply because there was no M&E in their operations.
e) Strengthening of the Urban Renewal Programmes as a multifaceted vehicle to drive development in the two municipalities because these are real ODA programmes through their funding from the EU The initial purpose of these programmes was to combat urban poverty and to integrate service delivery activities from the three spheres of government to ensure a sustained fight against underdevelopment This study clearly demonstrates that this goal is far from being achieved in both municipalities. The six mandatory results enshrined in these programmes are ideal areas in which the elements of the Paris Declaration could be implemented to assist in alleviating the perennial problems these programmes are currently experiencing at all levels.

f) Implement the key elements of the Paris Declaration in those areas (programmes and projects) in the municipalities in which they are likely to be most beneficial. The success of the Paris Declaration as an intervention to improve ODA delivery lies in its being integrated within the strategic and operational plans of the municipalities. The most ideal entry point is at the crafting of the IDP’s. Once they appear in the IDP, then they would be budgeted for, other resources would be made available, they would be cascaded into the relevant KPI’s, they would be reported on and this will ensure that they are part and parcel of the service delivery improvement plans.

g) The Process of service delivery should ensure that “intangibles” are not sacrificed on the altar of “tangibles” During delivery of services especially in most municipalities, emphasis is put on quantity or numbers at the expense of quality or how a particular service is provided. Again this study has proven that this is the case especially in the provision of low cost housing and the accompanying services like electricity and water. Most these houses collapse or crumble soon after they have been occupied due to shoddy workmanship. The big prize should be to ensure that quantity runs side by side with quality and dignity in all services which are delivered to the citizens.
h) **Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs or CSOs) should be encouraged to play a more meaningful role in ODA activities in the municipalities.** NGOs were pre 1994 the main role players in ODA in South Africa, post 1994 they could still be playing a major role still albeit quietly because they are currently sidelined from the main ODA activities in most municipalities. They are practically operating in their own sphere, at their own will and speed which should not be the case. Most of these organisations are very intimate with and within the communities and as such they are very reliable and trusted allies of the citizenry. Their presence in the municipal ODAs would indeed enhance these operations and their experiences would assist the municipalities especially at the operational levels. Further their presence would assist the country to correctly capture the ODA inflows in the country, which is not currently the case.

i) **ODA activities in the municipalities must bring its contribution to gender development to the fore by desegregating the reporting data.** The current trend of gender mainstreaming is also a priority in South Africa like elsewhere in the world. The plight of women in South Africa pre 1994 and also post 1994 is very well known. The current cosmetic changes especially in the political arena, where efforts of a 50:50 women /men representativity ratio is being attempted in the National Parliament a well as in the Provincial Legislatures is little solace to the majority of women at the periphery of our society especially in the rural areas. By desegregating ODA data it would then be possible to gauge female participation in this field and if necessary make the necessary amends timeously.

### 6.4 Areas for Future research

The results from this study indicate some specific themes whose further and deeper interrogation would not only contribute to the body of knowledge on ODA in South Africa but would also assist in the way improvement initiatives are infused in the ODA projects, especially at the coalface of service delivery. Firstly, it would be very important to investigate the role of NGOs or CSOs specifically during the same period as that of the Paris Declaration 2005–2010. This would assist in understanding their position towards the Paris Declaration itself and their presence or lack thereof during the community service delivery protests discussed in this study.
Secondly, another interesting area of further study could be the relationship between twinning programmes as they are currently implemented in the various municipalities and the way the IDC at National Treasury understands ODA and the consequences thereof.

Lastly it would be interesting to investigate the role of women in the current ODA programmes in South Africa. This study has shown that gender was brought into the Paris Declaration as an important factor in development post Accra HLF. The contribution of women in sustaining livelihoods and in development, especially in marginalised societies in Africa, is very well known. Here one thinks about the so-called “Market women” in West and East Africa or our own “Spaza-shops women” in the rural areas, locations and informal settlements, here in South Africa. So gender lenses would assist in gauging what contribution is coming from women and what assistance should specifically be targeted towards mainstreaming this ODA to be impactful in resolving societal problems of abject poverty related inequalities.
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Annexure A: Communications in respect of permissions to carry out study
The SG
Department of Local Government and Traditional affairs
Tyamzashe Building
Phalo Avenue
Civic Square
Bhisho
Eastern Cape
5605

South Africa (FAX No. 040 636 4350)

3/29/2011

Dear Sir

Ref: Permission to have access to your documents and relevant staff members and political office bearers in your organization and in Mandela Metro and Buffalo City Municipality for purposes of my study: PhD in Development studies with UFT.

Reference is made to the above. I have now reached a stage where I need to embark on the field part of my studies. This will involve both engaging with some relevant officials, politicians and communities in your area of jurisdiction as well as having access to some public documentation in your organization.

Purpose of this letter is to request your office to facilitate this process on my behalf and assist me to get access to both the relevant persons and documentation in your organization and in the relevant Metro and Municipality.

During this process I do undertake to adhere to International research Protocols around this type of study in particular reference to the involved documentation and persons. I also undertake not to divulge any Departmental or Municipal information to any third party without your express permission and the results of this study will only be used for purposes of fulfilling the requirements of this academic award. But I am also confident that the results of this study would contribute towards the turnaround Strategy in some municipalities especially towards the future use of ODA in your organisation and in the municipalities in general.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Ivan Lwanga-Iga
No.2 Lance Street East London
M/S Hester Botha  
Assistant Manager  
International Relations  
Nelson Mandela Metro  
Port Elizabeth  

9/20/2010  

Ref: Permission to have access to your documents and relevant staff members and political office bearers in your organization for purposes of my study: PhD in Development studies with UFF.  

Dear M/S Botha  

Reference is made to my previous previous E-mails and to the various telephone calls to your office in the above. I have now reached a stage where I need to embark on the field part of my studies. This will involve both engaging with some relevant officials, politicians and communities in your area of jurisdiction as well as having access to some public documentation in your organization. Purpose of this letter is to request your office to facilitate this process on my behalf and assist me to get access to both the relevant persons and documentation in your organization.  

During this process I do undertake to adhere to International research Protocols around this type of study in particular reference to the involved documentation and persons.  

I also undertake not to divulge any Municipal Information to any third party without your express permission and the results of this study will only be used for purposes of fulfilling the requirements of this academic award.  

Yours sincerely  

Dr Ivan Lwanga-Iga  
No.2 Lance Street East London
M/S Ondela Mahlangu
General Manager
Communication & Development Co-operation
Buffalo City Municipality
P. Box 134 East London 5200

9/20/2010

Ref: Permission to have access to your documents and relevant staff members and political office bearers in your organization for purposes of my study: PhD in Development studies with UFI.

Dear M/S Mahlangu,

Reference is made to both my previous visits and to the various calls to your office in the above. I have now reached a stage where I need to embark on the field part of my studies. This will involve both engaging with some relevant officials, politicians and communities in your area of jurisdiction as well as having access to some public documentation in your organization. Purpose of this letter is to request your office to facilitate this process on my behalf and assist me to get access to both the relevant persons and documentation in your organization.

During this process I do undertake to adhere to International research Protocols around this type of study in particular reference to the involved documentation and persons.

I also undertake not to divulge any Municipal Information to any third party without your express permission and the results of this study will only be used for purposes of fulfilling the requirements of this academic award.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Ivan Lwanga-Iga
No.2 Lance Street East London
Dear Mr. Lwanga-Iga

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HAVE ACCESS TO YOUR DOCUMENTS AND RELEVANT STAFF MEMBERS AND POLITICAL OFFICE BEARERS:


This office is in receipt your letter dated 29 March 2011 which seeks permission to have access to documents and relevant staff members and political office bearers of Nelson Mandela for the purposes of studies; PhD in Development studies.

In relation to your letter, this office has no objection in granting you permission to access the municipalities quoted in your said letter, however, kindly be advised that municipalities are a third sphere of government thereby making their own decisions as they are independent. The matter has therefore been referred to Buffalo City and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan respectively and that a further response will be addressed to you by these municipalities.

In the above circumstance given above, this office appreciates your initiative of your studies which will be of great assistance to our municipalities.
The Department appreciates this initiative and believe your research will be of great assistance to these municipality.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HAVE ACCESS TO YOUR DOCUMENTS AND RELEVANT STAFF MEMBERS AND POLITICAL OFFICE BEARERS: Your letter dated 29 March 2011 bears reference.

Yours in service delivery

S. KHANYILE
SUPERINTENDENT GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS
DATE: 10.05.11
Dr I Lwanga-Iga
No. 2 Lance street
Baysville
East London

DATE: 15 11 2011

THE ACTING CITY MANAGER
BUFFALO CITY METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY
PO BOX 134
EAST LONDON
5200

Dear Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH STUDY AT BCMM

I am a student at the University of Fort Hare, School of Public Administration, completing a PhD in Public Administration. I am sure you are aware that any post graduate study involves completion of a Dissertation. It is for this reason that I request your personal and professional permission to partake in my research in directorates and departments within BCMM.

The title of my research Dissertation is titled EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL AID (ODA) IN NELSON MANDELA BAY AND BUFFALO CITY METROS IN EASTERN CAPE, SOUTH AFRICA, and is being undertaken under the supervision of Professor Modiwobara Herbert Kanyane.

The objectives and aims of this research are to evaluate this aid within the parameters of the Paris Declaration of 2005 and also to establish whether this process has assisted the Metro in SERVICE DELIVERY. The research study shall make use of interviews/completion of questionnaires with key selected potential participants or respondents, through a mixed methodology process. The potential participants or respondents would thus include mainly officials working with Overseas Development Assistance (ODA), as well as some councillors, and the community at large in the prescribed areas.
The study will be beneficial to BCMM because it has several AID/ODA programmes which have been running for a while now. It will also give the Metro a chance to understand where it currently stands in relation to the effectiveness of its AID/ODA programmes.

The ethical research principles will be strictly adhered to throughout the research process so as to maintain a high standard of work and a high quality of the research study. The information obtained will be used only for purposes of this study, and will ensure anonymity and confidentiality of potential research participants or respondents. A copy of the full research report, once approved by the University will be handed to BCMM.

I thus request granting of permission to collect the necessary data/information from relevant officials and Councillors at BCMM for the purposes of completion of my Dissertation.

Your kind assistance in granting me permission will be highly appreciated and thank you for taking the time in allowing your staff to be part of this research study as I am sure it will not only be of benefit to me but to them as well.

Yours faithfully,

(Dr L. Lwanga-Iga)

ACTING CITY MANAGER

Approved | Not Approved
BUFFALO CITY METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY

MEMORANDUM

From: MANAGER: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, AND POLICY

To: Dr Ivan Lwanga-Iga

Date: 29 November 2011

Our ref: Please ask for

DR T NORUSHE
(043) 705 9706

Your ref:

RE: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN BCMM:
DR IVAN LWANGA-IGA

It is hereby acknowledged that Dr Ivan Lwanga-Iga, a candidate at University of Fort Hare doing a PhD Degree in Development Studies has met the prerequisites for conducting research at Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality (BCMM) for fulfillment of his degree. He has provided us with all the necessary documentation as per the BCMM Policy on External Students conducting research at the institution.

With reference to the letter to the Acting City Manager received on 24 November 2011, permission was requested to conduct research at BCMM for the Research Project, focusing on Evaluation of International Aid in Nelson Mandela Bay and Buffalo City local municipalities in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. This request was acknowledged by the Office of the Acting City Manager and forwarded to the Knowledge Management and Research Unit for further assistance. Dr Lwanga-Iga was asked to provide the Unit with the necessary documentation, which he subsequently did.

The relevant Officials to assist in the research were identified and duly informed about the research, and the fact that Dr Lwanga-Iga has met the prerequisites. Their contact details have also been provided to Dr Lwanga-Iga and he was informed to contact them directly for assistance.

Wishing you good luck in your studies.

DR T F NORUSHE
MANAGER: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, RESEARCH AND POLICY
Ivan Lwangaiga - My Questionnaire ; Ivan Lwanga-Iga

From: Ivan Lwangaiga
To: john.toffolo.glasgow.gov.uk; kees.bodegom@rijland.net; laila.nordfors@gavle.se; manderson@c4lh.org
Subject: My Questionnaire ; Ivan Lwanga-Iga
CC: darbyg@buffalocity.gov.za; ondelam@buffalocity.gov.za

Dear Colleagues,

Good afternoon
I am doing some research work on ODA in Buffalo Metro in Eastern Cape South Africa. After discussions with Darby from Buffalo Metro, she did recommend that you could assist me in getting the views of the Donor organizations as well as your own around this subject because of your experience in this field.

I am attaching my questionnaire in two parts with a request that you fill them in for me and return them as soon as it is convenient.
Should you have anybody else who could add value to my work in your organization, I would be very happy if you could forward her or him a copy of the same?

Please answer all questions where the DEVELOPMENT PARTNER (DONOR) IS MENTIONED

Regards

Ivan Lwanga-Iga
Ivan Lwangaiga - RE: Just checking on the status of my questionnaires

From: Darby Gounden <DarbyG@buffalocity.gov.za>
To: Ivan.Lwangaiga <Ivan.Lwangaiga@agr.ecprov.gov.za>
Date: 2011/08/04 05:46 PM
Subject: RE: Just checking on the status of my questionnaires
CC: "laila.nordfors@gavle.se" <laila.nordfors@gavle.se>, "Bodegom, Kees" <Kees.Bodegom@rijnland.net>, "Anderson, Mark" <MAnderson@c4ih.org>, SaraAlbiani <sara.albiani@gmail.com>, "Toffolo, John" <John.Toffolo@glasgow.gov.uk>

Dear Mr Lwangaiga

Thank you for your email. I got back to the office this week and it has been extremely busy. That never stops given we deal with so many events and activities in the city, so unfortunately we are also under a lot of pressure at work.

Due to being out of office the questionnaires could not dispatched. I am afraid I must give you the names of persons who we deal with so that you can send the questionnaires directly to them so that you can meet your deadline.

I have copied our colleagues into the email.

Gavle, Sweden – Laila Nordfors - laila.nordfors@gavle.se
Leiden, Netherlands – Kees Bodegom – Kees.Bodegom@rijnland.net
Milwaukee, USA – Mark Anderson – Manderson@c4ih.org
Glasgow, Scotland – John Toffolo John.Toffolo@glasgow.gov.uk
Region of Tuscany, Italy – Sara Albiani – sara.albiani@gmail.com

I hope the above assists you. I will try to complete my questionnaire shortly and forward to you as well.

Kind regards

Darby Gounden (Ms)
Manager Development Cooperation & International Relations
Annexure B: Research Instrument

**BIOGRAPHICAL DATA**

**QUESTIONNAIRE NUMBER**

Place a tick (✓) in the appropriate box in response to all the questions:

**A LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPALITY / METRO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1. Buffalo City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2. Nelson Mandela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B STATUS:**

Where do you belong?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner =Beneficiary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1. Municipality/ Metro employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2. Politician in the Municipality/Metro (Ward Councillor, Councillor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3. Local Government in the Province (employee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.4. Provincial Department (Treasury or Office of the Premier)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.5. Community member (recipient on the ground)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.6. NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.7. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Development Partner =Donor |   |
| B.2. Country (Government) |   |
| B.2.2. Development Institution/ Organisation |   |

**C POPULATION GROUP** (according to SA definition):

Which population group do you belong to?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coloured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indian/Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D GENDER:**

Which gender do you belong to?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E AGE CATEGORY:**

Which age category do you belong to?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 20-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 31-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 51-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL AID IN NELSON MANDELA BAY AND BUFFALO CITY METROS IN THE EASTERN CAPE, SOUTH AFRICA"

Overview

South Africa has been a favourite of Donor nations and Multinationals, post 1994. Most of this aid in South Africa has been logically targeted through the “Perceived” coal face actors namely the municipalities. According to Chapter 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, local government is the third sphere of government which is responsible for translating National and provincial plans into tangibles, in short ‘deliver” to the communities. This is where the delivery of services to the community should be carried out.

The objective of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the current development Aid processes (ODA) in the two Metros under study in the Eastern Cape namely Buffalo City with main centre in East London and Nelson Mandela Metro with its centre in Port Elizabeth; in the light of the 2005 Paris Declaration to which South Africa is a signatory

Respondents

The respondents in this survey are the following: Beneficiary Metros and officials therein, some members in the Provincial government especially the Office of the Premier, the Department of Local government and Traditional Affairs (Partners), Donors in these Metros (Developing Partners) as well as the Communities and NGOS who are the local beneficiaries on the coalface.

Guidelines

Please note that the information gathered during this research will be handled in a responsible manner within the confines of research ethics.

Process

The researcher and/or field assistants will administer the questionnaire based on the direct engagement with respondents.

Communication

The researcher and/or field assistants will engage the respondents in English only.
Disclaimer
This questionnaire has been prepared for a research project undertaken to fulfil the requirements of a PhD Degree in Public Administration at the University of Fort Hare. Your participation will be greatly appreciated.

© Ivan Lwanga-Iga, University of Fort Hare, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE SET UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Section: Tabular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Section: Descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Questions in this section can be answered using the table format as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question ID</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Questions for Optional model in the PD on Gender Equality & Empowerment

KEY: For purposes of this Questionnaire:

1) **PD** = The Paris Declaration
2) **ODA** (Overseas Development assistance) = **AID** (Technical, Financial or Trade)
3) **Partner** = Beneficiary (Municipality, Metro, Department or Country)
4) **Development Partner** = Donor (Overseas Country or Organisation)
5) **Community** = Communities on the coalface **including NGOs** (actual recipients on the ground)
6) **Mun. (Municipality)** = Refers to Metro and Municipality
RESEARCH QUESTION ONE:
(What sort of international development AID (ODA) has been made available to these two Municipalities)

Q1 GENERAL

To be answered by: Partners (MUN), Development Partners (DONORS) and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>We have Development Aid programmes in my Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>There is sufficient political and admin support for Aid Projects in the Municipality by: National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>Principals in the municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6</td>
<td>The community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7</td>
<td>There is coordinated support in the Municipality for aid projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8</td>
<td>Peer pressure is a big driver in the initiation of aid Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9</td>
<td>There is overall behavioural change in Aid activities since some or all of the Paris Declaration were implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESEARCH QUESTION TWO

*(How have the 5 elements of the Paris Declaration (PD) been implemented in these Municipalities)*

#### Q2.1 GENERAL

**To be answered by Partners, Development Partners and Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 I have heard about the Paris Declaration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 I know and understand the Paris Declaration, its <strong>5 principals</strong> as well as its <strong>12 Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 National, the Province, my principals in the Municipality have taken workshopped us trough the purpose of the Paris Declaration and its benefits to me and the Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 The Paris Declaration is well established in this Municipality as a development aid tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5 The Paris Declaration has changed the way Development / Aid programmes function in the municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.2 OWNERSHIP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>The Partner has an ODA/AID policy in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>The Partner formulates the NEEDS assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>The Municipality takes leadership &amp; stewardship during the planning and implementation of Aid projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>The partner identifies the development needs and sets the priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>ODA funding is in agreement with the development needs of the partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>The partner and its staff are capacitated to drive these ODA projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7</td>
<td>The Development Partners (Donors) have special have mitigation programmes in cases where there is a capacity deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8</td>
<td>The Development Partners listen to us, and take cognisance of our needs during this planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.9</td>
<td>The Developing Partner’s needs are taken cognisance of as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.10</td>
<td>Internal Mechanisms to assess Development funding Proposals are available in the Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.11</td>
<td>***Gender equality and empowerment is taken care of in the Municipal ODA programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.3 ALIGNMENT:

**To be answered by: Partners (MUN) & Developing Partners (DONORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>There are systems in place to manage Development assistance AID in the Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>These systems are functional and effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>Development Partners (donors) are using these Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>Procurement/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>Financials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6</td>
<td>There are conditionalities in Development AID funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7</td>
<td>They are not wide spread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8</td>
<td>The municipality has influence on these conditionalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.9</td>
<td>The Municipality has a say in which area Aid should flow to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.10</td>
<td>The M&amp; E systems in the municipality are strong and effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.4 HARMONISATION:

**To be answered by: Partners (MUN) & Developing Partners (DONORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Common arrangements for joint planning of funding development projects in the Municipality are in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Different Development Partners work together in this Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>Our Development partners have been requested to harmonise their activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4</td>
<td>These Projects are very effective as a result of working together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.5</td>
<td>There are several constraints hindering harmonisation of development projects in Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.5 MANAGING FOR RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1</td>
<td>The Partner’s (Municipality) Development Model is used to allocate resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2</td>
<td>There is a strong linkage between resource allocation and expected development results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>The Municipality has a system to manage for Results in regards to Planning, Finances and reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4</td>
<td>The staff is capacitated to do this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>There are steps are in place to capacitate &amp; retrain staff in this area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.6</td>
<td>There is a joint donor programme to harmonise monitoring and reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.7</td>
<td>There are a number of constraints experienced in focussing on Managing for results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.8</td>
<td>The Municipality has got a system for the results of AID to flow into the Policy planning, implementation and improvement system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.9</td>
<td>Development partners are participating in the results orientated reporting freely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.10</td>
<td>***Sex disaggregated DATA is analysed and used for decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.6 MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1</td>
<td>There is mutual accountability (Donors &amp; Municipalities) in the use of development Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2</td>
<td>Our development Partners are part of this Mutual accountability through.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3</td>
<td>Aid implementation/Budgets and planning are built into the municipal IDP programme and is freely available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.4</td>
<td>Aid /projects documentation are optimal in structure, content and presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.5</td>
<td>***Gender representatives are part of the periodic mutual reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.7 TARGETS

**To be answered by: Partners (MUN) and Developing Partners (DONORS):**

Indicate the extent (NOW) of the following in your Municipality or Metro as a % with a cross(X):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0-30%</th>
<th>31-50%</th>
<th>51-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1</td>
<td>Aid flows are recorded in the municipal budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2</td>
<td>Technical assistance is aligned and coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3</td>
<td>Donors use Municipal Financial systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>Donors use Municipal procurement Donors avoid parallel project implementing units (PIU’s)....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.5</td>
<td>Aid is more predictable.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.6</td>
<td>Donors coordinate Aid delivery mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.7</td>
<td>Donors coordinate their missions (visits).....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.8</td>
<td>Donors coordinate their country studies...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
<td>Communities / Civil society are made aware of the presence of the Development Project in their Municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
<td>Communities Civil society participate in the planning and implementation of development Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>The Municipalities solicit our views before these projects are initiated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
<td>There has been a remarkable change in the way projects are run since 2005 up to now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.5</td>
<td>There is a marked improvement in the delivery of both the Universal and Indigent basic services since 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.6</td>
<td>There is an improvement in the Provision of the following: Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.7</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.8</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.9</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.10</td>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.11</td>
<td>***Job/Business opportunities (1st &amp; 2nd Economies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.12</td>
<td>Certain MDGs will be achieved by 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESEARCH QUESTION THREE

*(Are these Municipalities under Study better capacitated to deliver on their mandates as a result of the implementation of all or some of the elements of the Paris Declaration?)*

#### 3.1 OUTCOME 1:

**To be answered by: Partners (MUN) and Developing Partners (DONORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Municipality is better capacitated to do the following in regards to development;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1 Making development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Implementing development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3 Managing aid finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4 Focussing on Development results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2 OUTCOME 2:

**To be answered by Partners (MUN), Developing Partners (DONOR) and Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The following has improved as a result of partial or full implementation the Paris Declaration elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 Better delivery of services to the community (Quality &amp; Quantity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 Equitable Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3 Improved institutional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4 Coordination of Investment programmes PPP &amp; LED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 KPA’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>There is a marked improvement on delivery on the 5 KEY MUNICIPAL KPA’S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>KPA 1: Institutional organisation and framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>KPA 2: Service Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4</td>
<td>KPA 3; Local economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.5</td>
<td>KPA 4: Financial management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.6</td>
<td>KPA 5 Good Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>There is a marked improvement in the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Audit Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>IDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.4</td>
<td>LED Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5</td>
<td>Budget management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.6</td>
<td>Revenue Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 IMPACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To be answered by: Partners (MUN), Development Partners (DONORS) and Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current ODA projects have assisted the Municipality in the following areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1 Sustainable growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2 Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3 Optimal Delivery on the Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.4 Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.5 Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.6 Sanitation/Sewerage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.7 Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.8 Refuse Removals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.9 Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.10 Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of some or all of the 5 Principles in the Paris Declaration have contributed to the following in this Municipality/Metro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.11 Poverty reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.12 Capacity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.13 Increased Economic Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.14 Reduction in inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.15 Meeting some of the MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.16 Notable Development in the municipal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting some of the MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable Development in the municipal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.22 Can you briefly comment on challenges in AID (ODA) implementation in the Eastern Cape? Can you propose how these challenges can be resolved

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION!!!
### Annexure C: List of Key Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albiani Sara</td>
<td>NETSAFRICA Tuscany Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Mark</td>
<td>Milwaukee USA (Development Partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodegom, Kees</td>
<td>Liden Netherlands (Development Partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosco Clara</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator: Support Programme to Decentralisation and Local Development Policies in South Africa-NETSAFRICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botha Hester</td>
<td>Manager IR. Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower Andre</td>
<td>Financial manager. Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality (MURP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayimani Vuyani</td>
<td>COO. Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounden Derby</td>
<td>Manager IR. Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendriks Debbie</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality Hellenville Urban Renewal Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakuja Xolisa</td>
<td>General Manager. Office of the Premier .EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambale Kavese</td>
<td>Economist. ECSSEC Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makalima Oyama</td>
<td>Manager IR Office of the Premier Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maphuka, S.</td>
<td>Councillor Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marele Swonabo</td>
<td>Manager. Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality (LED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mateke. M J.</td>
<td>Councillor Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdikane Zolisa</td>
<td>Senior Manager. Department of Housing, Local Government and Traditional affairs DLGTA. Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengezeleli, Baca</td>
<td>Senior Manager. Department of Housing, Local Government and Traditional affairs DLGTA. Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkabile Zingisa</td>
<td>General Manger. Department of Housing, Local Government and Traditional affairs DLGTA. Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morolong M.C.</td>
<td>Councillor Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngcaba M. T</td>
<td>Councillor Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkume Nwabisa</td>
<td>IR Practitioner Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordfors Laila</td>
<td>Gavle Sweden (Development Partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norushe Thembisa</td>
<td>Manager Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondela Mahlangu</td>
<td>Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindiswa Mququ</td>
<td>Senior Manager. IR. Office of the Premier Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotondoshe Hlanganisile</td>
<td>Manager. IR. Office of the Premier OTP Eastern Cape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toffolo, John</td>
<td>Glasgow Scotland Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toli, Robin</td>
<td>General Manager. International Development Cooperation (IDC) National Treasury South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshaka Vulindela</td>
<td>Manager Provincial Treasury Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uithaler Eldrid</td>
<td>Manager MURP Projects. Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexure D: Maps

Map of South Africa with Provinces and neighbouring countries

Source: www.afrilux.co.za

THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA WITH ITS PROVINCES

Source: ECSECC, 2011
Map of South Africa with current location of the Eastern Cape Province and Metros

Source: Demarcation Board website at www.demarcation.org.za under downloads- statistics- National A0 map

1. Eastern Cape
2. Northern Cape
3. Western Cape
4. Free state
5. North West
6. Gauteng
7. Mpumalanga
8. Limpopo
9. KwaZulu-Natal
Eastern Cape Today

Source: Demarcation Board website at www.demarcation.org.za under downloads- statistics- Eastern Cape A0 map

The Province is divided into 6 District Municipalities namely:

1. Alfred Nzo
2. Cacadu
3. Chris Hani
4. Amathole
5. Oliver Tambo
6. Joe Gqabi

And 2 Metros namely:

1. Buffalo City
2. Nelson Mandela Bay
Two nodes were identified in Eastern Cape Province namely Mdantsane in Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality and Motherwell in Nelson Mandela Bay Municipalities
Buffalo City Metro Municipality (BCMM)

Amathole District Municipality with Buffalo City Metro

Source: Demarcation Board website at [www.demarcation.org.za](http://www.demarcation.org.za) under downloads- statistics-DC12 & Buffalo maps
Nelson Mandela Bay Metro Municipality (NMBMM)

Cacadu District Municipality with Nelson Mandela Bay Metro Municipality

Source: Demarcation Board website at www.demarcation.org.za under downloads- statistics-DC10 map
Basic Services in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro

Source: NMBM GIS

Community based services in Nelson Mandela Bay Metro

Source: Service Monitor per Ward 2011
Annexure E: List of Partnerships

BUFFALO CITY METRO MUNICIPALITY (BCM) RELATIONSHIPS

The Metro has developed firm relationships through Twinning MOUs with the following cities:

- Gävle, Sweden
- Leiden, Netherlands
- Milwaukee County, USA
- Glasgow, Scotland (Tripartite with ADM)
- Nets-Africa, Tuscany, Italy

but has also received assistance from other sources like the EU, specifically for the Mndatsane Urban Renewal Programme (MURP). The Municipality is also pursuing relationships with other cities including the SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION (SSC) as well as with the BRICS Countries (no firm agreements yet) as follows (BCM 2011:1):

- Francistown, Botswana
- La Rochelle, France
- Wellington, New Zealand
- Kalamata, Greece

MOUs with no current activities

- Jinhua City (China)
- Qinhuangdao (China)
- BRIC countries

Metro documentation went further to outline the areas in which these projects are located as follows (BCM 2011:1):

- **Gavle, Sweden**
  - Management & Coordination
  - Good Governance – Housing (Working with Human Settlements Department)
  - Electricity Master plan
  - Ambulance project
• **Glasgow, Scotland**
  - Joint Marketing Bureau,
  - Lighting Project
  - Community Benefit clauses
  - Credit Unions

• **Leiden, Netherlands**
  - Logo South HIV/Aids
  - Logo South Storm water/water /Sanitation/Safety Management
  - Logo South Solid Waste Management
  - Youth at Risk project in DV – partnership with SAPS

• **Milwaukee, USA**
  - Mainly focusing on the Health Issues
  - Working with the University of Fort Hare (UFH), Walter Sisulu University (WSU) and East London Hospital complex as well as cooperation between WSU and the Medical College of Wisconsin.
  - Nutritional Food Programme from USAID
  - Sister Cities International – upgrading of Aspiranza Clinic in Buffalo Flats

• **NetsAfrica – Tuscany, Italy**
  - Ward based planning
  - Hydroponics
NELSON MANDELA BAY METRO MUNICIPALITY (NMBMM) RELATIONSHIPS

Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality has also anchored most of its ODA through the ‘Twinning Programmes’ and others through direct funding especially with the EU to support the Motherwell Urban Renewal Programme (MURP). NMBM boasted of having a total of nine International working relationships of which seven were active and the rest were dormant as follows (NMBM 2010; slide 6):

Active:

- Annaba, Algeria
- Beira, Mozambique
- Goteborg, Sweden
- Jacksonville, Florida, USA
- Ningbo, China
- Tyne & Wear Museums, Newcastle, north East England
- Wakhinane Nimzath, Dakar, Senegal

Dormant:

- Lobatse Botswana
- Sichting Steun, Netherlands

From the above list this Metro has actively pursued a South-South Cooperation (SSC) agenda as well as shown by the fact that at least three out of the seven active relationships were indeed with African countries whereby this Municipality also played the role of a Developing Partner, which role the IDC, the ODA coordinating body at the National Treasury does embrace and support (OECD. 2011:Annex.1.18:134).

The activities with the various cities and organisations are as follows (NMBM 2010:18-40):

- **Annaba, Algeria**
  - Culture & sport
  - Economy (Business Networking, NAFCOC, PERCCI, UDDI & EDRS visits
  - Environment
  - Social development
  - Tourism
  - Town Planning & Development (Model for efficient street lighting in Annaba
• **Beira, Mozambique**
  - Capacity building through visits & exchanges
  - Infrastructure & Engineering
  - Tourism
  - Town Planning & urban architecture
  - Waste & environment

• **Goteborg Sweden:**
  - Arts and Culture. (Poetry, Arts and crafts)
  - Environmental and Air Quality (Develop methodologies, emission databases)
  - Higher Education. (Joint programmes with NMMU in offering M. Techs).
  - Inner City development (Develop Best Practices)
  - Integrated Public transportation
  - Public Health (Youth HIV/AIDS clinic, Integrated Waste Management)
  - Sports. (Coaching clinics in Tennis, Soccer & Handball)
  - Sustainable Urban Development (Spatial development)
  - Tourism (Bilateral Tourism Fairs, City to City relationships)

• **Jacksonville, Florida, USA**
  - Culture. (knowledge Exchange between the ports, NMB & Jaxport)
  - Economy (Customer care model development)
  - Education & culture. (NMMU choir visited Jacksonville)
  - Knowledge Exchange & capacity building (Legal services section)
  - Science & technology (Waste Management, air pollution and parks management)
  - Social upliftment (Develop a poverty alleviation Proposal on water, sanitation and health)

• **Ningbo, China**
  - Agriculture (Capacity building, TATI project on ploughing in Motherwell, tractors donated to Sunday River’s Valley)
  - Culture
  - Economy (Joint Opportunities for NAFCOC & DAFENG Industries)
  - Education (Collaboration with NMMU, teacher & student exchange)
  - Human Resources Development
  - Ports
• **Tyne & Wear Museums, Newcastle, North East England**
  o Capacity building & knowledge exchange (Joint Project with the Province) in the following areas
    ▪ Arts & Culture (capacity building in Beadwork, and visual arts)
    ▪ Heritage
    ▪ Museums

• **Wakhinane Nimzath, Dakar, Senegal**
  o Economy
  o Infrastructure an engineering
  o Social development

  **Though an MOU was signed with this town the prevailing political situation has not allowed any fruitful engagements to continue thus far**
The Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action are founded on five core principles, born out of decades of experience of what works for development, and what doesn't. These principles have gained support across the development community, changing aid practice for the better:

It is now the norm for aid recipients to forge their own national development strategies with their parliaments and electorates (ownership); for donors to support these strategies (alignment) and work to streamline their efforts in-country (harmonisation); for development policies to be directed to achieving clear goals and for progress towards these goals to be monitored (results); and for donors and recipients alike to be jointly responsible for achieving these goals (mutual accountability).

### The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

Beyond its principles on effective aid, the Paris Declaration (2005) lays out a practical, action-oriented roadmap to improve the quality of aid and its impact on development. It puts in place a series of specific implementation measures and establishes a monitoring system to assess progress and ensure that donors and recipients hold each other accountable for their commitments. The Paris Declaration outlines the following five fundamental principles for making aid more effective:

1. **Ownership**: Developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption.

2. **Alignment**: Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems.

3. **Harmonisation**: Donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication.

4. **Results**: Developing countries and donors shift focus to development results and results get measured.

5. **Mutual accountability**: Donors and partners are accountable for development results.

### The Accra Agenda for Action

Designed to strengthen and deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration, the **Accra Agenda for Action** (AAA, 2008) takes stock of progress and sets the agenda for accelerated advancement towards the Paris targets. It proposes the following three main areas for improvement:
Ownership: Countries have more say over their development processes through wider participation in development policy formulation, stronger leadership on aid co-ordination and more use of country systems for aid delivery.

Inclusive partnerships: All partners - including donors in the OECD Development Assistance Committee and developing countries, as well as other donors, foundations and civil society - participate fully.

Delivering results: Aid is focused on real and measurable impact on development. Capacity development - to build the ability of countries to manage their own future - also lies at the heart of the AAA.

Source: www.oecd.org
### List of International Organisations adhering to the Paris Declaration and AAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest (CGAP)</td>
<td>Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)</td>
<td>Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction &amp; Development (EBRD)</td>
<td>European Investment Bank (EIB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVI Alliance</td>
<td>Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G24</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organisation of the Francophone</td>
<td>Islamic Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Campaign</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Development Fund</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Development</td>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Group (UNDG)</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.oecd.org
The representation at the 1st High-Level Forum Meeting on the PD in Paris

The Paris Forum on Aid Effectiveness in which the Paris Declaration was drafted, hosted by the French government, but co-sponsored by eight organisations which were represented at the highest level by the following:

1. The OECD Secretary-General, Donald Johnston and Chair of the Development Assistance
2. The Committee, Mr. Richard Manning.
3. The World Bank President, James Wolfensohn.
7. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development President, Jean Lemierre.
8. The Inter-American Development Bank Chief Development Effectiveness Officer, Mr. Manuel Rapoport.
9. President Enrique Bolaños (Nicaragua),
10. Commissioner Louis Michel (EC),
11. More than 60 ministers
12. Many other Heads of Agencies and High level officials

Source: OECD 2005 DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION REPORT – VOLUME 52
<p>| Afghanistan | Albania | Argentina |
| Armenia, Republic of | Australia | Austria |
| Bangladesh | Belarus | Belgium |
| Benin | Bolivia | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| Botswana | Brazil* | Burkina Faso |
| Burundi | Cambodia | Cameroon |
| Canada | Cape Verde | Central African Republic |
| Chad | China | Colombia |
| Comoros | Congo, Republic of | Congo D. R. |
| Cook Islands | Cyprus, Republic of | Czech Republic |
| Denmark | Djibouti | Dominican Republic |
| Ecuador | Egypt | El Salvador |
| Estonia | Ethiopia | European Commission |
| Fiji | Finland | France |
| Gabon | Gambia, The | Georgia |
| Germany | Ghana | Greece |
| Guatemala | Guinea | Guinea Bissau |
| Guyana | Haiti | Honduras |
| Hungary | Iceland | India |
| Indonesia | Iraq | Ireland |
| Israel | Italy | Ivory Coast |
| Jamaica | Japan | Jordan |
| Kenya | Korea | Kuwait |
| Kyrgyz Republic | Lao PDR | Lesotho |
| Luxembourg | Madagascar | Malawi |
| Malaysia | Mali | Mauritania |
| Mexico | Moldova | Mongolia |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Namibia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Palestinian territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Sao Tomé &amp; Principe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.oecd.org
## List of International Organisations adhering to the Paris Declaration and AAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest (CGAP)</td>
<td>Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)</td>
<td>Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction &amp; Development (EBRD)</td>
<td>European Investment Bank (EIB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAVI Alliance</td>
<td>Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G24</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organisation of the Francophone</td>
<td>Islamic Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Campaign</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic Development Fund</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Development</td>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Group (UNDG)</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org)
Annexure G: Phases of the Study

This study began with the planning phase in March 2010, and was completed in August 2012. The project was divided into four phases as illustrated in the table: the planning phase, the implementation phase, during which the research was undertaken, the data analysis and processing phase, and the report writing and completion stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Development Proposal writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Research &amp; Data Collection</th>
<th>March 2010 to December 2010</th>
<th>January 2011 December 2011</th>
<th>January 2012 to August 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research instrument. Interviews with Community Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to one interviews with KEY actors in the ODA arena in the Province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Data Analysis &amp; Processing</th>
<th>March 2010 to December 2010</th>
<th>January 2011 December 2011</th>
<th>January 2012 to August 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receive collate, peruse, process &amp; analyse Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data successfully analysed, findings written up and presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"I won’t let you starve!! But you should first put your jacket, shirt and trouser on the free Market"

Figure Modified from Original with thanks from the German "Berliner ZEITUNG “
12th September 2011
Very Relevant to the ODA subject.
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