

# **FROM COMMUNITY DRIVEN TO LOCALLY LED CASE STUDY OF THE UGANDA TSUPU PROGRAM**

Celine d'Cruz  
Urban Development Practitioner

## **Overview and Status of Urbanization in Uganda:**

The Government of Uganda embarked on a process of developing its national urban policy in 2009. This policy aspires to respond to issues of land rights, service provision and security concerns and to build the capacity of all levels of government to make urban governance respond to a wider concern of poverty and the needs of marginalized citizens. Currently, about 15 per cent of Uganda's population lives in urban areas and 14 per cent of the urban population live below the poverty line.

Uganda's population growth rate of 3.2 per annum is one of the highest in the world. The population will reach 68 million in 2035, with 30 per cent (some 20 million people) likely to be living in urban centres. Uganda's economy is growing at 7 per cent annually—hence putting considerable pressure on its expanding development needs. Out of the 79 poorest countries that borrow from the World Bank through international development assistance (IDA), Uganda is the sixth largest recipient of IDA loans in the world and number one in Africa.

Kampala city, Uganda's largest city, was planned for 350,000 residents, yet today it has a night population of 1.5 million and a day population of 2.5 million. It is now typical of similar situations in other developing countries, where the poorest are priced out of improved or new services and housing or have moved to areas far from employment opportunities.

Secondary cities account for about 50 per cent of the population and have expanded beyond their geographical boundaries. This rapid expansion of secondary cities without proper planning poses significant challenges.

Poverty in urban poor settlements is marked by a lack of basic services such as clean water, sanitation and electricity, all of which are difficult to obtain with unstable incomes and insecure shelter.

### **History of organized urban poor communities in Uganda before the Transformation Of Urban Settlement Upgrading (TSUPU) Project**

In 2002, Uganda's Ministry of Land and Public Works invited the NGO Slum Dwellers International (SDI) to support the national government's urban agenda. SDI initiated the first slum enumeration in the Kesenyi settlement of Kampala in 2005, identifying and supporting local leaders to count and map their settlements. The community leaders from Kampala made contact with leaders in the city of Jinja. From this growing network emerged the National Slum Dwellers Federation of Uganda.

In 2005, the residents of Kikaramoja settlement in Jinja were threatened with evictions. The data collected by the communities for 2000 people proved that the residents had lived there for many years. As a result, the community was able to negotiate for an alternative and stop evictions. Similarly, the Mpumudde settlement in Jinja faced regular evictions. The community was sufficiently organized to identify 7.5 acres land within the borders of the municipality and construct 30 houses financed by the Federation's urban poor fund. This housing pilot became a learning site for many communities in Jinja, as well as in other cities in Uganda and elsewhere in Africa.

In Kampala and Jinja, organized communities developed the capacity to construct community sanitation blocks. Such pilot projects became precedent-setting, since by doing and showing, organized communities proved to local governments and other communities that they had the capacity to collect real time information and implement small upgrading projects.

### **The Transformation Of Urban Settlement Upgrading (TSUPU) Project**

In 2009, The Government of Uganda collaborated with Cities Alliance, SDI, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the National Slum

Dwellers Federation of Uganda (NSDFU) to create the Transformation Of Urban Settlement Upgrading (TSUPU) project. TSUPU builds on the growing commitment and desire of the Government of Uganda to manage its urban growth, support decentralization and align its development efforts at national, local and community level to improve the conditions of the urban poor and include them in planning, decision making and in the implementation of upgrading projects.

The TSUPU program was implemented in 5 out of 14 municipalities -- Jinja, Mbarara, Mbale, Kabale and Arua -- with an investment of more than USD 4 million in three years. In addition to their size and growth rate, the five municipalities were chosen because of their institutional capacity and economic potential. The Gates Foundation stipulated that 50% of the total budget went directly to communities.

Parallel to TSUPU, the World Bank's Uganda Support to Municipal Infrastructure Development (USMID), a USD 150 million project in 14 municipalities over 6 years (2013-2018) includes the 5 TSUPU cities plus nine other Ugandan municipalities. USMID aims to improve urban service delivery and build capacity of local governments. At present, USMID covers large municipal infrastructure projects only and does not include small upgrading projects.

TSUPU was a key component of the Cities Alliance Country Programme, from which most funding was provided, and which later made linkages to the World Bank's USMID programme. TSUPU was completed in 2013.

TSUPU support was used to:

- Build the capacity of local governments to plan and manage their urban growth and support national and local policies for the poor.
- Strengthen the capacity of organizations of the urban poor to actively engage with local government and participate in local development.

Expected outcomes of TSUPU:

- 50,000 slum dwellers in 5 cities actively engage in securing their rights and acknowledging their responsibilities to improve urban governance.
- 50,000 slum dwellers in 5 cities access municipal services.
- Inclusive urban development policies & strategies that enable better management of future urban growth of 200,000 slum dwellers nationwide.

The Implementing agency for the TSUPU program is the Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development (MOLHUD), which worked in partnership with the NSDFU, the local governments of Jinja, Mbarara, Mbale, Kabale, and Arua, the Urban Authorities Association of Uganda (UAAU), and Makerere University.

The components to support community participation include:

1. **The creation of the Uganda National Urban Forum, Municipal development forum and Settlement forum**, which aimed to legitimize the space for communities to engage with local government and other urban stakeholders.
2. Collect **Informal settlement data** by urban poor organizations.
3. **Community saving program** for organizing communities around small financial needs.
4. **Community upgrading funds (CUF)** designed to enable local government and communities to jointly manage grants for upgrading.
5. **Community contracting through the Community Driven Development (CDD) model** was not in the design of TSUPU but developed mid-course by SDI. It allowed communities to design, plan and implement their own upgrading projects.

This case study will focus only on the 5 TSUPU cities where slum-upgrading projects were implemented and contracted to communities. USMID does not have a slum-upgrading component in the other nine cities. The following section will look more closely at each of the community participation components, explaining how they developed

and have been used by communities to engage local government for local development.

### **1. National, Municipal and Settlement Forums**

**The National Urban Forum focused on Uganda's national urban policy** and addressed issues concerning improved tenure, land rights and basic services. The National Forum legitimized the space for organized communities to participate with other urban stakeholders and strengthen their capacity to engage in dialogue, build consensus and make efficient and effective contributions to improving their living conditions. The communities could bring their concerns from the local level and present the challenges encountered by local politicians to the National Forum, which led to the signing of a charter between communities and all concerned parties locally and supported the establishment of Municipal Development Forums (MDF). Although communities successfully used the National Forum to find solutions for their local problems, it remains unclear how much the communities were able to participate in the formulation of broader policy issues.

**The Municipal Development Forums (MDF) legitimized the equal participation of urban poor** with other stakeholders at the local government level. They currently function in all 14 municipalities where TSUPU and USMID were active. The Forums are a reflection of the

growing understanding between communities and local governments that they need each other. The proposals prioritized by the communities are brought to the MDF where they get discussed and approved.

The MDFs have helped bridge the gap between municipal councils and communities. They have opened tremendous opportunities for communities to understand for the first time, matters such as municipal budgets and other governance matters of the city. Resolutions and minutes of the forum meetings reflect this shift. MDFs have become multi-stakeholder platforms and create an enabling environment for dialogue between communities and municipal councils. It is a space where urban problems are identified and debated and where recommendations are presented to council.

**Settlement forums continue to be active in most of the 14**

**municipalities** with support from the NSDFU. These forums focus on activities such as slum mobilization, mapping, enumeration and profiling. They are a platform for urban poor communities to reflect, discuss and prioritize projects and prepare upgrading proposals to take to the MDF. Settlement forums tend to focus more on the collective challenges that confront the community such as evictions and lack of basic services. Not all the proposals prioritized at settlement forums have been implemented. Nonetheless, the settlement forums continue to work on the above-mentioned activities and serve as a conduit for learning and networking.



## **Lessons and Challenges of the National, Municipal and Settlement Forum:**

- One of the challenges of the Uganda National Urban Forum was the lack of any mechanism for communities to influence the dialogue on policy, which remained dominated by researchers and academics with no real participation of local communities. This brought into question the established priorities of the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, whose policy priorities differed little from past experiences.
- One of the achievements of the National Forum was establishing the MDFs, which have remained active after the completion of TSUPU. The participation of communities at the MDF symbolises the commitment of local government to deepen the existing governance structures. The MDF effectively addressed the problem that communities and local government have unequal sets of information when managing upgrading projects. Communities, therefore, are now better informed of projects and programs and can monitor and participate more effectively in ongoing programs.
- Communities continue to use the MDF to learn and understand the interests of the different stakeholders. It teaches them how to engage in dialogue and contribute information so that they can safeguard their

interest with every new initiative.

- The forum at all three levels showed that when communities are involved from the start, they can better understand the challenges faced by the city. This involvement has made the communities willing to contribute resources to support these projects and build trust with local governments and increased the contribution of the urban poor to the larger urban agenda.

**2. Linking citywide slum profiling to slum upgrading** shows a new path by which communities organize, collect information, and actively engage local government. Communities learn to use real time data to prioritize and develop upgrading projects.

The data collection steps include:

- Preparatory meetings for mobilizing and sensitizing the community
- Identification and training of data collection teams
- Numbering both household and commercial structures
- Administer the questionnaire/ settlement profile
- Data management and entry
- Data verification
- Data/Cadastral Maps verified and endorsed by local government
- Report preparation for 5 cities

## SELECTED RESULTS FROM SLUM ENUMERATION OF FIVE CITIES

CITIES	No. OF SLUMS	TOTAL POP	SLUM POP	% WITHOUT TOILET	% WITHOUT WATER
JINJA	8	132,150	20,000	83%	95%
MBARARA	11	102926	80,000	92%	67%
MPALE	7	86,642	42,750	83%	64%
KABALE	11	54,407	29,920	67%	65%
ARUA	6	39,250	55,000	79%	58%

Source: ACTogether 5 city enumeration reports 2012 and Final TSUPU Report 2013.

### Lessons and challenges for slum enumeration:

- The community data collection process brings communities and information together citywide and adds value to the mapping technology.
- Municipalities are very receptive to communities collecting information on informal settlements, as it is cost effective and produces verifiable information the city needs.
- The quality of data is superior when compared to that collected by external research organizations hired for the same purpose.
- Collecting quality data is tedious and needs tremendous time, resource investment and supervision. Communities invest the time and resources because the stakes are high for them.
- Once this investment is made, the skills and the capacity of the

- community data team can be used for collecting information of informal settlements in other cities and for updating information.
- The settlement profile for each settlement is a good first step since it fulfills the purpose of collecting just enough information needed for planning and designing upgrading alternatives.
  - This data collected is also useful to the community at the time of eviction threats. For example, the community at Soweto in Jinja used the data collected to negotiate for tenure when they were threatened with demolitions by the local university.
  - Household data unlike profiles is more useful at the time of a relocation or redevelopment and can be used only if necessary to compliment the data collected by the community.
  - Profiling the settlements keeps the process simple, affordable and easy for communities and cities to manage and replicate in new cities.
  - Complex technology like satellite mapping is very expensive and does not help communities in upgrading or for managing allocations during resettlement or redevelopment.

3. **Community savings for organizing communities around small financial needs.** Savings groups help finance individual and household needs for emergencies, livelihood development and home improvement. By learning to borrow and repay small and medium loans they develop the discipline to manage larger finances for house construction and upgrading works. By July 2013, there were 343

savings groups with approximately 22,648 members in 5 municipalities. The number of the urban poor engaged in these saving schemes continues to grow. The growing savings and information collected by the communities makes it easier for communities to prioritize proposals and suggest alternatives.

Uganda's National Urban Poor Fund (SUUBI), initiated by SDI and NSDFU was a precursor to the Community upgrading Fund (CUF) developed under TSUPU. With SUUBI, community members learnt to make a shift from individual to collective savings. By saving a fixed amount into the urban poor fund, enabled them to leverage external finances for slum upgrading. The discipline of savings and repaying loans at the individual level builds the credit worthiness of the community to manage larger finances for collective upgrading works.

The SUUBI fund supports pilot upgrading projects designed and managed by the urban poor communities. These included sanitation and water projects in Kampala and Jinja and housing development at Kawama in Jinja. Through learning by doing, communities were able to prove to themselves and the city that they had the capacity to participate and implement upgrading projects at scale.

**COMMUNITY SAVINGS AND URBAN POOR FUND SAVINGS  
(SUUBI)**

CITY	SETTLEMENTS	SAVING GROUPS	SAVING IN UGX	SUUBI SAVINGS
JINJA	7	62	356,107,000	13,000,000
MBARARA	11	110	6,524,450	5,500,000
MPALE	6	84	19,622,600	5,507,621
KABALE	12	49	17,859,450	5,016,521
ARUA	6	123	152,265,000	14,270,258
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>552,378,970U</b>	<b>43,294,400</b>

Source: Actogether/NSDFU, Uganda, August 2016

**Lessons and Challenges:**

- By building their organizational capacity and linking the formation of saving groups to the broader urban developmental agenda, communities have demonstrated that they can participate in their settlement upgrading and use their savings to leverage affordable finance.
- The discipline of community savings and the ability to manage the community urban poor fund prepares communities to leverage, transact and engage with external funds, and makes community participation more sustainable.

## UPGRADING PROJECTS SUPPORTED WITH URBAN POOR FUNDS FROM SUUBI

5 CITIES	SUUBI	% OF SETTLEMENTS WITH UPGRADING PROJECTS
JINJA	11	50%
MBARARA	8	45%
MPALE	10	71%
KABALE	7	55%
ARUA	11	100%

Source: Actogether/NSDFU, Uganda, August 2016

4. **THE COMMUNITY UPGRADING FUND (CUF), created under TSUPU,** was jointly managed by local government and communities. The intention was to enable community organizations to access grants to finance upgrading initiatives that meet certain clearly defined criteria. A CUF manual was co-designed by communities and local government to ensure that the funds were routed to the very poor communities. The guidelines developed for this purpose of financing slum-upgrading projects describe how the fund functions, explain procedures on how to apply for funds, outline the criteria for evaluating applications, and note the safeguards framework for monitoring and supervision. CUF supported upgrading projects, which cost between USD 7000-10,000.

Communities had the mandate:

- To identify projects

- Source a local community contractor
- Develop plans/design project
- Sign contracts with local contractors
- Approve the completion of a project
- Saving groups receive money in bank account and accountable to local government.

In the design stage there was considerable discussion about using CUF for upgrading and income generation. However, it soon became clear that the limited CUF finances were not sufficient for all the upgrading proposals already in the pipeline. By the end of TSUPU there was a huge gap in the number of proposals and those that could be implemented.

Of the 500 upgrading proposals identified in the five municipalities by the MDF, only 130 projects were implemented through CUF funds of which 26 were implemented by communities.

#### FUND FLOW FOR CUF PROJECTS CONTRACTED TO

COMMUNITIES: MOLHUD transfers CUF funds to the Ministry of Local Government (MOLG), which subsequently transfers it to a municipal council's general. The council transfers the funds to a municipal TSUPU account. Once the MDF select the project to be implemented, the funds are transferred to the community joint account. The municipal council keeps 2% aside for administration cost and 8% goes towards project costs.



**UPGRADING PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY THE COMMUNITY  
UPGRADING FUND (CUF)**

5 CITIES	SLUMS	CUF PROJECTS	MUNICIPAL CONTRACTOR	COMMUNITY CONTRACTED	FINANCES TO COMMUNITY
JINJA	8	26	8	18	181,409
MBARARA	11	29	7	22	158,415
MBALE	10	23	7	16	145,943
KABALE	10	24	8	16	150,538
ARUA	7	22	6	16	154,417
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>790,722</b>

Source: MOLHUD, Government of Uganda, August 2016. This included NSDFU and other CBO's.

**Leveraging additional funds for CUF locally:** Considering that Uganda's Local Government Act provides for the transfer of 25% of their own source revenue generated by the Municipality, a portion of these funds could be set aside to continue financing small infrastructural projects at the community levels. At present, the funds that are disbursed to the lower councils are used to pay allowances for the Councillors, hence making virtually no impact on improving the services to the Communities. Jinja Municipality for example, generates about UGX. 8 billion annually on average; 25% of this translates

into UGX. 2 billion. If a portion of these funds, for example 30%, could be used in a Community Upgrading Fund, it would ensure sustainability of the initiative and enhance accessibility of the community to basic services.

### **Lessons and Challenges:**

- The National Urban Poor Fund (SUUBI) initiated by SDI and its Ugandan federation was a precursor to the TSUPU Community Upgrading Fund (CUF). The experience and history of the federation to manage its own urban poor fund was a huge advantage to the successful implementation of CUF.
- CUF created the space for organized communities to participate in planning and designing alternatives for upgrading at scale together with local government.
- The CUF projects have demonstrated that the collaboration and teamwork between the council, local authorities and communities can lead to improved living conditions with improved access to basic services like solid waste management, safe water supply, street lighting and other initiatives and can have impact citywide.
- The manual/guidelines created for the community-upgrading fund made it possible to administer the projects according to a certain set of criteria acceptable to communities and the council. This accelerated decision making, insuring that projects were completed on time without bureaucratic delays.

- One of the challenges of the CUF intervention is its sustainability. All proposals approved by the MDF were not implemented because of insufficient funds in CUF. This was a set back to the aspirations of the saving groups.
  - The WB USMID project at present only focuses on large municipal infrastructure. There is no funding yet for slum upgrading. Communities hope this will change in the second phase of USMID. One idea was to make CUF into a revolving fund.
5. **Community Contracting** made possible through **Community Driven Development (CDD)**. Once projects are approved, the MDF hands over the proposal to a municipality's Community Development Officer (CDO) and the engineering team to follow up and call for tenders from serviced contractors. Communities wanted to be joint signatories with the town clerks to procurement contracts that concerned the purchase of goods and services for upgrading projects in their communities and wanted to share this responsibility with local government. Subsequently, they changed this in the later part of the project when procurement guidelines were put into place for community contracting.

The procurement function is regulated under Uganda's Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority Act (PPDA). The procurement regulations provide the procedures that guide the procurement of assets and

service providers as well as the disposal of public assets. Under the PPDA, the firms or bidders are required to be formally registered companies which pay VAT, have filed their returns and audited accounts. When bidding they factor in the taxes they must pay. The regulations provide for various procurement methods depending on clearly stipulated thresholds. Such requirements limited the participation of the communities, as a city's procurement and disposal unit (PDU) advertised for suitable bidders, carried out evaluation and awarded contracts. Although this was in compliance with the PPDA regulations, it reduced the amount of the funds that would be used for the project, as part of the funds were for taxes and for the profits for the contractors. In the first phase of CUF, the contractors' bids included 18% VAT on material and about 30% for profit and overheads. This greatly reduced the value for money and provided no opportunity for communities to implement projects. Additionally, the projects were too expensive and not completed on time, and the quality of construction was often questionable.

The Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development had to coordinate with other relevant Ministries and Agencies regarding the issue of tax exemption on projects implemented with the Community Upgrading Funds. These included the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Ministry of Local Government, Auditor General, and the PPDA. It was therefore recommended that community-contracting procedures be adopted as applied under the community driven development program.

Since the Ministry of Local Government is responsible for the oversight role of the local governments, it would assist in the institutionalization of such a mechanism that can be used as a tool for empowerment of the community to participate in planning and in the active management of their projects. This could also facilitate leveraging of more resources from the communities for development purposes.

A municipal council's role was to provide the core funding to the community for project implementation and to provide technical support. The role of the community development officer (CDO) was to bridge the gap between the engineering team and the community. The role of the municipal engineers was to give guidance to the community and ensure that the building norms were followed by the community contractors. There were challenges where communities lacked capacity but this was soon corrected.

One engineer was appointed in each local government to support the community to build technical capacity. As they learned to work together, it became clear to both sides which projects could be contracted to communities and which had to be contracted to municipal service providers. For example, boreholes were contracted to municipal contractors since their construction entailed complicated engineering. In the case of the solid waste management projects, communities purchased carts and bins for collecting waste. Similarly, fencing a school compound entailed complying with

planning and zoning standards and the stipulated off set from the road. With toilet construction it was important to determine the number of users to be served so the structural and quality standards could be applied accordingly.

Some of the challenges faced by communities were from the procurement staff at the local government. Town clerks were not aware of CDD procedure. For example, the Town Clerk of Kabale did not honor the CDD procedure and the Ministry had to threaten to close the project. Loss of control is normal and most communities experience this in other projects. However, as the communities participated in sensitizing, educating and building capacity of new communities, it reinforced a sense of ownership from the side of community while building trust among the municipal team. It's a space that needs to be institutionally protected for communities.

**TYPE OF PROJECTS CONTRACTED TO COMMUNITIES  
(2009-2013)**

PROJECT TYPE	JINJA	MBARARA	MPALE	KABALE	ARUA
SANITATION	3	1	1	1	1
WATER	2	1	3	4	6
ELECTRICITY	3	1	1		
DRAINAGE/CULVERT	1	2	2		
GARBAGE					1
FOOT BRIDGE			1		2
SCHOOL FENCE					1
SCHOOL BLOCK			1		
ROAD		2	3		

COMMUNITY HALL	1	1			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>

Source: ACTogether engineer, Kakaire Waiswa from NSDFU database, August 2016

### **Lessons and Challenges:**

- Community contracting allows for greater community ownership, greater awareness especially on matters of quality of construction and cost of the project and makes it easier for communities to hold the contractor accountable.
- Community contracting through the CDD framework provided opportunities for communities to use affordable material and cut down cost by contributing community labor. Often the contractors are from among the urban poor communities and this becomes a livelihood support for both skilled and unskilled labor.
- The gap of engineering skills within the communities was a challenge and the municipal engineers had to provide technical guidance and supervision. While the lack of capacity was seen as a hindrance, in most cases this engagement strengthened the relationship between the municipal engineers and the communities who became realistic of each other's strengths.
- The technical staff and the town clerk are ultimately responsible for the quality of the project implemented in the community-contracted projects. One of the challenges faced by local government was to

manage community expectations. Working together on the ground on the projects ironed out a number of the creases.

- The national government recognizes the community contracting procedure as critical in enhancing the role of the community in planning, implementation, and monitoring of community infrastructural projects. It will be necessary to explore the possibility of formalizing and aligning community contracting to the PPDA to ensure that communities continue to drive development processes.

### **Conclusion:**

A growing number of organized urban poor federations want to participate more actively in large and small scale projects that affect their settlements directly or indirectly. Today, country and regional urban poor federations in many cities in Africa and Asia have a track record demonstrating the skills and their capacity to participate at scale citywide.

Federation processes start at the community level, with daily savings, enumerations and exchanges becoming a foundation for any projects that develop later. Without a supportive framework such projects are much more difficult for federations of the urban poor to undertake successfully at scale on their own. TSUPU has shown that when organised communities drive the process, the transformation in attitudes and commitment is significant.



Acknowledging this from the project design stage makes it easier for this investment to be made.

TSUPU in Uganda was designed to transform the manner in which urban poor communities partner with local and national governments to improve living conditions of informal settlements. This was the first time for local governments and communities to receive resources directly and was learning for on how best to use the opportunity and make this partnership work for both sides.

TSUPU created the momentum needed to build the capacity of communities and local government and scale up in a short time. When communities secure land from local government to build sanitation units and implement upgrading projects, it demonstrates council recognition for the right of slum dwellers to reside where they are and improve their living conditions.

The knowledge and experience of the communities have not been sufficiently integrated into the policy process. The mechanisms needed to allow the participation of communities in drafting, implementing, and monitoring the National Urban Policy is unclear.

A major barrier to addressing the delivery of basic services is the lack of information by the city on informal settlements. The settlement-profiling

tool formed the basis for organizing communities collecting quality data that is useful for planning and implementing citywide upgrading projects.

Community savings pave the way for organized communities to link individual financial needs to collective needs, strengthening the building blocks of the community-upgrading fund. There is a direct correlation between the increase in the federation membership, the quality of community organization and the sustainability of the urban poor funds and CUF. This groundwork prepares communities to access Community Upgrading Funds and participate from the project inception stage to the project completion phase.

Since procurement procedures are necessary for more than 70% of the transactions of local governments, it is extremely important that local communities involved with upgrading projects learn to work with government procurement procedures, and to understand their logic and motivation so they can participate more responsibly and influence the process from the project proposal stage through the implementation and monitoring stage.

CUF is not just about more finances to address issues of community infrastructure. If positioned correctly, it has the potential of addressing deeper issues of urban poverty and more so redefining the relationship between communities and cities.

Capacity was a challenge from both sides; communities and local government both had to learn to work together. Both lack different types of capacity and information and by engaging with each other were able to bridge the information and capacity gap. By organizing themselves, communities contribute their expertise, skills and resources ensuring sustainability of the process. Both came from different positions but worked towards the same goal. For the local government hygiene was one of the main problems detected and hence the focus of the upgrading projects was around, water, hygiene and sanitation. For communities, security of tenure and lack of basic services was a major issue and the implementation of the water and sanitation projects addressed some of their deeper issues of poverty and inclusion.

The significant shift within TSUPU has been from community driven to locally led.