UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

ASSESSMENT OF THE STAKEHOLDERS' UNDERSTANDING OF A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY AND THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THEIR INITIATIVE: A CASE OF TSILITWA PROJECT IN THE MHLONTLO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, EASTERN CAPE

By Gcinumzi Qotywa

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS (Environment & Society)

DECEMBER 2011

DISCLAIMER

I, Gcinumzi Benett Qotywa, hereby declare that

Assessment of the Stakeholder's Understanding of a Sustainable Community and the Sustainability of their Initiative: A Case of Tsilitwa Project in the Mhlontlo Local Municipality, Eastern Cape

is my own original work, and has not been submitted previously for a degree or examination at any other university.

....

Gcinumzi Benett Qotywa

Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude goes to all those who contributed towards the success of this work.

My special thanks go to Dr Jane Olwoch, my supervisor, for her guidance, patience, understanding and the unqualified support she provided me from the inception of this project until the end. Without any shred of doubt I would want to indicate that had it not been for her I would not have finished this work.

A special word of thanks goes to the Ford Foundation Fellowship Programme for funding my studies and the Africa-America Institute in Johannesburg who were responsible for the administration of the fellowship. I would like to thank them for their understanding and patience with me all this time.

I would want to thank all the participants in this study, Mhlontlo Local Municipality, the former Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism and the community of Tsilitwa. The people of Tsilitwa village will always have a special place in my heart, and I would want to thank them for allowing me into their families. The Tsilitwa Development Forum has been extremely helpful in terms of filling all the gaps I had during my data collection.

Lastly, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my family, my wife, Siya and sons, Buhle and Siqhamo for their support and allowing me to rob them of our family time to focus on this work.

Abstract

The key stakeholders to the Tsilitwa Project in Mhlontlo Local Municipality have a consistent understanding of what a sustainable community is and their understanding is generally consistent with the widely used and acceptable definition of sustainable community, except that the stakeholders to this project do not seem to attach any value to ecological integrity. They all believe that central to the development of a sustainable community is an active participation of the community itself in determining their destiny. However, there seems to be a disagreement on whether the project was implemented in accordance with their understanding, with others blaming the implementing agent on one side and others believing that the original budget was not sufficient on the other.

Even though some stakeholders are optimistic about the sustainability of the project, they all seem to agree that for the project to be revived and become a sustainable initiative some funding from either government or other partners is necessary. The participation and/or involvement of other partners such as other government departments, development finance institutions, etc is also seen as one thing that would boost the project further. The current state of the project and the associated facilities is not a good sight and there is clear evidence of deterioration of the cooperative, guesthouse and other facilities. The provision of water has been a challenge to the whole community due to non-payment of an electricity bill for the water supply facility, and this has led to ESKOM cutting the power supply.

Key words: Sustainability, Sustainable Community, Stakeholders

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Boxes

Annexures

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction and background

Communities all over the world face increasingly complex issues and rapid changes that challenge their future direction (Moss & Grunkemeyer, 2010). Furthermore, Moss & Gunkemeyer argue that the challenges facing the local leaders and community developers, in their endeavor to make sound and widely supported decisions, include growing population diversity, economic hardship and social equity, conflicting development desires and passionate environmental concerns. The past 30 years have seen a move towards ensuring that environmental considerations are taken into consideration whenever development initiatives have to take place. This is the period that has seen a lot of debate on the concepts of sustainability and sustainable development. The same debate has also led to competing and conflicting views on what the terms mean, what is to be sustained, by whom, for whom, and what is the most desirable means of achieving this goal (Agyeman, 2005).

The early 1990s, however, have seen the move towards 'sustainable communities', a concept that is regarded as less problematic compared to sustainability and sustainable development. Although it does not seem like there is any one uniform definition for this concept, one of the widely used and probably accepted definitions for a sustainable community can be found from Hempel (1999: 48) who defines it as the *"one in which economic vitality, ecological integrity, civic democracy, and well-being are linked in a complementary fashion, thereby fostering a high quality of life and a strong sense of reciprocal obligation among its members"*.

1.2 Origins of the Research

This research arose from the work undertaken by the Sustainable Villages Africa (Pty) Ltd, referred to as SVA, at Tsilitwa Location in Mhlontlo Local Municipality, Eastern Cape. In 2004 SVA, a private company, together with Tsilitwa Community Development Forum approached the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) with a proposal for the implementation of a sustainable village project in Tsilitwa Location, Mhlontlo Local Municipality in the Eastern Cape.

In October 2004, DEAT approved the proposal with a funding of R5 million and the actual implementation commenced in March 2005. In submitting a business plan to DEAT, SVA indicated the objectives of this project as being "to submit an environmentally friendly solution to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism for sustainable local economic development for the Tsilitwa community. "For this project, we will demonstrate sustainable homestead living, supported by a village cooperative. We will also upgrade and fix the village water supply, demonstrate renewable energy generation and upgrade the village guest house".

Figure 1. A board advertising the Tsilitwa Project

In a speech delivered by the former Minister of Trade and Industry during the launch of the project on 28 February 2006, he promised some funding from his department to bolster the co-operative component of the project. In the second half of 2006, the former Deputy Minister of DEAT, visited the project and she announced an additional R4.5 million (thereby increasing the total budget to R9.5 million) funding from DEAT alone to keep the project going and to probably make it sustainable. In addition, the Eastern Cape Department of Economic Development and Environmental Affairs (DEDEA) presented a donation of a light delivery motor vehicle to the project. Furthermore, it has been reported that other government departments such as the Department of Agriculture have made other donations in an attempt to strengthen the project so as to ensure its sustainability. With all the contributions that have been made by the government departments on this project, it can be assumed that government is determined to invest in sustainable communities' initiatives, but the question is whether these initiatives do indeed succeed or not.

1.3 Problem Statement

The concept of sustainable community is generally new especially in South Africa. Therefore it became important that we take a look at one of the cases of this concept in the country. The Tsilitwa Project mentioned above is one of the cases known to the researcher and there is a belief from the researcher that if we need to make a contribution in the development of our country, we need to learn lessons from what we implement. South Africa is suffering from a high unemployment rate and poverty continues to ravage most communities, and rural communities like Tsilitwa are not immune from this. In fact the rural areas of South Africa are synonymous with poverty. These are the areas where the most vulnerable groups of the population, the children and elderly in particular reside. Sachs (2005: 244) argues that *"at the most basic level, the key to ending extreme poverty is to enable the poorest of the poor to get their foot on the ladder of development".* Extreme poverty, according to Sachs (2005) is when households cannot meet the basic services for survival.

It therefore becomes imperative that if there is an initiative that has a potential of creating jobs and sustaining the livelihoods of a particular community such lessons are learnt and replicated elsewhere. This study will therefore determine whether the stakeholders of the Tsilitwa Project have the same understanding of what a sustainable community is as well as whether their understanding is consistent with the internationally accepted definition(s) of this concept. It would also be interesting to get a sense of whether this project conforms to some or all of the characteristics of a sustainable community i.e. whether there is any demonstration of all or some of these characteristics in the conceptualization, planning and implementation of this project. This study will also look at whether this project demonstrates any signs of sustainability beyond government funding. Furthermore the study will look at the lessons learnt from this project and make recommendations on those elements that could be replicated. In essence therefore, the study will have to answer the following questions:

- Is there a uniform understanding among the key stakeholders on what a sustainable community entails?
- Four years since the start of implementation, what is the status of the project? Is it showing signs of sustainability or otherwise?
- What are the lessons that can be learnt from this initiative?

1.4 Aims and Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 Research Aim

The main aim of this study is to determine whether the Tsilitwa Project in Mhlontlo Local Municipality is indeed a sustainable community project.

1.4.2 Research Objectives

The research aim indicated above was achieved through:

- Determining the understanding of the concept of sustainable community among all key stakeholders to this project
- Observation and assessment of the state of the project to determine its sustainability or otherwise.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Current Views on Sustainable Communities

Agyeman (2005:65) provided the following (see Table 2.1) as the most common characteristics to all sustainable communities. These characteristics, which were developed by the Local Government Management Board in Great Britain in 1994, according to Agyeman (2005), indicate the ideal sustainable community that espouses the environmental, social and economic goals. Agyeman (2005) further argues that these characteristics are very similar to the elements of a sustainable community that were developed by the board of the Institute for Sustainable Communities (ISC) in Vermont and subsequently used by the President's Council on Sustainable Development (1997) in its Task Force Report, 'Sustainable Communities'. While the elements of a sustainable community include managing and balancing environmental, economic and equity concerns, in order for these elements to be fully realized, two further critical elements are needed: democracy and accountability (Agyeman, 2005). In terms of democracy, Roseland (1998:24) notes that:

"…for people to prosper anywhere they must participate as competent citizens in the decisions and processes that affect their lives. "Sustainable development is thus about the quantity and quality of empowerment and participation of people. "Sustainable development therefore requires mobilizing citizens and their governments toward sustainable communities". Accountability on the other hand should, according to Foster (2003:803), *"be concerned with how two factors manifest themselves in development decision-making processes. "The first factor concerns quality of participation among members of a community affected by development decisions. "The second factor concerns the representativeness of individual participation within those communities".*

Table 2.1 *Characteristics of a Sustainable Community*

A sustainable community seeks to:	
Protect and enhance the environment	• Use energy, water, and other natural resources efficiently and with care • Minimize waste, then reuse or recover it through recycling, composting, or energy recovery, and finally sustainably dispose of what is left • Limit pollution to levels that do not damage natural systems • Value and protect the diversity of nature
Meet social needs	• Create or enhance places, spaces and buildings that works well, wear well and looks well • Make settlements "human" in scale or form • Value and protect diversity and local distinctiveness and strengthen local community and cultural identity • Protect human health and amenity through safe, clean, pleasant environments • Emphasize health service prevention action as well as cure • Ensure access to good food, water, housing and fuel at reasonable cost • Meet local needs locally whenever possible • Maximize everyone's access to the skills and knowledge needed to play a full part in society • Empower all sections of the community to participate in the decision-making and consider the social and community impacts of decisions
Promote economic success	• Create a vibrant local economy that gives access to satisfying and rewarding work without damaging the local, national, or global environment • Value unpaid work • Encourage necessary access to facilities, services, goods, and other people in ways which make less use of the car and minimize impacts on the environment • Make opportunities for culture, leisure, and recreation readily available to all

Source: Agyeman (2005:63, adapted from DETR, 1998)

As much as the above characteristics of a sustainable community are widely accepted, Agyeman (2005) offers a caution when he argues that if a robust sustainability inventory were completed, which could assess whether the above characteristics were present in any given community, and where the imprimatur *sustainable community* meant doing not one but *all* these tasks together, then no community on earth would be classified as a sustainable community. Hempel (1999) agrees that human communities cannot be totally sustainable in any strict sense of the term even though the concept of sustainable community is temporarily accepted for most human endeavors.

Most of the research on sustainable community has concentrated on the northern hemisphere even though there have been some sustainable community initiatives in the southern hemisphere. As a developing country, South Africa continues to experiment these development methods and it therefore becomes important to undertake some studies which can shed some light on whether the few sustainable community initiatives already in place are indeed what they should be. In looking at whether the sustainable community initiatives in place are worthy of being called sustainable community projects, we should bear in mind Folke and Kaberger's (1991) argument that 'it is not meaningful to measure the absolute sustainability of a society at any point in time'. Hempel (1999) agrees that we have to settle for *relative sustainability* as it is relative and context-intensive. This study should therefore be viewed in the context of relative sustainability as it has clearly been argued that absolute sustainability would be too difficult to measure and even more difficult to achieve.

According to Williams (nd) sustainable development as an idea and practice is the latest in a long line of major approaches to economic development. He believes that whether sustainable development is the major paradigm in contemporary debates on development or one approach among many is not important but what is important is that it has been touted as the dominant solution to the problems of environmental degradation and poverty especially in the Southern Hemisphere. Sustainable development represents a new justification for intervention in the developing world. The terrain for intervention has been extended to include governance, the role of civil society and the stewardship of environmental resources (Williams, nd). The main interpretation of sustainable development comes from the Brundtland Commission and its report, Our Common Future (1987). Williams (nd: 6) argues that *"In an approach to sustainability, which attempts to integrate the multiple dimensions of sustainable development within its analysis, the economic concept of discounting is given a key role but the debate about sustainability is enlarged to cover non-economic factors".* The emphasis is therefore put on sustainable development for essential human needs, rather than on the trade-offs between economic and biological systems. The Brundtland Commission's definition of sustainable development is *"development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs"* (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987: 3).

Since the advent of this widely used definition of sustainable development there has been a huge interest from policy makers, researchers, economists, politicians, etc to understand the whole concept of sustainable development. Gouldie, Douglas & Furnass (2005), on the other hand focused on the concept of sustainability, which they define as the capacity of human system to provide for the full range of human concerns in the long term. They further provide a list of what they call 'sustainability principles' and what is worth noting in these principles is that they highlight the interconnectedness of social, environmental and economic activities. Some authors like to emphasize the link between sustainability and justice (Patel, 2006). Dobson (1999) is one of those and he argues that sustainability obliges us to think about sustaining something into the future, and justice makes us think about distributing something across present and future.

Unlike the contested nature of the concepts of sustainability and sustainable development, the concept of sustainable communities seems to be less problematic (Agyeman, 2005). It is for this reason, among others, that this study will focus on the sustainable communities' concept as indicated earlier on. It is equally important that if one has to make any statement about the sustainability or otherwise of a particular initiative some consideration is given to the indicators that one can use to determine this sustainability. In line with the definition of the sustainable communities, Kline (1995) has argued that the whole concept of sustainable communities represents successful integration of four key objectives i.e. ecological integrity, economic security, high levels of quality of life, and citizen empowerment with added responsibility.

A sustainable community therefore can only be successful if the authorities involve the community members. In their study of how sustainable livelihoods were built in nine villages across three districts in Laos or the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Bouahom, Douangsavanh & Rigg (2004) demonstrate this issue. Their study demonstrates a shifting of the focus of the discussion away from government policy and development interventions to the issue of how rural households sustain, protect and develop their livelihoods during an era of multiple transactions. The role of the citizens in shaping their lives is very clear in this case study. In another study where Meech et al. (2006) look at how a derelict mine in British Columbia, Canada was transformed into a sustainable community, they further reinforce the issue of community participation and accountability. One of the projects of this programme was the Britannia Beach Visioning Charrette whose aim was "*to collectively design a sustainable community at Britannia Beach around the historically significant,*

but highly constrained Britainnia mine site" (Meech, et al. 2006:355). There was an agreement on eight principles in the design of this sustainable community (see box 2.1).

Box 2.1 Community Design Principles: The Britannia Beach Visioning Charrette (Meech, et. al. 2006:356

1.   Each community must be complete
2.   Alternatives to the automobile are promoted
3.   Natural systems are integrated and enhanced
4.   Buildings and infrastructure are greener, smarter and cheaper
5.   Housing meets needs of the entire community
6.   Good jobs are close to home
7.   The spirit of each community must be honoured
8.   Everyone has a voice

Meech et al. (2006) conclude by arguing that *The Charrette* was successful in developing a process which all participants could claim ownership of the design. As such the reaction of the community to the site design was an overwhelming support. It is clear that this shared vision gave all the participants the comfort and trust that their values and needs were not only being taken into account, but were mirrored in the eventual appearance of the site. Indeed the process has been very participatory given that it included:

> *"…an evening workshop to establish goals and objectives for the site; an evening workshop to translate these aims into design guidelines; and a 40-day intensive working session to agree on: suitable and desirable development; scope and size of each element; possible synergies amongst the elements; and detailed drawings and plans of who the site might look. An evening session was held to share the results with the community and obtain comments and feedback. Finally …a public forum took place in Vancouver to release the findings to the general public"* *(Meech et al. 2006:355).*

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Area

3.1.1 Location of Pilot Homesteads and Socio-Economic Issues

Mhlontlo Local Municipality is one of the seven local municipalities within the OR Tambo District Municipality in the Eastern Cape. This is a B4 rural municipality encompassing the two towns of Tsolo and Qumbu with all the adjacent rural areas and the municipal offices are located in Qumbu. This municipality lies on the north east side of the Eastern Cape Province alongside the N2 route between Mthatha and Mt Frere and R396 between Tsolo and Maclear. The newly approved Integrated Development Plan of the municipality (Mhlontlo Local Municipality IDP, 2011-2012) puts the population of the municipality at 237 136 inhabitants as of 2007. This reflects a 14.4 % growth compared to 2001 numbers and this is the highest growth rate compared with other municipalities within the OR Tambo District Municipality. In fact this growth rate is even higher than the average population growth rate for the Eastern Cape province which was put at 11.1 % in 2007 (Mhlontlo Local Municipality IDP, 2011-2012).

The same IDP reflects that 73 % of the inhabitants of Mhlontlo Local Municipality lived below the poverty line in 2008 and this reflects an 8% increase from 1995 where 65% of the population was living in poverty. However, this might be seen as a slight improvement compared with 2005 where poverty level peaked with 81% of the population leaving below the poverty line. Even though the numbers show an improvement compared to 2005 the challenge of poverty is still evident as one traverses the rural areas of this municipality and halving the number of people who live in poverty by 2014 looks unlikely. However, it must also be noted that this municipality is one of the pilot sites for the government's Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP). The Mhlontlo Municipality IDP (2011-2012), using the broad definition of unemployment indicate that the rate of unemployment stood at 72.3% in 2007. In a district with generally high unemployment, this municipality is second only to Port St John's Municipality whose rate stood at 83.4% in the same period.

This municipality boasts 21 wards and ward 19 is made up of the administrative areas of Maqhubini, Qotirha, Thwa, Khubusi and Gqwesa. Tsilitwa village, where this project is

implemented, is one of the 18 villages of the Maqhubini Administrative Area and it has its own chief like the other 17 villages. Tsilitwa village is made up of three sub-villages, Thembeni, Ntsukandihlale and Ndzondweni, each with its headman (isibonda). The homesteads for the pilot project drawn from these threes sub-villages as follows: Ntsukandihlale has six pilot homesteads followed by Thembeni with three and the last one is Ndzondweni with two homesteads. There are other areas though, outside of Tsilitwa (but within Maqhubini A/A) that benefited from this project for instance Nonyikila village had a field fenced through this project, in Lwandlana village a vegetable garden was established in the local church and three homesteads in Mtondela village were identified and utilized for the pilot.

The main criterion for selecting the homesteads for the pilot was whether someone is already planting any vegetables in his or her garden. The main idea was to utilize those people who already have passion for vegetable gardens rather than start from the beginning. The second criterion related to the willingness of the people to avail their gardens for this pilot project given the fact that no provision was made in the project funds for the purchase of land. Of course, the availability of the financial resources played a major role in determining the number of homesteads that could be accommodated under the pilot project.

Fig. 3.1 A map showing the villages where pilot homesteads were drawn

3.1.2 Physical Attributes

The eastern region of the Eastern Cape is made up of complex structures which resulted from the sequences and crustal formations and deformations (Oche, 1997). This, according to (Oche, 1997) manifests itself through the steep-like series of land surfaces which characterize the descending nature of the Drakensburg highlands. He further argues that this region is therefore made up of three main physiographic units/belts and these are the escarpment, the inland plain and the coastal plateau, with the escarpment being predominantly underlain by the basaltic materials which host the main drainage systems of the region. McKenzie (1984) contends that it is due to this high gradient on the slopes of the region that most rivers are swift at their upper course but also seasonal. It is this seasonality of the rivers that has a lot of impact on the availability of water resources in the entire region in general and Mhlontlo Municipality in particular.

Mhlontlo Municipality falls within the subtropical region and therefore the climatic conditions depict those of the region. This area is characterized by warm and humid summers with cool and relatively dry winters, however as in the Southern Africa the rainfall is highly seasonal (Tyson, 1986). Tyson (1986) further notes that precipitation over the north eastern regions of South Africa follows an annual cycle and is almost entirely a summer phenomenon and it has been reported elsewhere that approximately 85% of the rainfall occurs in the summer months (October to March). The reliability of the rainfall, however, is threatened by the frequent drought occurrences in the region (Oche, 1996). These drought occurrences and the general reliability or lack thereof of the rainfall in the region, and other factors, could be contributing to the current land cover patterns in the Mhlontlo Municipality. The Mhlontlo Municipality IDP (2011-2012), reports that 76% of the land cover in the municipality is either degraded or unimproved grassland, with only 17% of the land cultivated either for semi-commercial or subsistence purposes. 8% if the land is reported to be covered with forestry plantations whilst thicket and bushland as well as urban or built-up residential areas cover 5% each.

Figure 3.2 Spot image of the study site

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 Type of Research

In choosing the most appropriate research techniques the researcher had to take into account a number of things and among them is the fact that this project has been implemented in a small area i.e. in one village. Even there, the fact that only ten homesteads directly benefited through the vegetable garden infrastructure made it more important to have a focused study. The idea of this study was therefore not to generalize the results, but to learn about this particular area, but even more important, to engage with the direct beneficiaries. It was therefore the researcher's considered view that the best research approach to use in this case would be a qualitative technique as opposed to a quantitative one. Kumar (2005:12) argues that a *"study is classified as qualitative if the purpose of the study is primarily to describe a situation, phenomenon, problem or events; the information is gathered through the use of variables measured on nominal or ordinal scales..."* This definition is consistent with a number of authors on this subject including Creswell (1998) who believes that qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on the distinct methodology of inquiry that explores a social or human problem. Key to Creswell's argument is the fact that in this type of a research the researcher conducts the study in a natural setting.

It is clear therefore, that a qualitative research seeks answers to questions through in depth examination of various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings (Berg, 1989). In simple terms, as Fitzpatrick et al. (2004) put it, qualitative research uses qualitative data and this is non-numerical data. This data is mainly in the form of narrative, verbal descriptions whereas quantitative data is mainly numerical and statistics are often used to summarize such data. This approach was found suitable for this study because, the intention was not to engage into some statistical testing to determine the stakeholders understanding of their setting. Rather it was to report their understanding of the sustainable communities and make observations about whether their activities point to a community on its way towards living sustainably.

3.2.2 Sampling

In a case like this one where the researcher knows that only a handful of people can give you an insight into a particular situation, it is always desirable to look at sampling techniques that will ensure that such an objective is achieved with minimal waste of time and resources. The choice of respondents was mainly determined by the role of each stakeholder or individual in the planning and implementation of the project. In essence therefore, a non-probability sampling type specifically the *judgmental or purposive* sampling was deemed to be the most appropriate in determining the respondents. A lot of authors (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004; Kumar, 2005; Babbie, 2007) agree that the judgmental or purposive sampling is used when the main consideration is the researcher's opinion as to who can provide the best information required to achieve the objectives of the study. In this instance, therefore, the researcher only considers those people s/he believes are useful for the study, have the necessary information and are willing to share it. In the Tsilitwa case, the key people were easily identifiable and well known to the researcher, hence the judgmental or purposive sampling.

In this case, the key stakeholders were identified as the community development forum members, the individual community members whose households were used as pilot homesteads, the relevant DEAT and municipal official(s) as well as members of Sustainable Villages Africa (Pty) Ltd, the implementing agent for the project. As indicated earlier on, this type of sampling (judgmental or purposive) is more relevant in case studies where the idea is not to generalize but to understand and explore a particular case (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004). Similarly, Patton (1987) concurs and further argues that the fact that data collection is not constrained by predetermined categories of analysis contributes to depth and detail of qualitative data.

3.2.3 Data Collection Tools

The methodology of adopted in this study included a review of the literature on sustainable communities as well as all the project documentation including a business plan, latest progress payment report as well as the completion audit report. Furthermore, a questionnaire was developed and interviews were held with the community members, official of DEAT and as well as

the official of the Mhlontlo Local Municipality. An attempt was also made to get hold of the officials of the Sustainable Villages Africa (Pty) Ltd, however such attempts were not successful.

In the case of the Tsilitwa community, some of the direct beneficiaries of the project (i.e. homeowners of the pilot homesteads) were interviewed. Because of time constraints, it was not possible to interview all the owners of the pilot homesteads and to this end, out of the ten homesteads in Tsilitwa village, only five homeowners were interviewed. Another community member who had worked as a manager of the cooperative was also interviewed individually. In addition to the individual interviews, there was also a focus group undertaken for the members of the Tsilitwa Development Forum. This is a community structure whose main objective is to facilitate development in the Tsilitwa village and at the time of the interview there were eight of them. Among the key members of this structure is the local chief and the ward councilor.

Furthermore, given the fact that the researcher had an advantage of seeing the project at its height of implementation it was easy to undertake some observation and visit the various sites. Among the sites visited was the water generation station, guesthouse, cooperative and all the individual homesteads whose owners were interviewed. Below is an indication of how the study attended to each of the chosen objectives:

(i)   ***Objective 1: Determining the understanding of the concept of sustainable community among all key stakeholders to this project***

Structured interviews were used to collect data on the stakeholders' understanding of the concept of sustainable communities. This data, in respect of the community structures, included aspects of how they have lived their lives before this project came into existence and any change in their lifestyle (if any) since the introduction of the project. Furthermore, data on the specific components or activities that make up a sustainable community i.e. how does a sustainable community live, what services should be provided and what are the key elements of such a community. The community's understanding of a sustainable community was then contrasted with their traditional ways of living such as the old age tradition of working the land to produce food for the families. This information was analyzed and trends determined so as to get to an understanding of whether all the key stakeholders understood from the onset what they were

getting into. Having a uniform understanding of a sustainable community concept would be a good start for all the key stakeholders who have to devote their energies and resources to ensure its realization.

(ii)   *Objective 2: Observation and assessment of the state of the project to determine it sustainability or otherwise*

Observation of the condition and state of the assets (mainly physical) created by the project was undertaken to get a sense of the level of maintenance for longer term use. The observation mainly focused on the cooperative, guesthouse, water supply as well as the pilot homesteads. Furthermore, the overall situation of the project was assessed looking into the financial and non-financial records of the entity that is responsible for managing the affairs of this project i.e. the community development forum. Structured interviews were undertaken with the key stakeholders such as the community development forum, former manager of the cooperative, individual community members who benefited from the project, officials of DEAT and Mhlontlo Local Municipality with a view to get an understanding of their perception on the sustainability of the project.

3.3 Data Analysis

"Qualitative data analysis begins while still in the field, when insights may emerge (Morra-Imas & Rist (2009:374)". In arguing further this point, Morra-Imas & Rist suggest that part of field work is to record and track analytical insights that occur whilst you are still collecting the data. This view is supported by Patton (1987) when he argues that the analysis of qualitative data is a creative process, there are no formulas. He further argues that there is no one right way of analyzing and interpreting qualitative data. When using the qualitative approach of evaluation, the most important consideration in developing the frame of analysis is your preference for a particular style of writing (Kumar, 2005). In substantiating this point, Kumar (2005) argues that for those that want to communicate frequency of various themes then they should analyze the data that achieves various themes, but for those who want to write text on the basis of verbatim responses they need to analyze the data accordingly.

For this study the two approaches as suggested by Kumar (2005) have been used. The study has tended to focus on the themes that come out of the interviews with all the participants to this study, but at the same time there is use of verbatim responses from the interviewees. The former is used to demonstrate a particular trend in the understanding of the stakeholders in a particular issue while the latter is used to emphasize a particular view held by a certain stakeholder to this project. It should be noted that all of the analysis was done manually, without any use of computer programmes. Kumar (2005:244) supports this approach when he argues that *"If the number of respondents is reasonably small, there are not many variables to analyze…you can manually analyze the data."* For the analysis of the themes the responses to the interview questions were grouped together and in some cases tables were drawn up to show the patterns emerging from the responses. This process of identifying coherent and important examples, themes and patterns in the data is called content analysis (Patton, 1987; Morra-Imas & Rist, 2009.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Understanding of the concept of Sustainable Communities

The responses to the questions that were meant to determine the first objective of the study i.e. the understanding of all the key stakeholders in terms of the concept of sustainable communities comprised of six elements. Those elements are, their definition of what a sustainable community is, their understanding of the elements of a sustainable community, whether the project was implemented in line with their understanding of a sustainable community, any change in their lifestyle since the introduction of the project, the understanding of the main benefits to the community linked to the project, and lastly, any negative elements or unintended consequences of the project.

4.1.1   Definition of a Sustainable Community (SC)

There is a general synergy in terms of the understanding among the key stakeholders on what a sustainable community is and this is reflected in table 1.2 below.

Table 4.1 Stakeholders' Definition of a Sustainable Community

Stakeholder	Understanding of a Sustainable Community
Community Development Forum	• A community with development initiatives • Community ownership of the development initiatives • A community where money circulates within the community i.e. they have banks of their own
Individual Community Members	• Development of a community • Development of rural areas • A community that cultivate crops to provided for its residents and sell to other people
Mhlontlo Local Municipality Representative	• A community that generates its own food • A community that is self-reliant • A community with community banks
DEAT Representative	• A community that engages in activities to sustain itself
Cooperative Manager (community member)	• Development of rural areas

From the above table it can be observed that there is meeting of minds among the stakeholders on what they were expecting when this project was being planned and implemented. The issue of a community that is producing for itself i.e. self-reliant and has its economic activities and institutions comes up sharply in the understanding by all the key stakeholders. Furthermore, their collective definition of a sustainable community is broadly inline with the widely accepted definition of a sustainable community as advanced by Hempel (1999).

4.1.2 Elements of a Sustainable Community

On the question of what elements constitute a sustainable community, a variety of responses were provided. However, three things that came sharply was that any sustainable community should have agricultural activities and markets within its boundaries; Basic services in the form of water and electricity; and lastly good and reliable health and educational facilities. Of course there are other elements that complete the picture and they are all indicated in the matrix below.

Table 4.2 Stakeholders' Understanding of the Elements of a Sustainable Community

Services/Activities	Stakeholders				
	CDF	ICM	MLMR	DR	CM
Agricultural Activities & Markets	X	X	X	X	X
Transport Networks (Roads)	X	X			
Basic Services – Water & Electricity	X	X			X
Shopping Malls	X				
Multi-Purpose Cooperative	X		X		
Communication Network (including postal services)	X			X	
Banks	X		X		
Satellite office for Government Departments	X			X	
Health and Education Facilities	X			X	X
Community Projects		X		X	
Funeral Schemes			X		

Key: CDF - Community Development Forum; ICM - Individual Community Members; MLMR - Mhlontlo Local Municipality Representative; DR – DEAT Representative; and CM – Cooperative Manager

When one contrasts the elements of a sustainable community as seen by the stakeholders in the Tsilitwa project with the ones suggested by Agyeman (2005) and indicated elsewhere in this report what is clearly missing are the environmental considerations. It appears that the Tsilitwa project stakeholders see sustainable communities as only concerned with social and economic considerations only.

4.1.3 Stakeholders Understanding and mode of implementation

All the stakeholders, with the exception of the DEAT official, agree that the project was implemented in line with their understanding of a sustainable community. However, they also agree that more could have been done and their reasons on why they are not completely satisfied with the project vary and the main reason indicated relate to the resources. The community development forum, for instance, believes that a project like this would have been very successful had more financial resources been available, and their estimate of what is sufficient resources ranges from R40 million to R100 million. The municipality agreed with this, and they further believe that this project started well but it did not get to where it should have and the main reason being resources, but other issues relate to their belief of how the money was used in the process. There is a belief from the municipality that the resources could have been used better, in fact they assert that, from their observation it looks like a lot of money went into the implementing agency.

DEAT official, on the other hand, is not quite convinced that the project was implemented in line with their understanding of a sustainable community. They agree with the other stakeholders that the concept was good, but the execution, not quite good. A number of reasons were given for this thinking and they range from poor implementation practices by the implementing agent to insufficient resources for a project of this nature, among others. Most importantly though, DEAT is of the view that initiatives like this need the collaboration from other government departments and although promises were made nothing tangible has come forth from other government institutions and this has compromised the project.

4.1.4 Introduction of project and its influence on community lifestyle

The project has had a great influence on the lifestyle of the Tsilitwa community. The Community Development Forum whose responsibility is to assist the community in getting whatever development initiatives exist out there speaks fondly of the influence of this project. They believe that the work ethics of the Tsilitwa people have improved as they have to wake up early and get to work. This is so not only for the families of the homesteads selected for the pilot, but for the community at large especially those that benefited from the project through jobs. In total 333 people were employed during the implementation phase of the project (DEAT Progress Payment Report, 2007).

There is a belief from the community development forum that poverty level in the area has improved, most people have cellphones and therefore communication has been greatly enhanced. Furthermore, skills from some of the youth in the area have been unearthed as part of the skills development process which was an integral part of the project. This is demonstrated through the fact that some of the youth have now physically build houses for themselves. The project has generally increased the economic activity of people in Tsilitwa and there are cases where women have bought cows and cars.

The Individual community members that benefited from the pilot homesteads have learned practical skills from the project. They were taught irrigation techniques and they have now departed from the traditional ways of planting only maize, they are now planting vegetables and selling to others within the community. One of the interviewed community members boasted that he *"used to plant maize in October but now I plant spinach cabbage, green pepper, potatoes and carrots and eat immediately. This project has indeed opened our minds; it taught us to be responsible…we now use tanks to harvest rain water. In some cases women have now started competing with husbands in terms of the knowhow of agricultural activities".* This is a clear indication that people have thrown away the stereotypes about whose responsibility it is to work in the garden, women feel they can compete in the same space and even do better. The Cooperative manager speaks of a personal experience when she says, *"before this project I did not have a job and it gave me my first opportunity to a decent job as cooperative administrator, I now work in the community post office…thanks to the training I received from the project."* This whole process introduced a new routine and work ethic in that she now had to wake up and go to work, she had to take

responsibility for things that happen in the cooperative and that was extended to generally how she lives her life.

4.1.5 Community benefits from the initiative

All the stakeholders agree that the project has greatly benefited the Tsilitwa community. During the interview the Community Development Forum members indicated that *"there is now a post office in the area through this project; we have a fenced field with sprinkler irrigation; there is general unity among community members; and most importantly the name of Tsilitwa was raised even politically".* Through this post office some permanent jobs have been created, in fact the former cooperative manager now works full-time in the post office, and at the time of the interview she was in the post office.

Figure 4.1. The Tsilitwa Post Office located next to the Cooperative

Short-term jobs have been created and people have been trained on a variety of skills and as a result of the training some people managed to get jobs outside Tsilitwa and that has given their families the much needed break from the vicious cycle of poverty. People in the community now have the much needed skills to start doing things on their own rather than to wait for handouts from government, some still plant the vegetables and sell. Through the project community members have been taught to be generally responsible for their lives. One of the key things that the project has done is to put Tsilitwa on a map, during the time of the implementation of the project various political and business leaders have visited the place. They now know what it can

offer and what its needs are and therefore there is a potential for more investment in the area. Most importantly the project has managed to bring the community together; there is a general sense of purpose in the community.

4.1.6 Negative unintended consequences of the project

Much as the community has been unified to some extent as a result of the project, there are elements of discord. There are those who question the selection criteria for the pilot homesteads. There are also issues that relate to why only 10 homesteads were selected. Since development is not only an economic activity but also a political one, there is a sense from the community members and the community development forum that there are signs of jealousy from the surrounding communities. The key area of concern being the attention that seems to be given to Tsilitwa at the expense of other areas. There is also evidence that it is difficult to keep any community together once the initiative that brought them together has ended. The community development forum has been struggling to get people to attend community meetings since the end of the project and this is seriously compromising the sustainability of the project against the intent of its name 'sustainable village'.

The challenge with any short term employment is that people become economically active at the time they have the job, but once the contract ends a number of things happen, and Tsilitwa has not been immune to this. Since the end of the project, there has been an increase in the repossession of furniture by store accounts, there has also been increase in reported cases of house breaking in the community. The Community Development Forum also gave an honest account of what they believe are the unintended consequences of this project when they say, *"a lot of taverns have opened in the area; there is jealousy from the surrounding villages and this has also extended to the political space. There has also been a generally poor attendance of community meetings, especially at the end of the project"*. DEAT and the local municipality are also of the view that there is a perception that this project is a one-man show i.e. the ward councilor does as he wants, and this may have alienated some of the community members who may not have agreed with how he want things to be done.

4.2 State of the Project and its potential for sustainability

4.2.1 Current activities since the end of DEAT funding

Since the end of DEAT funding, there are differing views among the key stakeholders on whether there are any activities that are taking place. The community development forum is the only stakeholder that believes there is something still happening. They quote some advice centre which was opened by a private company to provide advice to the community members on a variety of issues. However, all the other stakeholders i.e. the local municipality, DEAT, individual community members (including some who are members of the community development forum) as well as the cooperative manager believe that there is nothing currently happening. They claim to have had some promises from some government departments in particular the department of agriculture but none of those have materialized. In fact, the municipality presents a dim view of the project when they say *"nothing is happening now, the cooperative ended up operating like a spaza shop…they would stock and sell"*. What everyone agrees on though, is the fact that the individuals that benefited through the pilot homesteads are still planting the vegetables. This was confirmed through visits to five homesteads and the gardens were operational. Other than that there does not seem to be anything else taking place. As can be seen in the pictures below the cooperative has been locked for some time and has not been operational. In one of the pictures the sign post is on the ground indicating that the cooperative is in a state of decay.

Figure 4.2 The Tsilitwa Community Cooperative

The main challenge identified during the visits and confirmed by all the community members and the community development forum separately related to water supply. The community had been without water for sometime because they owed some money to Eskom for the electric pump

responsible for generating water, and as such the service had been discontinued. To counteract this challenge of water those that still run their gardens had to collect water from the river which is approximately three kilometers away. In essence, out of the four main activities of the project i.e. the co-operative, guesthouse, vegetable gardens and water supply to the community, only the vegetable gardens were still operational at the time of the data collection. What complicate matters for this community is the perception among them that the running of the cooperative was a one-man show as confirmed by the individual community members interviewed (including some who are part of the community development forum). Even worse, all the individual community members interviewed claim not to know whether the cooperative made any profit and if any what happened to the money.

Figure 4.7 The state of the vegetable gardens

4.2.2 Sustainability of the Project

DEAT and the community development forum are the main stakeholders who believe that the project has a chance of survival. They both agree that there is a need for further support from other partners and this could be government or private sector. Their view is that an initiative like this does not need a once off injection of money, but continuous funding and engagement with the affected community until a point where they can manage the project on their own. The community development forum believes that this project has opened their eyes and they have been to other areas like Free State and Mpumalanga to learn better ways of managing projects like this. On the other hand, 40 % of the interviewed community members do not believe that this project is sustainable whereas 60 % believe it is.

Figure 4.4. The Water Supply System for the Project

Those who believe it is sustainable agree on one thing and that is if the issue of water provision can be sorted, most of their problems would be resolved. Those who believe it is not sustainable blame the other community members for not heeding the call when they were all requested to contribute towards the payment of the Eskom account so that water provision could resume. The cooperative manager and the municipality strongly believe that much as the project had provided the necessary break for a lot of community members at the time of implementation, there is no future for it.

Figure 4.5 The state of the Guest House

From the visits to the homesteads as well as all the key project sites like the guesthouse cooperative and the water supply, it can be concluded that that this project is not sustainable. A concept like this one requires close collaboration between a lot of government departments as no one department can really claim the ability to put up and support in all respects a sustainable community. By funding a project of this nature, DEAT was living to its responsibility of being the custodian of sustainable development in the country, however this is one of those initiatives where they needed the partners most. The fact that there are suspicions from some key stakeholders (including some members of the community development forum) about the sincerity of the

implementing agent does not bode well for the success of the project. As demonstrated in the interviews some of the community members and the municipality believe that the implementing agent should step aside and allow them space to implement the project. This might prove difficult given that the project has been conceived and planned by the implementing agent with the community merely tagging along as beneficiaries.

Furthermore, if one considers the objectives indicated by Kline (1995) and quoted elsewhere in this report, it is clear that the main focus of this project has been on economic activities and to some extent, community participation. It can also be inferred that there was an attempt to improve the quality of life of the community members, especially the participants of the pilot homesteads. However, there does not seem to be any meaningful reference to ecological integrity as one of the four pillars. In simple terms, as Hempel (1999) puts it, the sustainable community concepts calls for interdisciplinary and cross-cutting approaches to problem framing and policy response.

4.2.3 How to improve the project?

Even though other stakeholders do not give the project any chance of survival going forward, when asked to provide their ideas on how it could be improved, they were very generous as indicate in table below. The table also contains various proposals from various stakeholders on what could be done to improve the project and thereby enhance its chances of sustainability.

Table 4.3 Stakeholders Proposal on how to Improve the Project

Stakeholder	Proposal for Improvement
Community Development Forum	• Government intervention on the water provision issue (engage with Eskom) • Fencing of fields • Use this project to pilot rural development as championed by the Department of Rural Development & Land Reform • Adoption of this project by the Development Finance Institutions
Individual Community Members	• Additional funding from government • Resolve the water provision issue • More community facilitation
Mhlontlo Local Municipality Representative	• Cut ties with the implementing agent – SVA (their fees are too high)
DEAT Representative	• Get other partners to get involved
Cooperative Manager (community member)	• Additional funding from government • Ensure good management

It is clear from the above table that additional funding and the unlocking of the water provision impasse are the main issues, in the immediate, that could see this project back on track. The issue of the engagement with the community in terms of what is expected of them came up very sharply as well from the individual community members interviewed. There is a general belief that if people know what is expected of them there is no reason why they would not comply especially on issues that relate to their development. It appears that much as there was a positive mood around the project at the beginning and during the implementation there was no clarity on the responsibility of the community members. This was demonstrated by their reluctance to pay a R50 per household at one point where they were required to do so in order to pay the Eskom account so that water provision could resume.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The study has demonstrated without any doubt that all the key stakeholders agree on what constitute a sustainable development. They all believe that such a community is self-reliant and has all the basic services and the necessary infrastructure. The reality though is that government contribution is key in achieving such a community and this is so for a number of reasons but mainly because communities on their own would never be able to provide the necessary infrastructure such a roads, electricity, basic services like water, etc as it has been demonstrated in this study that water provision has been cut off due to some outstanding debt to Eskom. This view is supported by Jacobs (1997) who believes that the implementation of sustainable development and the consequent development of sustainable communities is a state-based activity because the state influences the access individuals have to resources.

Much as government contribution is important, what should always be borne in mind is that this is a sustainable community and therefore it is about the community and their participation in the formulation of the indicators of success is vital. Fraser, Dougill, Mabee, Reed & McAlpine (2006) believe that community participation in the selection of indicators is important for two reasons, firstly because it is impossible to ensure that indicators chosen by 'development experts' will be relevant to local situations, local input is necessary to make sure indicators accurately measure what is locally important. Secondly, because the preliminary research shows local engagement may help build capacity to address future problems, and that this may be more significant than the results of the actual development projects.

It has been observed in this project, that the concept of a sustainable village has been defined in the main by the Sustainable Villages Africa (Pty) Ltd, who later became the implementing agent. This confirms the view expressed by Patel (2006) that decision-making tools in respect of sustainable development, and by extension sustainable communities, have been driven by the 'experts' with little community support. In the process of the development of this project there may have been some participation by the Community Development Forum, but there is no demonstration that the community would have actively engaged with the process except as beneficiaries and workers in the project. This is therefore the one lesson that should be learnt in

the process of planning and implementation of sustainable communities' concept. The role of the respective communities cannot be understated.

The second key lesson relates to the participation or non-participation of relevant government institutions in the development of sustainable communities. The study has demonstrated that even though there may have been gesture of good will from other government departments, nothing tangible has become of it. The former Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism undertook this initiative single handedly and there is no clear indication that there would have been concerted efforts from the department to bring in other relevant departments. This seems to have been left to the community to organize. Looking back at the definitions of the sustainable communities provided by all the key stakeholders, it is clear that this cannot be achieved by one government department. Sustainable community is not only about environmental management, but is also about socio-economic activities. Having realized that the concept for this village was mainly premised on agriculture, the department of agriculture should have been one of the leading departments. Others should have included the department of trade and industry in particular for the support to the cooperative, the department of water affairs as well as energy for the provision of water and electricity respectively. The local municipality, as the closest sphere of government is very key in the success of a project like this, however from the interviews they did not seem to be committing on anything. What was interesting though, was that they claim to have set aside some financial resources for a project like this in one of the villages in Tsolo, Mbutho village.

As I conclude, I would want to reiterate the fact that there is a synergy in terms of the understanding of a sustainable community from all the key stakeholders for this project. Furthermore, there is agreement in terms of what should be done to make the project even better. However, in its current format this project is not sustainable. There is no doubt that the concept is good and is workable, but there is a need for facilitation of all the role players if such an initiative is to succeed. The community of Tsilitwa is very energetic and enthusiastic about development all that is required is a close working relationship with whoever wants to invest in their area. If the community of Tsilitwa is to successfully implement a sustainable community initiative all the relevant government institutions must come to the party. The concept to be implemented must be canvassed with the community to ensure that it meets their requirements.

CHAPTER 6: REFERENCES

Agyeman, J., 2005: Sustainable Communities and the Challenges of Environmental Justice. New York, New York University Press.

Babbie, E., 2007: The Practice of Social Research. United States. Thomson Wadsworth.

Berg, B.L., 1989: Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences. Needham Heights. Allyn and Bacon.

Blignaut, J. & de Wit M. (eds), 2004: Sustainable Options: Development Lessons from Environmental Economics. Cape Town, UCT Press.

Bouahom, B., Douangsavanh, L. & Rigg, J., 2004: Building Sustainable Livelihoods in Laos: Untangling Farm for Non-Farm, Progress for Distress. Geoforum., 35: 607-619.

Creswell, J.W., 1998: Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions. Thousand Oaks. SAGE Publications.

Dobson, A., 1999: Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Social Justice. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Fitzpatrick, J.L., Sanders, J.R., and Worthen, B.R., 2004: Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines. Boston. Pearson.

Folke, C. and Kaberger, T., 1991: Recent Trends in Linking the Natural Environment and the Economy. (In Folke, C. and Kaberger, T., 1991: Linking the Natural Environment and the Economy: Essays from the Eco-Eco Group, eds. Dordrecht. Kluwer)

Foster, S., 2003: From Harlem to Havana: Sustainable Urban Development. Tulane Environmental Law Journal., 16: 783-808.

Fraser, E.D.G., Dougill, A.J., Mabee, W.E., Reed, M. & McAlpine, P., 2006: Bottom up and top Down: Analysis Indicator Identification as a Pathway to Community Empowerment and Sustainable Environmental Management. Journal of Environmental Management. 78: 114-127.

Goldie, J, Douglas, B. & Furnass, B., 2005: In Search of Sustainability (eds.). CSIRO Publishing, Australia.

Hempel, L.C., 1999: Conceptual and Analytical Challenges in Building Sustainable Communities. (In Mazmanian, D.A. & Kraft, M.E., 1999: Towards Sustainable Communities: Transitions and Transformations in Environmental Policy, eds)

http://thelapa.com/scripts/runisa.dll?DEAT:PGPROJREQ:762736273.9926:11,...2008/04/11

http://thelapa.com/scripts/runisa.dll?DEAT:PGPROJREQ:762736273.4416:24,...2008/04/11

Jacobs, M., 1997: The New Politics of the Environment. (In Jacobs, M., (ed), Greening the Millenium? The New Politics of the Environment: The Political Quarterly. Blackwell, Oxford).

Kline, E., 1995: Sustainable Community Indicators: Examples from Cambridge. MA, Tufts University Consortium for Regional Sustainability. Boston.

Kumar, R., 2005: Research Methodology: A step-by-step Guide for Beginners. London. SAGE Publications.

McKenzie, B., 1984: Ecological Considerations of Some Past and Present Land Use Practices in Transkei. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Meech, J.A., Mcphie, M., Clausen, K., Simpson, Y., Lang, B., Campbell, E., Johnstone, S. & Condon, P., 2006: Transformation of a Derelict Mine Site into a Sustainable Community: The Britannia Project. Journal of Cleaner Production. 14: 349-365

Mhlontlo Local Municipality: Integrated Development Plan 2011-2012 Review

Morra Imas, L.G. & Rist, R.C., 2009: The Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations. Washington DC. The World Bank.

Moss, M.L. & Grunkemeyer, W.T., 2010: Building Shared Visions for Sustainable Communities. Community Development. Vol. 41(2): 240-254.

Oche, C.Y., 1996: Drought Dimensions and Responses in Transkei, South Africa. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. 7 (1&2): 91-108

Oche, C.Y., 1997: Environmental Management in the Rural Setting: Indigenous Water Conservation Techniques in Transkei, South Africa. A paper presented at the South African Sociological Association Conference. University of Transkei, Mthatha, 6-10 July 1997.

Patel, Z., 2006: Of Questionable Value: The Role of Practitioners in Building Sustainable Cities. Geoforum. 37: 682-694.

Patton, M.Q., 1987: How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation. Newbury Park. SAGE Publications.

President's Council on Sustainable Development, 1997: Sustainable Communities Task Force Report. Washington, DC: GPO

Roseland, M., 1998: Towards Sustainable Communities: Resources for Citizens and their Governments. Gabriola Islands, BC: New Society Publishers

Sachs, J., 2005: The End of Poverty: How can we make it happened in our lifetime. London. Penguin Books

Tyson, P.D., 1986: Climatic Change and Variability in Southern Africa. Cape Town. Oxford University Press.

Williams, M., n.d.: Aid, Sustainable Developemnt and the Environmental Crisis.

World Commission on Environment and Development   (The Brundtland Report). 1987: Our Common
    Future. Oxford. Oxford University Press

Interview Guide for Community Development Forum
Tsilitwa Sustainable Livelihoods Project

Determine Understanding of Sustainable Communities

1. What is your understanding of a sustainable community/ sustainable livelihood?
2. What are the elements of a sustainable community/livelihood i.e. what are the activities that constitute such a community?
3. Has the project been implemented in accordance with your understanding of sustainable commumity/livelihood? If not please explain.
4. Has there been any change in terms of how you live your life since the introduction of the project? If yes please explain also indicating how you have been living your life before the project.
5. What are the main benefits (positive elements) for you or the community at large that have come from this project?
6. What are the negative elements that the project has brought to you or to the community at large?

Determine the State of the Project and its Sustainability

7. Since the end of DEAT funding are there any activities that continued to take place? If so what are those and who funded them?
8. In your opinion what is the current status of the project, is there anything still happening?
    a. What is the status of the cooperative? Is it making any profit and if so what do you do with the money?
    b. What is the status of the guest house? Is it making any profit and if so what do you do with the money?
    c. Do you still have any homestead with vegetable gardens? If so how many and what is their status?
    d. What is the status of the water supply system? Is it still working
9. Do you think this project is going to continue to survive i.e. is it sustainable? Please explain.
10. Is there anything that you think can be done to make the project better? Please explain.
11. Is there any other thing that you would want to say about the project, good or bad.

-the end-

Annexure B

Interview Guide/Questionnaire for Individual Community Members

Tsilitwa Sustainable Livelihoods Project

Interviewee Profile

Age		Gender		Educational Level	
Below 18		Male		None	
18 – 35				Below Grade 6	
36 – 50		Female		Grade 7- 9	
51 – 65				Grade 10 – 12	
Above 65				Tertiary level	

Determine Understanding of Sustainable Communities

1. What is your understanding of a sustainable community/ sustainable livelihood?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. What are the elements of a sustainable community/livelihood i.e. what are the activities that constitute such a community?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Has the project been implemented in accordance with your understanding of sustainable commumity/livelihood? If not please explain.

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Has there been any change in terms of how you live your life since the introduction of the project? If yes please explain also indicating how you have been living your life before the project.

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. What are the main benefits (positive elements) for you or the community at large that have come from this project?

………

………

6. What are the negative elements that the project has brought to you or to the community at large?

    ....

    ....

Determine the State of the Project and its Sustainability

7. Did you receive any form of training from this project? If so what kind and what are you doing with that skill now?

    ………

    ………

8. Since the end of DEAT funding are there any activities that continued to take place? If so what are those and who funded them?

    ………

    ………

9. In your opinion what is the current status of the project, is there anything still happening?

    a. What is the status of the cooperative? Is it still operational and if so do you think it is making any profit. What happens to the money if any?

        ……

        ……

    b. What is the status of the guest house? Is it making any profit and if so what do you do with the money?

        ……

        ……

    c. Do you still have a vegetable garden? If so what is its status and how are you maintaining it?

        ……

        ……

    d. What is the status of the water supply system? Is it still working and are you playing any role in its maintenance?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Do you think this project is going to continue to survive i.e. is it sustainable? Please explain.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Is there anything that you think can be done to make the project better? Please explain.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. Is there any other thing that you would want to say about the project, good or bad.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

-the end-

Interview Guide/Questionnaire for Cooperative Manager(s)

Tsilitwa Sustainable Livelihoods Project

Interviewee Profile

Age		Gender		Educational Level	
Below 18		Male		None	
18 – 35				Below Grade 6	
36 – 50		Female		Grade 7- 9	
51 – 65				Grade 10 – 12	
Above 65				Tertiary level	

Determine Understanding of Sustainable Communities

1. What is your understanding of a sustainable community/ sustainable livelihood?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. What are the elements of a sustainable community/livelihood i.e. what are the activities that constitute such a community?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Has the project been implemented in accordance with your understanding of sustainable commumity/livelihood? If not please explain.

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Has there been any change in terms of how you live your life since the introduction of the project? If yes please explain also indicating how you have been living your life before the project.

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. What are the main benefits (positive elements) for you or the community at large that have come from this project?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. What are the negative elements that the project has brought to you or to the community at large?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Determine the State of the Project and its Sustainability

7. Since the end of DEAT funding are there any activities that continued to take place? If so what are those and who funded them?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. What do you think is the link between the cooperative and the entire project?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. In your opinion what is the current status of the project, is there anything still happening?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. What is the status of the cooperative? Is it still operating and if so is it making any profit and what do you do with the money?

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Do you think this project is going to continue to survive i.e. is it sustainable? Please explain.

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. Is there anything that you think can be done to make the project better? Please explain.

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Is there any other thing that you would want to say about the project, good or bad.

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

-the end-

Interview Guide/Questionnaire for DEAT Official(s)

Tsilitwa Sustainable Livelihoods Project

Determine Understanding of Sustainable Communities

1. What is your understanding of a sustainable community/ sustainable livelihood?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. What are the elements of a sustainable community/livelihood i.e. what are the activities that constitute such a community?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Has the project been implemented in accordance with your understanding of sustainable commumity/livelihood? If not please explain.

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. In your opinion what do you think have been the main benefits (positive elements) for the community at large that have come from this project?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. In your opinion what do you think are the negative elements that the project has brought to the community at large?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Determine the State of the Project and its Sustainability

6. Since the end of the project has DEAT provide any after care to the project? If so in what form?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Did DEAT play any role in bringing to the fold other partners? If so who are those.

………
………

8. Are those partners currently playing any role in the project and what is that role.

………
………

9. What is the current involvement of DEAT with the project?

………
………

10. Overall, in your opinion what is the current status of the project, is there anything still happening?

………
………

11. Do you think this project is going to continue to survive i.e. is it sustainable? Please explain.

………
………

12. Is there anything that you think can be done to make the project better? Please explain.

………
………

13. Is there any other thing that you would want to say about the project, good or bad.

………
………

-the end-

Interview Guide/Questionnaire for Local Municipality Official(s)

Tsilitwa Sustainable Livelihoods Project

Determine Understanding of Sustainable Communities

1. What is your understanding of a sustainable community/ sustainable livelihood?

    …………………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. What are the elements of a sustainable community/livelihood i.e. what are the activities that constitute such a community?

    …………………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Has the project been implemented in accordance with your understanding of sustainable commumity/livelihood? If not please explain.

    …………………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. In your opinion what do you think have been the main benefits (positive elements) for the community at large that have come from this project?

    …………………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. In your opinion what do you think are the negative elements that the project has brought to the community at large?

    …………………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………………

Determine the State of the Project and its Sustainability

6. Has the municipality taken any special interest in this project? If so how, what are the things that you have done in this respect?

    …………………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. Has the municipality provided any funding to the project either in cash or in kind?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. What is the current involvement of the municipality with the project?

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. How has your support, if any, been received by the community?

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Overall, in your opinion what is the current status of the project, is there anything still happening?

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. Do you think this project is going to continue to survive i.e. is it sustainable? Please explain.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. Is there anything that you think can be done to make the project better? Please explain.

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Is there any other thing that you would want to say about the project, good or bad?

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………

-the end-