

https://dspace.org/

The participation of informal settlement communities in city-level policy-making processes in Johannesburg

Mohamed, Salah Eddin Elzein

2010-04-09T13:02:20Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/7955

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

3. Urban Management Debates: Interaction between Citizens and Urban Authorities

3.1 Introduction

In chapter 2, I established a theoretical understanding for the study of the poor and marginalised communities' participation in policy-making. In this chapter, I continue engaging theoretical debates on the participation of informal settlement communities in policy-making, particularly at city-level. I explore different approaches to urban management and define the interaction between urban authorities and urban citizens, especially the poor in policy-making, within these approaches. I argue that policy-making at city-level is the most significant task of urban management with the others being policy implementation, asset management and fostering relations with other spheres/levels of government. Therefore, participation in urban management refers mainly to participation in citywide policy-making processes. The goal of this chapter is to locate South Africa's post-apartheid approach to city management within contemporary debates on urban management.

I first explore the scope of the phrase 'urban management'. I then examine the evolution of the idea of urban management during the last century by discussing four distinct approaches to urban management (traditional bureaucratic, market-based, participatory, and the Third Way, which presents a confluence of ideas from the market-based and participatory). I then look at the key aspects of the emerging approach to managing cities and towns in South Africa, particularly the local processes and international influences that shaped the system of urban management, as well the key ideas ingrained in the system.

3.2 Meaning(s) of urban management

It has been argued that, pragmatically, 'one way or another, cities have always been managed' (Werna, 1995:353). However, the focus in contemporary literature on urban

management has given the notion of urban management new impetus to become a key approach in urban development, which has been applied extensively throughout developing countries (Cohen, 1994; Mattingly, 1994; Werna, 1995; Harrison, 2006; Harrison *et al.*, 2007). In addition, the term 'urban management' gained international prominence through the establishment of the global technical support programme known as the Urban Management Programme (UMP) in 1986. The UMP is jointly co-ordinated by the World Bank, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNHCS -later renamed UN-Habitat), and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The phrase 'urban management' has meant different things to different people. In an early 1990s article, Richard Stren (1993) noticed that the concept of 'urban management' lacked in content and was elusive. He gave an historical account of the use of the concept in the field of urban studies, which demonstrated how the phrase 'urban management' was used in many different ways. To the World Bank, urban management meant a business-like approach to the governing of cities and towns that aims to ensure more efficient and effective use of its loans. Decades earlier, urban management had been equated with more effective urban government to maintain public order and safety, and provide basic services. The concern in both cases was on how public sector organisations in urban areas are operated. In the early 1990s, urban management was understood as a tool with which to orient the governments of developing countries to the urban agendas of the key international donors and development agencies, such as the World Bank and the UNDP. (Stren, 1993)

Similar to Richard Strens' (1993) account, Michael Mattingly (1994) summarises the connotations attached to the idea of urban management in urban development literature. He explains that:

> [t]here is urban management as project management: a concern to carry out urban projects effectively. There is urban management as development or growth management: tackling the demand of cities and towns which are expanding and rebuilding with policies for land use, structures and service networks. It is used as a term for public finance management or for environmental management. It is there as public service management: to operate the public services, which are the chief concern of local governments, satisfactorily' (Mattingly, 1994:201).

Both Stren (1993) and Mattingly's (1994) explanations demonstrate how each one of the different perspectives focuses on a single characteristic of urban management, such as physical planning, project management, public administration, or business-like organisational management. Mattingly (1994) combines these qualities by offering three key analytical characteristics for urban management. First, for him, urban management is concerned with matters related to urban areas. Regardless of the different preoccupations of the various parties interested in urban management (outlined later in this section), they all share 'a desire to improve human life in urban settlements' (*ibid*.: 202). Mattingly (1994) insists that it is the changes in urban living, which are desired by the interested parties, and not just in the behaviour of urban governments or the performance of projects, that is key.

Second, Mattingly (1994) also sees urban management as assuming a comprehensive perspective and responsibility regarding the various investment sectors and the several levels of public administrations, and involving actors and actions from the private and community sectors, as well as government. Hence, urban management embraces 'policies and programmes as well as projects, maintenance as well as construction, policy formulation as well as the administration of policies, programmes and projects, and the delivery of goods and services as well as planning and building' (*ibid.:* 202). Third, urban management is also about pursuing objectives, which define the problems and opportunities to be focused on. I return to this last point later in this section.

The main purpose of urban management is to take sustained responsibility for public actions to achieve particular objectives with regard to human settlements. The appropriate actions differ from time to time and from place to place, depending on a variety of objectives which underpin the management of a city or town. For example, McGill (1998) suggests that urban management in developing countries should generally seek to achieve two fundamental objectives: planning and maintaining a city's infrastructure and services, and ensuring the city's financial and organisational fitness to provide and maintain its infrastructure and services. The World Bank's policy paper (World Bank,

1991), which draws on market ideas, emphasises improvement of urban productivity, poverty alleviation and protection of the urban environment. Drawing on its developmental agenda, the UNDP advocates improvement of living conditions in the urban areas of developing countries, particularly by improving the provision of public goods and services to the growing number of poor people in urban areas (UNDP, 1991). From a rights-based perspective, the practice of managing urban centres is understood as part of the struggle to achieve democratic governance of the city, combat segregation and achieve social justice (Souza, 2003; Martin, 1997). The latter understanding differs significantly from the two others, as will be explained later in this chapter.

Although it is common to relate urban management to urban areas, it is not space alone that is being managed, but the totality of what happens in urban spaces (Mattingly, 1994). This view broadens the scope of urban management to include 'the collection of activities which take place in an urban area' (*ibid.*:202). Despite government being the organisation that plays the central role of management, government itself is also managed in urban areas (*ibid.*). Earlier, Clarke (1991) advocated this broader view of urban management. He outlines its main functions as follows:

- taking responsibility for governance by fostering the basic relations between national, provincial and local governments with regard to the allocation of responsibilities and resources, as well as internal management responsibilities;
- policy development and investment co-ordination, particularly in terms of the short-, medium- and long-term strategies for development of the city and identifying responsibilities for public and private sector actors;
- managing the city's assets and services, including the implementation, operations and maintenance of the city's physical and social services, their pricing, the collection of charges and revenues on these services and their assigned responsibility to public or private sector agencies; and
- undertaking general functions which include the assessment and collection of taxes and general revenue, the provision of regulatory frameworks for public services, and private activities such as transport, communications, land development, and business licensing.

This underscores the broad understanding of urban management as a system of public organisational interactions focusing on a single urban area, which result in performance of basic services and/or functions (Devas and Rakodi, 1993). It is seen as a holistic concept that aims to strengthen the capacity of governmental and non-governmental actors to 'identify policy and programme alternatives and to implement them with optimal results' (Cheema and Shabbir 1993:7).

For the purpose of this thesis, urban management is a holistic concept that denotes managing the totality of activities that take place within an urban area. It is about taking comprehensive and sustained responsibility for public actions with the aim of improving human life in urban settlements. The responsibility of urban management involves mainly policy development, as well as fostering relationships with other levels/spheres of government and managing the city's assets and services. The literature reviewed below identifies five key actors who are involved in urban management: local elected officials; public sector agencies; residents and their associations; civil society organisations; and the business community. The role of each one of these actors in the main task of urban management (i.e. policy formulation) varies according to the different approaches. In the following paragraphs, I briefly outline and describe the five actors.

Local elected officials

Local elected officials include mayors (executive and symbolic) and councillors. Sometimes, elected officials for national/state (provincial) legislatures may also play critical roles in processes of urban management. While the exact role of the local elected official is determined according to the model of urban management adopted, they generally make laws, policies and budget allocations as the authoritative decisions of city councils (Vogelsang-Coombs and Miller, 1999). Experiences from different parts of the world show that executive mayors wield considerable power and may be responsive to the needs of poor residents, particularly when the votes of the poor count (Rakodi, 2003).

Public sector agencies

These agencies mainly include local and higher level government departments and parastatals. The division of responsibilities, power and resources between local and other levels of government, and the extent to which semi-autonomous bodies (parastatals) are responsible for the delivery of essential services, are critical determinants of local government's ability to respond to local priorities and needs, and how the government interacts with its citizens. Where local government is overshadowed by parastatals accountable to higher political and administrative levels, municipal capacity is likely to be undermined (Rakodi, 2003). In developed countries such as Britain, Germany and Australia, public servants - in contrast to politicians - 'usually enjoy a less political image in the eyes of citizens, so they may gain more public trust than politicians' (Vigoda, 2002:536). Consequently, the professional cadre of public administration can effectively lead the operative involvement of citizens (*ibid.*).

Residents and their associations (also see sub-section 2.4.1)

Richard Box (1998, cited in Vigoda, 2002:536) identifies three types of citizens, 'classified along a continuum based on their desire to affect government actions and public policy processes'. They include:'free-riders' who are considered consumers of public services without involvement in the work of citizenship; 'activists' who, by contrast, are deeply involved in public life and in citizenship actions for the community; and 'watchdogs' in the middle of the continuum, who are involved only in key issues that are relevant to themselves. Unless organised into associations around their areas or interests, residents can only exert power and influence over decision-making through their votes or the cultivation of personal contacts within the political or bureaucratic systems (Rakodi, 2003). Drawing on experiences from Latin America, Rodriguez and Winchester (1996) identify the existence of grassroots organisations and the occupation of positions in the municipality by pro-poor parties or individuals, especially mayors, who support meaningful participation of communities in government.

Civil society organisations (NGOs, social movements, etc)

Civil society formulations may undertake their own developmental initiatives, provide services for government, act as intermediaries between residents and public sector agencies; support local associations of residents or micro-entrepreneurs, or campaign for civil rights and political participation. I have shown earlier (see sub-section 2.4.1) that territorially based associations as well as the 'new social movements' appear to play significant roles in facilitating the participation of the disadvantaged communities in city-level policy forums. Studies in several cities around the world by Devas *et al*. (2001) and Rakodi (2003) found that NGOs generally tend to have weak links with the poor and political structures. As a result, in practice NGOs are rarely influential political actors. In turn, trade unions often play important roles in struggles against authoritarian regimes but 'they are primarily concerned to protect the interests of their members who are not (necessarily) the poorest workers' (Rakodi, 2003:528).

Business community

Businesses range along a continuum from large enterprises (very significant to the local economy in such a way that they wield systemic power without needing to enter into explicit alliances) to micro-enterprises (that can rarely influence decision-making without forming some sort of association).

Having broadly discussed the meaning, aim, and the key actors in urban management, I now turn to examine different models of urban management, namely, traditional, market-based and participatory. The focus will be on the type of interaction between urban authorities and citizens, especially the disadvantaged groups in each model.

3.3 The traditional approach to urban management

Traditional urban management has been associated with the main principles of the traditional model of government and public administration. These principles, according to Peters (1996), include apolitical and institutionalised civil service, hierarchy and rules, permanence and stability, and internal regulation. Traditional urban management has

mainly been concerned with the maintenance of public order and the protection of the interests of those in power (Cheema and Shabbir, 1993). The type of interaction between urban authorities and citizens during the early stages of this approach, which lasted until the late 19th century, was coerciveness 'where leaders and administrators held almost absolute power and control over the people' (Vigoda, 2002:532). Within this context, urban residents were treated as subjects and could not have any say in government matters. This corresponds with what Arnstein (1969) considers 'non-participatory' and Choguill (1996) sees as neglect and rejection (see sub-sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2). Coercion may still exist in dictatorial states in which centralised power is accompanied by rigorous bureaucratic structures (*ibid.*).

Towards the end of the 19th century, there was a change in the type of relationship between citizens and their rules. Democratic systems, especially representative democracy, were introduced in the Western nations. This has created what Vigoda (2002:532) characterises as 'a more equal, fair, open and flexible coexistence of citizens and rulers'. As voters in regular elections, citizens gained power to influence government decisions by electing who would be entrusted to make those decisions. Within this context, the type of interaction shifted from 'coerciveness' to 'delegation', where citizens 'count on the wisdom, experience, and civic goodwill of their representatives' (*ibid.*:532).

A key assumption in this approach is that urban authorities have the authority and capacity to govern; 'to formulate and implement policy, and to realise development goals' (Rakodi, 2003:524). Policy-making in the traditional urban management is seen as 'a technical matter that has to be undertaken on the basis of rationality' (Souza, 2003:194). Key debates within this context have rather been focused on what could be 'an appropriate allocation of roles and responsibilities between central and local government and between the administrative departments of government and semi-autonomous public sector agencies' (Rakodi, 2003:524). Overall, policy-making follows a top-down approach rendering the involvement of ordinary citizens (privileged or disadvantaged) not desirable.

However, during the 1970s, there were clear indications that the traditional approach to urban management was in crisis. It was clear that citizens were not satisfied with the ability of the existing political systems to respond to their views and needs, whether in well-established systems of representative democracy where power was actually concentrated in the hands of a few, or authoritarian, bureaucratic and one-party states (Skocpol, 2003; Gaventa, 2007). There were people who were unable or unwilling to participate in electoral processes, while others were simply not aware of the importance of taking part in elections (Verba *et al*., 1995 cited in Vigoda, 2002:532). Distance from decision-making centres, by choice or not, made citizens in the USA for example, more cynical towards government and public administration. Citizen cynicism was further exacerbated in Europe and America, as Rainey (1990) suggests, by unsuccessful and ineffective public policies with regard to education, welfare, health and crime control of the 1960s and 1970s.

The increased citizen cynicism towards government and public administration, and the crisis in public policy prompted scholarly efforts aimed at creating alternative public policies in social fields and administrative processes (Peters, 1999). These efforts resulted in wide-spread reforms in public administration, which according to Vigoda (2002), relied on the theory of the marketplace and on businesslike culture in public organisations known as the 'new public management' (NPM). According to this perspective, a major goal of government is 'to satisfy the needs or demands of citizens, namely, to show higher *responsiveness* (emphasis added) to the public as clients' (*ibid*.:533). Another response to the crisis of the traditional model was the emergence of broad social movements and advocacy NGOs that called for increased political participation. These two responses led to two distinct approaches to urban management, which I discuss in sections 3.4 and 3.5 below.

3.4 The market-based approach to urban management

During the late 1970s, new ideas about public sector management emerged in Europe and North America that drew 'heavily on economic models of governing' (Rose, 1973:475).

These ideas are based on an unconditional belief in the efficiency of the free market as the best mechanism for allocating resources within society (Peters, 1996). Advocates of this approach argue that other forms of allocation (i.e. through bureaucracy or law more generally) 'are distortions of outcomes that would be produced by a free market' (*ibid.*:23). During the changing of political climate to neo-liberalism in the 1980s, there was a retreat from some of the main ideas of traditional urban management in many developed countries (Devas and Rakodi, 1993), placing greater emphasis on cost effectiveness, efficiency, and 'value for money' in the provision of municipal services (Clarke, 1991).

During the 1980s, the influence of the NPM began to dominate thinking about governing and public administration (Devas and Rakodi, 1993). NPM, which is also known as 'neo-managerialism' (*ibid.*), is most commonly associated with the efficiency drive of the 'neo-liberal' approach to governance. A first wave of this new thinking spread globally in the 1980s, beginning in developed countries such as the UK, USA, Australia and New Zealand, where radically neo-liberal administrations came to power. It then spread rapidly to other places, including developing countries where the NPM was promoted by multilateral development agencies, such as the UNDP and the World Bank (Harrison, 2006). The World Bank in particular, has long been concerned with cost recovery and soon became interested in organisational management and efficiency at both national and local levels in developing countries (Drakakis-Smith, 2000).

Advocates of the NPM ideas believe that the main problem with the traditional approach to urban public administration is 'its reliance on large, monopolistic departments that respond ineffectively to signals from the environment' (Peters, 1996:30). Instead, the proponents of NPM adopted decentralisation and privatisation, separated policy-making from operations, created corporatised units for service delivery, and the increased involvement of non-state agencies in urban management (often through public-private partnerships). This resulted in 'the diffusion, fragmentation and growing complexity of governance' (Harrison, 2006:189).

However, NPM-inspired practices of urban management were fairly diverse (see Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald, & Pettigrew, 1996; Peters, 1996). The common element, nevertheless, was the pursuit of bringing a corporate culture concerned with business-like efficiency and outcomes, into public agencies of urban management. Key elements of the NPM approach often included professional and flexible management at the top of public sector bodies; the separation of policy making from operations; the disaggregation of public sector departments into corporatised units; the introduction of competition into service delivery; outsourcing and competitive tendering; and an emphasis on output-based performance evaluation (Hood & Peters 2004 –- cited in Harrison, 2006:188; Pieterse, 2002).

The market-based approach to urban management has been criticized for being associated with counter cultural values to that of the well-established public sector organisations. At a conceptual level, this approach negatively affects the role of urban citizens. It tends to characterise the public in general as consumers or customers of government services (Pierre, 1995). This characterisation of citizens as customers, according to Peters (1996), is both 'empowering' and 'demeaning' at the same time. Defining citizens as consumers, on the one hand, provides them 'with the same expectations of quality services that they have when dealing with a private sector firm' (*ibid*.:42). However, by considering citizens as mere customers, their role 'as the holders of rights and legal status vis-à-vis the state appears diminished' (*ibid*.:42).

Pierre (1995) argues that government should be concerned with more than buying and selling of public services. If government is reduced to the level of mere economic action, then 'citizens become less significant…than they should be' (Peters, 1996:42). This conceptualisation is very significant, because it fundamentally contradicts other contemporary views of politics that emphasise the rights of citizens, regardless of their gender, status or ethnicity, to take significant roles in policy-decisions that affect their lives.

Another problematic aspect of the market-based approach to urban management pertains to a perceived lack of accountability and bottom-up control of public actions. Traditionally, the notion of accountability in public sector institutions has a democratic basis; either through direct election or through nominated boards, which historically included elected local representatives. The market-based ideas introduced a widespread change to the institutions of governance, including new mechanisms of accountability. Within the context of city management, the application of market ideas led to a general decline in the role of elected politicians and an increase in the number of individuals formally appointed for their personal skills and qualities (Ferlie, *et al.*, 1996). This change led Kelly (1998) to argue that the biggest problem with this approach was maintaining and increasing bottom-up control of all officials, those appointed and hired through contracts, as well as those elected.

Overall, the market-based approach to urban management, particularly the wave of the 1980s, appears to be undermining the role of planning and strategic policy-making. The focus has been on individual, and mainly short-term, projects rather than on longer-term strategy and planning. Vigoda (2003) points out that the increased responsiveness associated with the 1980s urban management practices was also 'accompanied by a lower willingness to share, participate, collaborate and partner with citizens' (*ibid.*:528). While it disenfranchises those who reside in informal settlements and decreases their ability to influence citywide policies, the market-based model offers the private sector a greater role in shaping the urban space in a way that pursues business gains and further marginalises the poor.

From the mid 1990s, another version of NPM emerged, which maintained some key ideas from the 1980s, but also tried to address some of its limitations. I discuss this version of NPM reforms, which has been associated with the 'Third Way' politics, in section 3.6 of this chapter; however, the participatory model will be discussed in the following section.

3.5 The participatory approach to urban management

Another response to the crisis of representative democracy in the West and other parts of the world (see section 3.3), but different from the market-based approach, was the emergence of social movements and advocacy NGOs that called for increased political participation (Peters, 1999). This led to (re)democratisation of many authoritarian regimes in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and to a shift of focus from formal political structures and governments as the locus of decision-making to involving civil society organisations in these decisions (*ibid.*). Greater attention had been paid to civil society organisations and social movements, both because of their role in challenging undemocratic regimes and the status many civil society organisations won for themselves in the constitutions of emerging democratic countries, such as Brazil and South Africa (Vigoda, 2002). Linked to the waves of democratisation were the calls for decentralisation. These calls were based on an assumption that 'a decentralised government is able to co-ordinate sectoral activities, is more knowledgeable about local conditions, and is more accountable to the local population and thus better able to match resources to local needs and priorities' (Rakodi, 2003:525).

The waves of democratisation and decentralisation made participation in urban management a dominant political theme during the 1990s, which Peters (1996:47) describes as 'an age in which government finds it difficult to legitimate its actions without active public involvement'. Advocates of this participatory urban management reject both the traditional technocratic and the market mechanisms of decision-making and call for more political, democratic and collective mechanisms. They assume that 'public interest' is better served by encouraging citizens to claim the maximum possible involvement in policy decisions (*ibid.*).

Participatory urban management soon gained momentum internationally as an effective strategy to address the problems of urban poverty and growing socio-economic inequality. Seeking to support the implementation of the Habitat II Agenda's goal of creating 'sustainable human settlements development in an urbanising world', the UN-Habitat launched its Global Campaign on Urban Governance in 1999 (UN-Habitat,

2002b:5). The campaign's main purpose was to contribute to the eradication of poverty through improved urban management (*ibid.*). The stated aim of the campaign was to increase the capacity of local governments and other stakeholders to practise 'good urban governance', particularly to address the needs of the excluded urban poor and to promote their involvement in decision-making at all levels (UNCHS, 2000).

The theme of the campaign was 'Inclusive City', which reflects both the campaign's vision and its strategy, and also promotes growth with equity. An inclusive city, according to this perspective, is a place where people, regardless of their economic status, gender, race, ethnicity or religion, are empowered to fully share and participate in the social, economic and political opportunities that cities have to offer. This development reflects a growing international acceptance that the quality of urban management is an important factor when dealing with urban poverty. (UNCHS, 2000).

The concept of governance is complex and controversial due to its different interpretations (UNCHS, 2000). There are, however, some common points of departure. Governance is not government: governance as a concept recognises that power exists inside and outside the formal authority and institutions of government. Governance also emphasises 'process' and recognises that decisions are made based on complex relationships between many actors with different priorities (National Academy of Sciences, 2003). Urban governance is 'the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, plan and manage the common affairs of the city' (UN-Habitat, 2002a: 9). According to this perspective, governance becomes 'a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action can be taken' (*ibid.*:9). Echoing this understanding, Pieterse (2002:12) sees urban governance as 'fundamentally about the nature, quality and purpose of the totality of relationships that link various institutional spheres - local state, civil society and private sector - in urban areas'.

These definitions of urban governance assume that there is no *a priori* morality to governance (Pieterse, 2002). By adding the adjective 'good' to 'urban governance', the

variety of interpretations of the concept increases as different people, organisations and governments define 'good urban governance' according to their own experience and norms. For example, the UNDP suggests a list of criteria for measuring good urban governance that includes participation, the rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision (Mehta, 1999). According to UN-Habitat, good urban governance is based on the principle of citizenship, which affirms that no resident of a city shall be denied access to the necessities of urban life, and that citizens should be 'provided with the platform which will allow them to use their talents to the full to improve their social and economic conditions'. These understandings and definitions of the idea of 'good urban management' appear supportive of public participation in urban policy-making, particularly the participation of the poor sectors of society.

As already mentioned, the Global Campaign on Urban Governance was founded on the principles of 'good urban governance', which intended to provide a common vocabulary for debating the key issues affecting the quality of life in cities (Pieterse, 2002). Based on commitments made by governments at major United Nations conferences during the 1990s, and on UN-HABITAT's and its partners' experiences in urban development in different parts of the world, the campaign provided a set of normative criteria for good urban governance. The criteria included: sustainability in all dimensions of urban development; subsidiarity of authority and resources at the lowest appropriate level; equity of access to decision-making processes and the basic necessities of urban life; transparency and accountability of decision-makers and all stakeholders; and civic engagement and citizenship, to promote the active contribution of urban residents to the common good (UN-Habitat, 2002). This means that good urban governance offers, at least theoretically, an opportunity to involve informal settlement communities in the processes of city governance. However, the notion of good urban governance also involves market-based ideas that seek efficiency in government, which lead to internal contradictions with the idea of participation, as the case study from Johannesburg demonstrates.

Some of the well-documented attempts to achieve the ideals of an inclusive city have taken place in Brazil. Since the late 1980s, the Latin American country has been regarded as an example of re-democratisation, decentralisation and policy innovation to promote good governance, particularly the participation of local communities in policy-making (Baiocchi, 2001; World Bank, 2001; Souza, 2002; UNDP, 2003). Brazil's participatory urban management is oriented towards achieving social justice (Souza, 2003). It is characterised by bottom-up and participative policy processes which make planning and management of cities a political and technical process, rather than just a technical one (*ibid.*). Unlike the traditional model, whose objective is an ideal city from which 'squatter settlements' have to be eradicated, this model instead recognises the existing city, and does not seek to establish 'projected ideal futures', but 'to conceive tools for tackling urban problems in a socially just and really democratic way' (*ibid.*:194). I return to the Brazilian example in chapter 4, where I look at how the City of São Paulo involved its residents from informal settlements in city-level policy-making processes.

On the eve of the 21st century there was an international convergence of policies, where ideas from the market-based and participatory approaches to urban management were combined. In the 1990s, the traditionally leftist parties of countries in the global north challenged the hegemony of neo-liberalism, which dominated the 1980s (Harrison, 2006). In making this challenge, they adopted a 'Third Way' approach to politics that accepted the fundamentals of the 1980s neo-liberalism (conservative fiscal and monetary policies, the welfare-to-work approach, and a commitment to privatisation), but also emphasised progressive ideals such as building community, inclusion, participation, poverty alleviation and integration (*ibid.*). I look at this emerging approach to management of cities in the following section.

3.6 The 'Third Way' approach to urban management

The Third Way approach to urban politics, which emerged during the mid to the late 1990s, shaped new approaches to urban management that emphasise efficiency, integration and participation. This new discourse on governance and development has again been 'forcefully' promoted in a number of developing countries by powerful

international institutions and agencies of development (Harrison, 2006). In the 1990s, the World Bank and the UNDP produced an important policy statement on urbanisation and its problems, which distinguishes 'between macroeconomic policies that are managed at the national level and urban policies that are largely, though not exclusively, managed at city level' (Cohen and Leitmann, 1994:119). The policy statement called for enhancing the productivity of the urban poor by devoting more attention to reversing the deterioration of urban environment (*ibid.*). The two institutions joined hands in the Urban Management Programme (UMP), which was based on three principles: enablement, participation and capacity building. The goal of the UMP was to strengthen the capacity of urban managers to meet the challenges posed by the rapid growth. According to Devas and Rakodi (1993), in many instances, UMP led to aid programmes targeting management and planning at the expense of practical projects, to directly improve basic needs. Devas and Rakodi (1993) point out that the capacity of urban managers has been improved, but also the capacity-building role has extended external influence over the development process in the cities of the developing world.

In 1999, a coalition of cities from various countries and their development partners such as the World Bank, UN-Habitat and associations of local authorities and governments established the Cities Alliance as a programme to address urban poverty, which had become a global public policy issue. To develop pro-poor urban governance in cities, the Cities Alliance adopted the 'city development strategy' (CDS) as a participatory governance tool to provide a framework for sustainable and equitable economic growth through pro-poor policies and strategies. The combination of the market-based and participatory approaches to urban management as brought together in the Third Way thinking is evident in the definition of CDS. In a paper by the Cities Alliance (cited in UN-Habitat, 2002a: 9), a CDS is defined as 'an action plan for equitable growth in cities, developed and sustained through participation, to improve the quality of life for all citizens'. Furthermore, the goals of a CDS include a collective city vision and action plan aimed at improving urban governance and management, increasing investment, and systematically reducing poverty (*ibid.*).

Furthermore, the Third Way approach to politics gained international political prominence during the 1990s. An international network of Third Way heads of states and governments emerged during this decade, including figures such as Bill Clinton (USA), Tony Blair (UK), Jean Chretien (Canada), Helen Clarke (New Zealand), Gerhard Schroeder (Germany), Vladimir Spindla (Czech Republic) Leszek Miller (Poland), Ricardo Lagos (Chile), and Thabo Mbeki (South Africa). These leaders, and others, met regularly to develop and further their ideas and it was only with the fall-out over the Iraqi war that the unity of this coalition has been fractured (Harrison, 2006).

These developments have given the emerging ideas of the Third Way perspective significant impetus to influence policy debates in developing countries. As a result, urban management in most of these countries became not only 'about ways of delivering local government services fairly, efficiently and effectively, as it was in the 1960s' (Healey *et al.*, 1995:284), but also 'about how people in firms, agencies and households with shared interests…can come together to identify common concerns, develop strategic ideas and generate the momentum to bring forward investment in building links and constructing discourses' (*ibid.*). This brought new attention to the need of the state to collaborate with citizens and their organisations as partners (Harrison, 2006).

While the Third Way approach represents a shift away from the focus solely on economic rationality- a dominant feature of the market-based approach urban management, it also presents a complex and 'uneasy mix' of ideas (Beland, de Chantal & Waddon, 2002 - cited in Harrison, 2006:189). Harrison (2006:192) speaks about 'contradictions between the idea of collaborative governance and a performance management culture, which places officials under enormous pressure to attain targets within specified time frames'. He also points to 'a tension between participation and a model of joined-up government', which tends to emphasise overall control over policy-making and finance at the centre, and 'between participation and the often technocratic approach to policy-making by Third Way administrators' (*ibid.*). According to him, the reputation of the Third Way is 'somewhat tarnished, as evidence suggests that it may have done more for the middle class than the poor' (p. 189).

Harrison's critique of the Third Way approach is significant as it points to its serious limitations, particularly its failure to achieve socio-economic and political inclusion of the poor sectors in the city. In Chapter 7, I look at the participation of the informal settlement communities in the processes of policy-making in Johannesburg; a city that embraces the hybrid ideas of the Third Way approach to urban management (Pieterse, 2002). In the following section, though, I locate South Africa's urban management approach within the approaches discussed in this chapter.

3.7 South Africa's post-apartheid approach to urban management

The post-apartheid urban management approach in South Africa is part of the country's local government system, which was negotiated and legislated after the demise of the apartheid regime. This system has been shaped by the negotiated transition to democracy and international influences, and contains key elements of the Third Way approach to urban management: integration, participation and efficiency. I deal with these aspects in five subsections.

3.7.1 Transition processes and influences

Towards the end of apartheid rule, a framework for a new system of democratic non-racial local government in South Africa was negotiated at the Local Government Negotiating Forum (LGNF) in the early 1990s. The Forum, which was representative of statutory structures (national, provincial and local) of the time and non-statutory structures led by ANC-ally, the South African National Civic Organisation (SANCO), began a complex process of negotiation that put an end to the apartheid regime at the local level, and proposed a phased process leading to the full implementation of a new municipal system (Harrison *et al*, 2007; Pillay and Tomlinson, 2006). The participants in the Forum agreed on three measures to take local government in South Africa into a democratic era, including promulgation of legislation for local government transition; setting up of a local government finance system; and inclusion of a chapter dedicated to local government in the interim constitution.

The Local Government Transition Act (Act 209 of 1993), laid out the route towards the completion of the transformation of local government, by providing for three phases: a pre-interim, an interim and a final phase (Republic of South Africa,1993). The pre-interim phase led up to South Africa's first democratic local elections in November 1995 (later for KwaZulu-Natal and the Western Cape). While the interim phase lasted from 1995/96 until the local elections of December 2000, which ushered in the new system of local government in South Africa, many of the defining characteristics of this system are set out in the country's first democratic constitution which was adopted in 1996.

A defining characteristic of local government systems is the nature of powers and functions assigned to its municipal councils (Peters, 1999). The municipal powers and functions of South Africa's post-apartheid local government are mainly about delivery and maintenance of municipal services and infrastructure. Section 156 (1) of the Constitution of South Africa states that municipalities have executive authority in respect of, and the right to administer, 'the local government matters listed in Part B of Schedule 4'. These include, among other functions, air pollution; building regulations; electricity and gas reticulation; fire fighting services; local tourism; municipal planning; municipal health services; municipal public transport; municipal public works; storm water management systems; trading regulations; and water and sanitation services (Republic of South Africa, 1996).

In addition, local government matters listed in Schedule 5 of the Constitution include cemeteries; cleansing; control of public nuisance; control of undertakings that sell liquor to the public; local sport facilities; markets; municipal abattoirs; municipal parks and recreation; municipal roads; noise pollution; public places; refuse removal, refuse dumps and solid waste disposal; street trading; street lighting; and traffic and parking (*ibid*.). Overall, these local government matters have to do with basic municipal services, and fall short of venturing into the complex arena of socio economic matters. However, municipalities in South Africa have potential powers and functions that may be delegated to them from national and provincial governments. The Constitution makes provision for

delegation of powers and functions to local government by agreement, provided that 'municipalities have the necessary capacity and are considered the most effective site from which these powers may be exercised' (Van Donk and Pieterse, 2006:110).

In addition to the transition processes outlined above that shaped the approach to urban management in South Africa, there were also international influences on the country's urban policy discussions in general. A variety of interlinked global policy networks influenced and significantly shaped the outcome of post-apartheid policy and practice in the country (Harrison *et al.*, 2007). Key agents in this regard included major multilateral bodies, such as the World Bank and various UN agencies, international development agencies of powerful Western states such as the USA, the UK and Germany, private sector consultants (both local and international), and academics (Mabin, 2002). The involvement of President Mbeki after his election in 1999 in the international network of Third Way leaders (Harrison, 2006) has added to these influences.

The importance of the international influences lies in the key ideas they infused in post-apartheid urban policy in general, and urban management in particular. The key ideas that came with these influences include the notion of urban management shifting the focus of municipalities from land-use administration, to issues of financial performance and efficient delivery of services (Mabin, 2002; Harrison, 2006; Harrison, *et al.*, 2007). Furthermore, these influences also introduced concepts such as 'integration' and 'participation' to the debate about local government (Harrison *et al.,* 2007). In the following subsections, I explore how these ideas are reflected and practised in South Africa's urban policy.

3.7.2 Integration of local government interventions and processes in South Africa

The notion of integration was adopted in post-apartheid urban policies as part of a plethora of ideas to address the urban challenges inherited from the apartheid era. As discussed in chapter 1, section 1.3, at the beginning of South Africa's transition to democracy in the early 1990s, urban areas were characterised by deep social inequalities,

economic inefficiencies, institutional fragmentation, and racially-based spatial planning. These ills were the outcomes of apartheid's policies and associated planning approaches, as well as the economic forces that influenced the country's urban development for most of the twentieth century.

Integration is a 'profoundly contested term' (Pieterse, 2003:122), as it is burdened by multiple meanings and connotations. The usage of the term in South African policy discourse may sometimes describe desirable policy outcomes such as 'social integration', 'spatial integration', 'institutional integration', and 'policy coherence' (Harrison *et al.*, 2007). In other instances, integration is used to refer to policy processes as in the notion of 'integrated development planning' (Schmidt, 2008.). The term is also commonly used to refer to policy tools, such as the 'integrated development plan (IDP)', 'integrated transport plans', 'integrated spatial development frameworks', 'integrated sustainable rural development strategies', 'integrated environmental management plans', and more (Pieterse, 2003; Harrison *et al.*, 2007; Schmidt, 2008). Some of these usages are unpacked below.

Institutional integration was one of the key themes of local government restructuring, where considerable success has been achieved (Pillay *et al.*, 2006). At the centre of this process was that the massive rationalisation of municipalities which reduced the number of municipalities by almost three-quarters (Schmidt, 2008). Between 1994 and the end of 2000, the government had managed to reduce the number of local authorities from over 1200 to 284. The Municipal Demarcations Board had an extraordinarily complex task of redrawing the boundaries of all South Africa's municipalities. In addition, the IDP was conceptualised to improve levels of integration within municipalities, and also provide the basis for co-ordination across municipal boundaries. (Pillay *et al.*, 2006)

Ideas of integration have also been linked to the government goal of policy coherence. The integration of agendas and common programming between separate agencies within the different spheres of government was one of the areas of growing concern of Presidents Mbeki's administration (Harrison *et al.*, 2007). Mbeki used the term

'integrated governance' in his State of the Nation Address in 2002 (Mbeki, 2002) to mean the same as the idea of 'policy coherence' as used with the European Union (Harrison *et al.*, 2007). He argued that integrated governance could be realised through 'practical experiences in urban renewal and rural development programmes, in the clusters of ministers and directors-general, and in the president's Co-ordinating Council' (Mbeki, 2002). The IDP provided a level of policy coherence within the local sphere, though; it remained a limited tool of co-ordination (Harrison *et al.*, 2007). This understanding of integration often reinforces 'bureaucratic rather than developmental thinking' (Schmidt, 2008:123). It also increases the complexity of decision-making by increasing the number of variables involved and the degree of interaction with different levels of governance (see sub-section 2.5.2). This is significant as it tends to limit the participation of the poor in decision-making (Abbott, 1996).

Furthermore, the idea of integration has also meant the incorporation of governmental processes, and especially the assimilation of planning and budgeting, and of sectoral planning and management (e.g. in relation to land management, transportation, environmental management, waste management, water planning) (Harrison *et al*., 2007). The IDP is again seen as a tool capable of linking many different sectoral plans, and is also a key component of a system that attempts to improve the linkage and sequencing of critical steps such as budgeting, planning and performance review.

While considerable attention has been given to spatial integration, and to institutional, intersectoral, and procedural integration, socio-spatial integration, surprisingly, has not been a major objective of post-apartheid government. Post-apartheid settlement policy has even perpetuated racially segregated urban forms (Huchzermeyer, 2003; Harrison *et al.*, 2007). It is only recently that social integration has been given fairly explicit attention in policy (Harrison *et al.*, 2007) - the Department of Housing is supporting a form of inclusive zoning in its 2004 policy called 'Breaking New Ground' (Department of Housing, 2004), which requires developers of middle- and high-income housing to incorporate a percentage of low-income housing within their housing schemes (see Harrison *et al*., 2007) –

The term integration has further connotations at micro development level in South Africa. Writing from a housing practitioner's perspective, Charlton (2003) outlines several dimensions to the concept of integration in relation to the delivery of low-income housing in an urban context. She speaks of integration in relation to the spatial relationship of the location of a new housing development to transport networks, economic opportunities and higher order social facilities. Another aspect of integration in relation to housing delivery pertains to the nature of development itself, which should be holistic in nature, containing all facilities and amenities necessary for a fully functioning residential area. A third dimension of integration deals with the process of delivery, which should be co-ordinated, both spatially and programmatically, with the delivery of infrastructure necessary to make the area function at a technical level (p. 263). Charlton also mentions the potential of new residential developments to play an 'integrating role between parts of the city that were isolated and separated as a result of apartheid planning' (p. 263).

Clearly, the variety of understandings and usages of the term integration make it a very important concept in policy circles in South Africa's cities. Internationally, though, the idea of integration has been used to refer to the linking across state-civil society boundaries within networks of governance (Harrison *et al*., 2007). However, the extent to which this has happened in South Africa seems debatable. I expand on this aspect in the following subsection.

3.7.3 Participation in urban governance in South Africa

South Africa's democratic constitution (Republic of South Africa, 1996) established a multi-party, representative democratic system in which the power of elected politicians is complemented by forms of public participation. In the national and provincial spheres, participation takes the form of public involvement in the legislative and other processes of the National Assembly and provincial legislature, and their respective committees (*ibid*.). The local government sphere is mandated to play a greater role in promoting democracy at local level. Subsection 152 (1) of the Constitution requires local government to provide democratic and accountable government to local communities and

to encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in local government processes (*ibid*.). The pivotal role of ensuring democratic participation of communities in government processes, and holding councillors and municipal officials accountable between elections, rests on the shoulders of local government (Fakir, 2004). This arrangement appears to be creating a democratic system in which 'people should participate in continuing ways to shape their destiny' (*ibid*.:6) rather than have their political rights restricted to voting in elections every five years.

South Africa's Constitution presents a mixture of both representative and participatory democracy. This mixture, as Fakir (2004:6) explains, is 'a form of democracy in which citizens are actively involved in the decision-making processes of government at different levels, on issues that interest or affect them'. The main reason for the introduction of a participatory aspect to democracy, as Oldfield (2008:488) puts it, is 'to build citizenship by making a once exclusive state inclusive, open and responsive to the needs of the majority previously excluded and discriminated against'.

However, South Africa's legislation, in particular the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000), clearly stipulates that participatory governance should not be interpreted as 'permitting interference with a municipal council's right to govern and to exercise the executive and legislative authority of the municipality' (Republic of South Africa, 2000:30). This stipulation emphasises the legal mandate and the political legitimacy of municipal councils, which are products of representative democracy, to govern, and that the role of participation is to complement and not to replace that mandate (Visser, 2005; Centre for Public Participation, 2007).

Nevertheless, the law places community involvement at the centre of the local government system in South Africa. The Municipal Systems Act of 2000, which represents a key piece in the legislative framework for the country's municipal system, introduces a definition of a municipality as an entity consisting of 'the political structures and the administration of the municipality, and the community of the municipality' (Republic of South Africa, 2000: 18). This definition moves local governments in South

Africa from the traditional approach towards a more participatory system of government. In addition, the Municipal Systems Act lists the rights and duties of the municipal council including that of consulting the local community about the level, quality, range and impact of municipal services, and the available options for service delivery. The Act also lists the rights and duties of the local community, including the right to contribute to the decision-making processes of the municipality through the mechanisms and in accordance with the processes and procedures prescribed in the Act (*ibid*.).

Participation requires an enabling framework: mechanisms and processes through which local communities and their organisations can participate. Various pieces of legislation enacted during the first decade of democracy, particularly the Municipal Structures Act (Act 117 of 1998) and the Municipal Systems Act (2000) provide for the establishment of these mechanisms. The Municipal Structures Act establishes the 'ward committee system' as a statutory structure for public participation in municipalities (Republic of South Africa, 1998b). It defines a ward committee as an advisory body to the ward councillor, who is the chairperson of the body. The functions of the ward committee include: advising the ward councillor on policy matters that affect the ward; identifying the needs and challenges that face the ward; and communicating information to communities living in that ward. To ensure inclusive participation through the ward committee system, the law requires the formation of the ward committees to reflect the diversity of local interests and gender equity (*ibid*.).

Although the ward committee system is not the only mechanism for community participation at local government level, it generally exists as the most broadly applied and accepted model for community participation (DPLG, 2003). Underpinning this trend is a wide-spread perception among local communities and councillors that the only way they could interact is through ward committees (Nakedi, 2004).

In addition to the ward committee system, the South African law encourages municipalities to create other innovative mechanisms for public participation. The Municipal Systems Act instructs municipalities to develop policies that foster a culture of

community participation; provide proper mechanisms, processes and procedures that facilitate the participation of local communities and their organisations in the processes of policy making; and create efficient communication systems with local communities regarding participation activities. The Act identifies three main responsibilities for municipalities in this respect. First, it fosters public participation in their integrated development planning, evaluation of their performance, budgetary processes and strategic decisions around service delivery.

Second, it enables participation through capacity building in the community, councillors and staff. Third, it allocates funds for the above processes. It is significant to note that the IDP is the centrepiece of municipal planning, which provides strategic guidance to municipal authorities, and links and co-ordinates the different sectoral plans and planning processes (Republic of South Africa, 2000). This means that the law provides for public participation in city-level (municipal-level) policymaking, resource allocation, and accountability processes.

For example, in the province of Kwazulu Natal, a study by Todes, Sithole and Williamson (2007) found that the municipalities of eThekwini, Hibiscus Coast and Msinga have systems in place to involve communities at various levels of intensity in the preparation of their integrated development plans. Another study in the same province found that in the municipalities of Mgungunlovu, eThekwinin, Sisonke and Ilembe there is 'a fair degree of commitment by local government stakeholders to public participation' (Buccus, Hemson, Hicks, and Piper, 2008:302). In addition to the processes of preparing municipal integrated development plans, other mechanisms are also emerging in these municipalities such as ward committees, road shows, and stakeholder forums (Todes, *et. al.*, 2007). However, these studies found that community perceptions of municipalities' attempts to engage them in development planning and municipal decision-making processes have generally been negative, with respondents feeling that 'even when it did occur, public participation tended to make little or no difference to local governance' (Buccus, *et al.*, 2008:305). Overall, South Africa's local government framework provides for local communities to be involved in the processes of making policies that affect their

lives. However, public participation in these processes is still evolving and largely remains complementary to the role of elected politicians.

3.7.4 Efficiency in the delivery of services

The influence of the new public management ideas, such as efficiency, in shaping the post-apartheid local governance, has been widely acknowledged (see Bond, 2004b; Harrison, 2006; Harrison *et al.,* 2007). The formal quest for efficiency in South Africa's urban management began with the introduction of the municipal performance management system, which has its policy origins in the White Paper on Local Government (1998). This policy document proposed that performance management, together with integrated development planning and public participation, are important and are central tools to realising developmental local government. The White Paper argues that involving communities in developing municipal key performance indicators increases accountability within the municipality. The policy document suggests that regardless of the priorities a municipality may choose, involving its communities in setting key performance indicators and reporting back to communities on performance, increases accountability and enhances public trust in the local government system (Republic of South Africa, 1998a).

The notion of performance management has been further entrenched by legislation particularly, the Municipal Systems Act (2000). This Act which obligates all municipalities to develop a performance management system; set targets, monitor and review performance based on indicators linked to their IDP, publish an annual report on performance for the council, staff, the public and other spheres of government; incorporate and report on a set of general indicators prescribed nationally by the minister responsible for local government, and have their annual performance report audited by the Auditor-General; and involve the community in setting indicators and targets and reviewing municipal performance (Republic of South Africa, 2000:46). In 2001, the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) published the Municipal Planning and Performance Management Regulations, which set out the requirements for municipal performance management systems in more detail. The regulations also include

nine national key performance indicators, on which all municipalities are required to report and new requirements for both internal and external audit processes of municipal performance (DPLG, 2001).

Reflecting on South Africa's main post-apartheid urban policies, Bond (2003) points to a consistent 'de-politicisation' of the role of civil society organisations in urban matters since the early 1990s. In his analysis of the Housing White Paper of 1994 (Department of Housing, 1994), Bond (2003) notices that while the document speaks about people-driven development, it completely ignores any role for civic associations and other community groups. Similarly, he speaks about the White Paper on Local Government's 'apparent agenda of civil society demobilisation' and how it ignored 'numerous precedents for municipal democracy via social struggles prior to the early 1980s' (*ibid*.:44). He also criticises the latter document for failing to fully recognise the roles of communities and for merely appealing to citizens 'to trust a largely technocratic process' (*ibid*.:46).

In addition to the de-mobilisation and de-politicisation of civil society organisations, it is believed that neoliberal inspired solutions to post-apartheid urban challenges have contributed to undermining the roles of communities by promoting individualism, particularly in low-income groups. For example, while acknowledging the government's provision of housing to the poor, Mangcu (2004) blames the housing policy for failing to build communities. Similarly, Huchzermeyer (2003) criticises the once-off capital subsidy, a key strategy in the housing policy, for promoting individualisation, weakening the sense of community, and rendering community leaders in informal settlements powerless. In addition, the proponents of the capital subsidy have consistently sought to discredit the civic movement by portraying them as 'self-seeking, power hungry, disruptive and naïve' as demonstrated in Nuttall (1997) - cited in Huchzermeyer (2003:598).

The hegemony of the technocratic approaches to governance at local level has been seen as a source of dissatisfaction of communities that led to the widespread protests about poor service delivery in the run-up to the March 2006 municipal elections. Mathekga and

Buccus (2007) argue that the protests were not only about poor service delivery but also about lack of participation. In their view, post-apartheid local government institutions failed to appreciate and incorporate the strong culture of participatory democracy that characterised the anti-apartheid civic movement (*ibid.*). Oldfield (2008:488) speaks about 'the rush to address political imperatives for the delivery of services' which sidelined the 'less tangible and measurable democratic processes to build inclusion'. The cause of the service delivery protests lies in the government's perception of the role of local government to be mainly about providing services regarding the participation of communities and community organisations as 'a less important issue and, ultimately, secondary to service delivery' (*ibid.*:13). Therefore, while the wave of protests prior to the 2006 elections was often tied to lack of delivery of basic services such as water, housing and electricity, Mangcu (2006) claims that people also wanted to express their dissatisfaction with government's poor consultation and fewer engagements with local communities.

3.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have broadly looked at the concept of urban management and, more specifically, at four of its major approaches in the twentieth century, as well as South Africa's post-apartheid urban management approach. I have shown that urban management is about taking sustained responsibility for public affairs and interventions in urban areas. The exact purpose of the interventions may differ, however, according to the context and the interests of the parties involved. I have also shown that various urban management approaches have been developed in response to the prevailing circumstances and conditions. In light of the debates reviewed in this chapter, Table 3.1 below summarises the key features of three approaches to urban management discussed in this chapter: traditional; market-based; and participatory. The Third Way approach represents a combination of key ideas from the market-based and the participatory approaches.

Table 3. 1: Features of urban management models

Approaches to urban management	Traditional	Market-based	Participatory
Key objective	Maintenance of public order - provision of services	Managing urban growth	Social equality and expanding citizenship
Role of citizens	Subjects - voters	Customers/consu-mers	Partners
Role of urban authorities	Rulers - trustees	Managers	Partners
Type of relationship between citizens and authorities	Coercive - delegation	Responsiveness	Collaboration
Policy-making	Technical processes	Less emphasis on policy processes	Political and technical processes
Participation of disadvantaged population	No citizen participation	Citizen participation not desired	Participation of citizen, particularly the poor is encouraged

Source: Author's analysis of the literature cited in this chapter.

The table shows that only the participatory approach to urban management offers an environment conducive to the participation of poor citizens, such as informal settlement communities, in policy-making at city level. In addition to its roots in theories of social justice and citizenship, the participatory model also demonstrates the usefulness of government-assisted participation processes in enabling the poor to take part (see Baiocchi, 2003 and 2001; Abers, 1996). The other two approaches either do not support citizen participation as the case of the traditional approach, or do not support policy processes at all, as in the case of market-based approach. The emerging hybrid approach associated with the Third Way politics is attempting to achieve an uneasy fit between

ideas from the market-based and participatory approaches, while seeking institutional integration and policy-coherence.

South Africa's post-apartheid urban management represents the Third Way approach. The country's emerging model of urban management is informed by three main ideas: efficiency as espoused by the 'new public management', integration, and participation. The key question that remains here is: how does the actual practice of participation fit with the powerful notions of 'performance management' and 'integration' in the South African context? Evidence from literature suggests that the practice of urban management in cities of the country, more often than not, favours a technocratic style that emphasises efficiency and integration but sidelines public participation. The literature also suggests that this was caused by continuous pressures to redress the legacy of apartheid with a focus on delivery of public goods and services. I explain this in the context of Region 2 case study in Johannesburg.

Part Two of the thesis examines the participation of the informal settlement communities in city-level policy making in the context of Johannesburg, which stands out as an example of South Africa's urban management approach. However, before turning to the Johannesburg context, I conclude Part One by discussing empirical examples of participatory policy processes from the Brazilian city of São Paulo during 2001 - 2004. These examples expand the review of the Brazilian 'alternative urban management model' drawn from literature, and assist, in particular, in understanding the possibilities and limitations of a participatory urban management model in involving informal settlement communities in policy-making at city-level.