

https://dspace.org/

Unlocking public and private investment? The neighbourhood development partnership grant in the municipalities

Maesela, Sydney

2018
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/26766

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Schedule of Comments: Sydney Maesela, Student No: 1243003

Internal examiner:

Comments	Section addressed in the research report
• There is no explanation/clarity why the case studies were used	This is addressed in the second last paragraph of Section 2.2
• There is no information/ details about the interviewees and why they were interviewed	Section 2.3.2 Primary data
• Chapter 4, rename the generic title for this chapter • The origin of the conceptual framework is not clear and it is also confusing that is located at the beginning of chapter 4 • Some references are missing and the conclusion is not tight	• See Chapter 4, the title has been renamed • Conceptual framework revised, content rewritten, edited and moved to section 4.6 • Conclusion also revised • Missing references inserted in chapter 4
• In chapter 5, it is not clear when the discussion about 18 municipalities starts and also when the focus shifts to the study area • Where do this case studies come from and how do they fit in the study? • There are no maps for each location/case study	• Section 5.1 and last paragraph of section 5.3.1 clarify when to talk about the four (4) studies and all (18) municipalities are part of the programme. • Section 5.3.1 also clarifies the origin of case studies • Maps for each location inserted at the beginning of case study municipalities in section 5.3

External examiner:

The problem statement is not clearly presented. The data on impact of investment and causal link is anecdotal and there is lot of generalization.	• Problem statement is revised in section 1.5. In addition, the aims, objectives and key research questions have been revised • The data on impact is qualified and some sentences reconstructed and rephrased in section 5.3.1
The actual work done and the description is not aligned	This has been done by aligning the objectives of the projects, see section 1, 2 and 6. The aims and objectives of the study have been aligned in section 1.7 and 1.8
The study keeps on referring to NDPG as a new programme. The programme has been in existence for a number of years.	Addressed in Section 1.1 and the entire document. The wording that the NDPG is a new programme has been corrected
There are typos, punctuation, grammar, and missing acronyms as well as level 4 numbering	• Typos, punctuation, grammar, acronyms which should be presented only first time- addressed throughout the document • Fourth level heading removed throughout the document

• There is a mismatch between the methodology used and the knowledge claims as represented by the articulation of research objectives • Limitation of the study are not clearly articulated, for example the research does not deal with municipal own budgets / investments into the programme and whether there are seen as catalytic	• Research objectives have been modified in Section 1.7 and 1.8 • Research method revised in Chapter 2 • Limitation of the study addressed in Section 2.6 by inserting paragraphs that addresses
Some concepts used not defined	Glossary of term and definitions inserted just above chapter 1 of the study
The conceptual framework is not clear	Section 4.6- the conceptual framework revised and the write up improved
Key citation for SIPPS is Napier & Macozoma.	Citation added in Section 4.4.5
Need to be careful and clear about which financial data is used MTEF vs YOY allocations.	I have used year on year allocation and the actual expenditure as reflected on section 78 reports published by National Treasury
The presentation of the case studies is light on systematic evidence, particularly on investments.	I have used National Treasury leverage reports and supplemented by interviews. Qualified this through sentence in the last paragraph of section 5.3.1
Some of the analytical claims in Section 6 need to be reconsidered – e.g. the claims of how good and stable one administration is (e.g. Tshwane) and how bad and unstable in another is (e.g. the secondary cities) are anecdotal and not factual.	• See Chapter 6 • Claims have been qualified by citing National Treasury reports. See chapter 6. Based on how I wrote this in the document this is confined to ability to spend on catalytic projects

	The acknowledgement of the TTRI programme to address training / alignment issues is only presented much later and could already be coming in from 6.2.7 or earlier.	Section 6.2.7, the TTRI is cited
	The areas for further research should also consider the study limitations faced.	See section 7.4 - the limitations of the study were also discussed