

FINAL

824 UGKA96

*Library*  
IRC International Water  
and Sanitation Centre  
Tel. +31 70 30 689 80  
Fax +31 70 35 899 84

Madelien  
Wegelin

THE TRANSITION PHASE OF THE KATWE URBAN PILOT PROJECT, KAMPALA

Evelien M. Kamminga

August 1996

824-UGKA-14045



## PREFACE

The main objective of the Katwe Urban Pilot Project (KUPP) was to assist the Government of Uganda in developing a community-based approach towards the improvement of water supply and environmental conditions in low-income urban areas. The community-based approach is believed to reduce overall costs and to enhance long-term sustainability of improvements.

KUPP was funded by UNDP, executed by the UNDP-World Bank Regional Water and Sanitation Group and implemented under the Ministry of Finance through Kampala City Council. Being a pilot project, an important aspect of KUPP is detailed documentation of the whole project process, the experiences obtained and the lessons learned. The 'Transition Phase' has been the last phase of the KUPP, a six-months period up to its termination in November 1995. During this period the project advisors withdrew and management responsibilities were handed over first to the national counterpart institution, the Kampala City Council (KCC), and then to 'the Katwe community'. The Transition Phase has covered a period of six months from June to November 1995.

The data presented in this report were gathered in June 1996, half a year after the termination of the Transition Period. While the major focus of this report is the Transition Period itself, some observations will also be given on the current situation.

Many people interviewed were actively involved in the parliamentary elections which took place on June 27th. Nevertheless all of them made time available to share their opinions. I would like to thank all community members, Kampala City Council staff, previous KUPP staff, UNDP, RWSG-EA and other people spoken to for the frank exchange of ideas.

Comments on the draft document by the core members of the Katwe community team, the total KCC team and RWSG-EA staff have been incorporated in this final version.

LIBRARY IRC  
PO Box 93190, 2509 AD THE HAGUE  
Tel.: +31 70 30 689 80  
Fax: +31 70 35 899 64  
BARCODE: 14045  
LO:

824 UGKA96



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Executive summary

1. Introduction
2. The handover
  - 2.1 Introduction
  - 2.2 Roles and responsibilities
  - 2.3 Focus of activities during Transition Period
  - 2.4 Financial aspects
3. Period of management by Kampala City Council
  - 3.1 Introduction
  - 3.2 Roles and activities
  - 3.3 Problems encountered
  - 3.4 Conclusion
4. Period of management by members of the Katwe community
  - 4.1 Introduction
  - 4.2 Roles and activities
  - 4.3 Financial situation
  - 4.4 Problems encountered
  - 4.5 Conclusion
5. Functioning of the organized groups
  - 5.1 Introduction
  - 5.2 Katwe Community Child Care (KCCC)
  - 5.3 Katwe Allied Progressive Association (KAPA)
  - 5.4 Katwe Women's Club (KWC)
  - 5.5. Katwe Urban Environmental Protection Association (KUEPA)
  - 5.6. Katwe Community Mobilization Committee (KACOMO)
  - 5.7 Conclusion
6. Sustainability of project results
  - 6.1 Introduction
  - 6.2 Sanitation
  - 6.3 Drainage
  - 6.4 Garbage collection and recycling
  - 6.5 Water supply
  - 6.6 Conclusion
7. Replicability of project activities
  - 7.1 Introduction
  - 7.2 Effective demand
  - 7.3 Strategies for replication
  - 7.4 Conclusion
8. Local political leadership
  - 8.1 Introduction
  - 8.2 Leaders and local environment
  - 8.3 Conclusion



9. Institutional linkages
  - 9.1 Introduction
  - 9.2 Kampala City Council
  - 9.3 National Water and Sewerage Corporation
  - 9.4 Private sector
  - 9.5 Other communities
  - 9.6 Conclusion
- 
10. Recommendations

## References

- |             |                   |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Appendix A. | Persons contacted |
| Appendix B. | Programme mission |
| Appendix C. | Revolving Fund    |





## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this report the last phase of the Katwe Urban Pilot Project has been described as the Transition Phase. In this six-months phase, management responsibility for the project was taken over by first the implementing agency, the Kampala City Council, and later by a community-based management team. As the remaining project funds were few, the primary focus of the activities was agreed to be on finishing started demonstration facilities, operation and management of facilities and services put in place under KUPP, and replication of facilities at full cost of the owner.

During the Transition Period, most project activities continued as agreed. Spontaneous replication of activities, however, has not really 'taken off'. Landlords and tenants have not been willing to invest in the facilities offered by the project, in particular VIP vault latrines and drainage improvement. Also the sales of charcoal-briquettes, made from recycled materials, are slow.

This does not mean that people in Katwe are indifferent about their living conditions. People are actually paying for using the public latrines and for water from the standposts built under KUPP. An unknown number of people is also paying streetboys for collection of garbage from their homes. Through local taxes they also contribute to the maintenance of main and secondary drainage and garbage removal. Some of the local officials (RC1's) play an important role in the environmental management in their zones. Much depends, however on the support they have from their community and the resources they can mobilize. Although by-laws for dumping of waste exist, the RC's have difficulties enforcing them.

The major reason behind the lack of effective demand for KUPP facilities is probably, that the project has been essentially supply driven during all its phases, the Transition Phase included. The technology options promoted are too limited in choice and not affordable for the majority of residents and landlords. There is still insufficient insight in what tenants and landlords really want and how much they are willing to pay.

The Katwe community team, which took over project management responsibility, is composed of members from the various 'organized groups'. These groups were trained by the project to supply the facilities and services promoted. They have now formed an association, KUDEP, which is in the process of being registered as a NGO. KUDEP is a community-based organization, but not a community-management organization in the sense that they represent the Katwe population as a whole. Their basic strategy is to find external resources to subsidize replication of project activities, particularly in the area of secondary drainage and latrine-building.

During the Transition Phase it became also apparent that Katwe needs reliable vertical and horizontal linkages and partnerships.

These areas have been insufficiently identified and targeted during KUPP. The fact that all parties involved (KCC, KUDEP, organized groups, RC's and community members) have their own interests should have been made explicit from the beginning, in order to be able to build on each party's strength.

In particular, KCC as the implementing institution, plays many, and partially conflicting, roles. It is responsible for providing trunk infrastructure as a public good. It is also responsible for facilitating off-site human and solid waste removal. In addition, KCC is responsible for the enforcement of regulations which can support community-based infrastructural development, in particular the Public Health Act and building laws. In the KUPP concept, KCC is also expected to support and facilitate community-based urban development and thus implicitly to promote community-level empowerment.

After the departure of the KUPP advisors and the taking over by KCC and the Katwe community team, this lack of partnership between KCC and Katwe community surfaced even more. Roles and responsibilities of all parties involved have never been clearly negotiated during earlier phases of KUPP. It could not be expected that much progress would be made during the Transition Phase since there was no neutral agency which could facilitate the process.

In order to significantly improve living conditions in a sustainable manner, Katwe will still need further outside assistance, preferably from another NGO, to introduce a genuine demand driven approach; to develop real low-cost options; to assess willingness to pay and the precise need for subsidization (preferably not any); to set up sound mechanisms for financing and operation & maintenance; to provide hygiene education; to actively involve women; and to further develop vertical and horizontal linkages and partnerships.

The Transition Phase contributed not only to the building of capacities of the members of the Katwe community team, but also made it possible to better understand and analyze the Katwe Urban Pilot Project as a whole.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The main objective of the Katwe Urban Pilot Project (KUPP) was to assist the Government of Uganda in formulating and testing replicable and sustainable community-based approaches for providing low-cost water, sanitation and waste disposal in urban informal settlements in Kampala (UNDP 1995).

KUPP was funded by UNDP and executed by the Nairobi based UNDP-World Bank Regional Water and Sanitation Group. While funds were desbursed through the host Ministry of Finance, the Kampala City Council was the implementing agency. The starting date was May 1993 and the date of termination was November 1995. The period described in this report covers the last six months of the project when responsibilities for project management were handed by the KUPP management team first to the Kampala City Council counterparts and later to a community-based management team in Katwe. This period is called Transition Period.

The project area, Katwe Parish, is one of the oldest low-income areas in Kampala. This pre-colonial parish which covers 0,5km<sup>2</sup> and has about 10,000 inhabitants who speak five different languages. About 30% of the households are headed by women. Most people are tenants and many of them stay in Katwe for only a short period of time. While many Katwe residents work outside Katwe, others come to work in Katwe. Katwe has two flourishing cottage industries, metal work and furniture making, in particular coffins.

The high population density and lack of space require an integrated approach towards environmental improvement. Katwe is located in a swampy valley and frequent flooding was identified by KUPP staff as people's highest priority problem. During KUPP the main drain was reconstructed and the problem of flooding was greatly reduced. The project has also tried to address problems in drainage at the secondary (neighborhood) and tertiary (household) level.

Most inhabitants live in overcrowded rented rooms which have minimal sanitary facilities and some none at all. The high watertable makes the use of vault latrines necessary. When filled, they are emptied into the open drainage or into pits dug for this purpose. KUPP tried to introduce new types of latrines (VIP vault and pour-flush) and to alter the sanitation system from essentially on-site to off-site. Demonstration facilities were installed in two of the seven zones in Katwe. For the problem of desludging, a manually operated pit emptier (MOPLE) was made, which can manoeuvre through narrow passways.

KUPP has tried to address the solid waste problem through setting up a garbage collection facility. Recycling of organic waste, was promoted through the establishment of a small cottage industry making charcoal briquettes from banana peels (bananas is the staple food).

Access to clean drinking water is poor and environmental conditions are such that water born and hygiene related diseases are widespread. Under KUPP two demonstration stand posts were installed which were to be managed as a collective facility. Also hygiene education was provided.

In summary, KUPP's implementation strategy has been as follows. As the major entry point into the community were chosen the local political leadership and existing 'organized groups'. Each group adopted an area of activity: latrine building; drainage; charcoal briquette making; solid waste collection; community sensitization and mobilization. Although their first goal was income earning, they were also expected to show commitment on a voluntary basis. The local leaders and the members of these groups were the major target group for training. The major focus was on training in technical and business management skills. Hygiene education and capacity building for community management received less attention.

In the KUPP concept, the primary concern was developing a community-based system for the delivery of services. It was felt that with the right designs demand could be promoted afterwards by sensitization and mobilization. Existing practices and preferences were not taken as a point of departure for technology development. The overall approach was more supply than demand driven.

The organization of this report is as follows. In chapter 2. the handover process will be discussed in terms of its timing, procedure, definition of roles and responsibilities and perceptions of the major actors. In the third and fourth chapter, the periods of management by KCC and Katwe community will be described, with an emphasis on the roles of the parties involved, the activities undertaken and the constraints. In the chapter 5. the functioning of the 'organized groups' during the Transition Period will be addressed. In chapter 6. and 7. the progress made in sustainability and replicability of project outputs will be discussed. Some aspects of the actual and potential role of the local political leadership receive attention in chapter 8. In chapter number 9. the existing institutional linkages of Katwe community will be discussed and assessed in terms of their ability to provide an enabling environment for the Katwe community to take charge of improving its living conditions. Conclusions and summary are combined in the Executive Summary. Finally, in chapter 10. (Recommendations) issues relevant for developing future programmes will be highlighted.

## 2. THE HANDOVER

### 2.1 Introduction

Handing over refers to the transfer of responsibilities from the KUPP management team to the KCC counterparts and later to a community-based management team. In this chapter some background of the handing-over process will be given.

### 2.2 Roles and responsibilities

According to the Memorandum of Understanding for the handover, the parties concerned agreed that:

- a) 'the management of the project' would be taken over for three months by the Kampala City Council counterparts and then be handed over to 'the Katwe community'. Following the organizational set-up of KUPP, the community had to provide counterparts to KCC before assuming full management responsibility. These were to be elected from the 'organized groups'.
- b) the KUPP Advisors would be working for three months on their final report and remain available for 'emergency backstopping' to the KCC.
- c) KCC would continue its legal obligations as implementing agency and would provide 'backstopping services as needed' to the Katwe community management team during the second part of the Transition Phase.
- d) RWSG-EA, on behalf of the World Bank and UNDP, would continue its legal obligation and managerial responsibility as executing agent, and would oversee the project, monitor its activities, provide routine backstopping as necessary and provide funding (KUPP 1995).

A number of people felt that KUPP had hardly involved community members in any decision making until just before the handover, and now they suddenly had to assume responsibility for running the project. In addition, they had not much confidence in the potential support role of KCC.

The role of KCC as 'backstopping' agency was defined as: 'advising the community based team on operations and management' (KUPP 1995). The possible role of KCC as 'facilitator' of community-based environmental management or its responsibility for creating an 'enabling environment' has not been addressed at this stage nor during earlier stages of the project (see chapter 9.).

### 2.3 Focus of activities during the Transition Period

Although it is not exactly clear what the status was of the CTA's 'Handover Notes' to his KCC counterpart, they give an idea of the expected direction and outputs (UNDP 1995). According to these

notes, budgetary constraints were such that no new activities should be started during the Transition period, but the ongoing construction of demonstration facilities should be completed. The overall focus of the Transition Phase should be promoting the replication at full cost by the Katwe general public. Mobilization and training, in particular business management training, need continuation. In addition, the Katwe community need to be capacity built for the taking over of the management of the project. The utilization of the Revolving Fund needs to be further defined (UNDP 1995).

During the Handover Meeting in June 1995 it was agreed, that taking into account of the budgetary constraints, the major focus of the activities during the Transition Period should be:

1. completion of ongoing construction activities,
2. sustainability of project outputs, and
3. replication at full costs (Hommelgaard 1995a).

#### 2.4 Financial aspects

Being responsible for 'the project' and having to spend a lot of time on its activities, the Katwe community team expected to be compensated financially. A compromise was found by providing a monthly allowance of US \$60 to five of the members up to the end of the Transition Phase.

A small amount of funds remained for project activities during the Transition Phase, while no further financing was foreseen after the termination of the project. It was expected that project activities would be replicated either at full costs or with financial assistance from other donor agencies. (UNDP 1995)

### 3. PERIOD OF MANAGEMENT BY KAMPALA CITY COUNCIL

#### 3.1 Introduction

On June 1st 1995 the Kampala City Council counterparts took full responsibility over the management of the project for a three-month period. In Katwe a Community Management Team was elected by members of the organized groups to be counterparts to the KCC management team.

#### 3.2 Roles and activities

During the three-months, period management meetings were organized by the KCC management in Katwe on a regular basis. Participants were the KCC team and the Community Counterparts. Weekly workplans were made and progress discussed. Returning points of discussion were:

- completion of unfinished works
- non-operational status of the desludger (Mople)
- maintenance of the primary drain
- payments into the Revolving Fund
- outside funding opportunities
- management of the organized groups
- workshops and visitors

In general, the KCC team was little involved in the daily implementation of activities. The Katwe community team and the organized groups were basically left on their own.

Progress was made in completing demonstration units, a pour-flush latrine and a secondary drainage system. Spontaneous replication at full cost, however, did not take place. None of the groups obtained new contracts (see 7.). KCC management suggested to the charcoal-briquette group (KWC) to start selling on the market.

Concerning the maintenance of facilities put in place during earlier phases of KUPP, efforts concentrated on the main drain. According to the 7/8/95 Minutes the Makindye RC3 accepted to contribute three laborers and a supervisor for desilting the main drain. A long term solution has yet to be found.

The KCC team provided some training to the Katwe community team in project management matters, in particular meeting techniques, planning and budgeting. Implementation matters such as the management of the Revolving Fund; community-level operation & maintenance and financing mechanisms; strategies to promote replication; lower cost technology options; were hardly addressed. Also no progress was made in solving the desludging problem.

In terms of developing 'an enabling environment' for the Katwe community to take charge of improving their environmental conditions, few initiatives were undertaken. To the dissatisfaction of the Katwe community team no noticeable advancement was made in:

- improving secondary solid waste collection services, and
- using law enforcement (Public Health inspection and building inspection) to encourage landlords to build and maintain sanitary facilities

### 3.3 Problems encountered

The collaboration between the KCC and the Katwe community team was not always optimum (Monitoring and Evaluation Team 1995b). To some extent, the KCC team members were personally held responsible for the shortcomings of KCC as an institution.

Discussions on who should take care of the maintenance of the main drain, 'the community' and/or KCC (RC3) continued during the Transition Phase. The ongoing decentralization process within the local government, particularly the more prominent role of the RC3 (divisional) level, seems to have contributed to some confusion during earlier phases of the project.

Another issue was that the KCC team wanted to utilize the remaining project funds for completing ongoing activities, while the Katwe Community team was more interested in using the funds for new activities (f.e. build demonstration models in zones which had not yet been covered) to possibly enhance demand and to provide some incentives to the organized groups. The Monitoring & Management team mentions in their May-June and July-August reports the problem of 'loss of morale' among members of the management team and the organized groups because there is no effective demand in the community and therefore no income earning (M&E 1995a and b). The Revolving Fund was meant to be used for replication activities, but the Katwe community team felt reluctant using this Fund while project funds were still available.

There were also differences in opinion concerning the recuperation of outstanding loans to the revolving fund. KCC urged the Katwe community team to recuperate the money, but the team members had difficulties getting payments from both individuals and organized groups. Some of them tried to renegotiate their debt, since fixed percentages for cost recovery never existed under KUPP (see Appendix C.). A complicating factor was that the Katwe community team is composed of elected organized group members, so they had a conflicting role to play.

### 3.4. Conclusions

The KCC team has 'managed the project' in terms of accountability and maintaining a structure. Rather limited has been their contribution in terms of preparing the Katwe community team for taking over and creating an 'enabling environment' for community-based environmental management. A relationship of 'partnership' was also during this phase not established (compare UNDP 1995 and see chapter 9.).



#### 4. PERIOD OF MANAGEMENT BY MEMBERS OF KATWE COMMUNITY

##### 4.1 Introduction

The Katwe community team was put in charge of 'the management of the project' on September 1st until the termination of the project on November 30st 1995. KCC had agreed to continue backstopping, while working on their terminal report. (KUPP 1995).

RWSG-EA staff paid regular visits during this period and also the UNDP Project Officer attended some of the management meetings. KCC's inputs during this period were largely restricted to administrative matters and the attendance of meetings.

Several of the Katwe community team members are also elected local officials, both at RC2 (parish) level and RC1 (zone) level. During the Transition Period the Katwe community team, composed of elected members from the organized groups, formed an association, the Katwe Urban Development Programme (KUDEP), which is currently in the process of being registered as an NGO.

##### 4.2 Roles and activities

It can be concluded from the Minutes of the held meetings, the Evaluation & Monitoring Reports (1995b, 1995c and 1995d) and the discussions held, that no significant changes took place compared to the first three months of the Transition Period, when the Katwe community team was already executing the activities on the ground. In addition, the budget restrictions remained the same.

According to the Minutes major issues addressed were:

- attendance of meetings and time management in general
- definition of team members' responsibilities
- fund raising
- functioning of the groups
- maintenance of the main drain
- finishing of demonstration facilities
- replication strategies and new contracts
- non-operational status of the MOPLE
- modification of handcart for garbage collection (KUEPA)
- lack of repayment into the revolving fund
- visitors

Weekly workplans were made and followed up in the management meetings. Demonstration facilities mentioned in the previous chapter, a secondary drainage system, a pour-flush and a vault-latrine were completed during this period. Major operation and management issues addressed concerned the 1st waterkiosk and the main drain.

In terms of replication, the following progress was made. The latrine-building group, KCCC, obtained a substantial contract with an Irish NGO, GOAL, and built 46 subsidized vault latrines in Banda, another low income area in Kampala. In Katwe itself one latrine was built on a 100% cost recovery basis. It seems that

in order to reduce the costs, the quality of the product has been compromised to the extent that the product is substandard and the customer dissatisfied (see chapter 5.). Apparently, no provision has been made for 'quality control' after the departure of the KUPP technical advisor. Both Katwe and KCC team members confronted with this issue, had the opinion that this should be KCC's responsibility.

The drainage group, KAPA, got a contract in Katwe for building a tertiary drain (household level). The client paid for the costs except for the concrete slabs which were still in stock and were provided for free. In addition, KAPA has been selling about 10 latrine slabs and some other products per month to clients predominantly from outside Katwe.

Solid waste collection by KUEPA reached a standstill during this period, because of internal problems and low profit. Group members had expected more revenues from selling materials for recycling. Apparently, they could not collect sufficient amounts of specific materials to be able to sell them. Katwe like other low-income areas does not produce much recyclable waste. The exception are banana-peels, which can be used for fodder.

Interesting is that no problem was encountered with people's willingness to pay a fee for garbage collection from their home. (Monitoring & evaluation team 1995c). In some zones garbage is currently collected for a small fee by streetboys. Also pick-ups come to the area to collect banana peels for animal fodder.

Charcoal-briquette production and sales continued at a low rate. The two water-kiosks were both put into operation and were developing into viable enterprises, but no replication has taken place. See for further details on the functioning of the organized groups chapter 5.

The group responsible for mobilization and hygiene education has been having problems, because members loose morale and lack motivation. Both the Katwe Management team and the Monitoring & Evaluation team believe that the only solution is finding economic incentives for them, since the group is not prepared to operate on a fully voluntary basis. In the past they have tried selling of t-shirts and calendars, but this has not turned into a real business venture (Monitoring & Evaluation team 1995ab).

The Monitoring & Evaluation team produced three reports during the Transition Period, and one summary report covering the whole period (1995a, b, c and d). These reports are of good quality, but they were not really used as a management tool by the Katwe community team.

The relationship between KCC and the Katwe team remained problematic. The KCC team was waiting for the Katwe community team to be asked for assistance, while the Katwe community team rarely asked for help and felt left on its own.

#### 4.3 Financial situation

Like in the first part of the Transition Period leftover project funds were utilized for implementation and for payment of allowances to the Katwe management (5) and Monitoring & Evaluation team (4), and to the KCC team (4).

During the whole Transition Period, the Revolving Fund has not been utilized. The balance was US\$ 2,264,850 on June '95 and US\$ 2,877,893 on Nov. '95. The increase is caused by back payment of loans mainly during the first three months of the Transition Period when KCC pushed the issue. Up to date (July 1996) outstanding debts total ± 2 million US\$.

The objective of the Revolving Fund as being defined by KUPP staff is 'replication of project activities'. Guidelines for its utilization and management, however, were left to be developed 'by the community' during the Transition Period (UNDP 1996:40).

When asked, the Katwe community team, explained that they considered the amount of money in the Revolving Fund as rather small for starting a community-based loan scheme and therefore had decided to utilize the fund for establishing themselves as an NGO. This way they could indirectly contribute to replication of project activities (see 7.3).

The Katwe community team succeeded in mobilizing some external resources for the construction of 46 latrines in another low-income area in Kampala, but no further funding was received for Katwe. Contacts with potential donors have been established and proposals written. It is likely that in 1996 some funds will be made available for secondary drainage construction and maybe for replication of some other activities.

#### 4.4 Problems encountered

The Katwe community team itself perceives as the major problem that there is not sufficient demand for the services offered by the organized groups. Community members are not willing to pay the full price and so far replication has not yet taken off. As a result the group members have received little income and begin to lose morale. They see two solutions: 1. offer more affordable technical options and 2. finding additional funding to subsidize the services. The second solution is getting priority and much effort is being put into finding donors.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the taking over of the management of the revolving fund has not been easy, because the Katwe community team does not have legal nor legitimate authority to make people repay their loans. In addition, some of the members owe money to the fund themselves.

The Katwe Management Team, being composed of organized group members and local politicians, is assumed to be representative of 'the Katwe community' as a whole (UNDP 1995; KUPP 1995). However, many people in Katwe associate KUPP and KUDEP with

business and politics, and do not consider it an organization representing their interests. As mentioned in 2.2 during KUPP, community participation has taken place mainly through the organized groups. The general public has been little involved. Combining community development, business and politics and maintain credibility has proven to be difficult (compare Wright 1996).

#### 4.5 Conclusion

The Katwe community team has continued the project in the spirit of KUPP. Despite limited funds they made progress in completing demonstration models. They have concentrated on service delivery by the organized groups and finding money to subsidize activities in the area of drainage and latrines. The supply and income generation focus of KUPP has been maintained throughout the Transition Phase.

The Katwe community team, however, does not (yet) seem to have legitimate authority within the community nor effective influence on Katwe people to commit themselves to improving their environmental conditions. KUDEP is a 'community-based organization', but not a 'community management organization', which is representative for the community as a whole (compare Evans et al 1993). It seems that this important distinction was not totally understood by the KUPP management team.

## 5. FUNCTIONING OF THE ORGANIZED GROUPS

### 5.1 Introduction

In the KUPP concept the 'organized groups' have been the entry point into Katwe community and became the cornerstones of the project. Three of the groups (KWC, KCCC and KAPA) were existing groups and two of them (KACOMO and KUEPA) were especially created for the project. KUPP expected the members to be both volunteers and entrepreneurs; to represent and to serve the people, and to start viable businesses (UNDP 1995).

These groups played an important role in technology development and received a good amount of technical and business management training. Together with the local leaders (RC1's and RC2) these groups were the major focus of the project's capacity building efforts (UNDP 1995). The established Katwe management team is composed of members of these organized groups. Some of them are also local political leaders.

### 5.2 Katwe Community Child Care (KCCC)

KCCC is an older community group which receives assistance from an American NGO, Assistance Feed the Children, to buy school materials, to pay school fees and to organize parties for children. Currently there are over hundred members (mainly parents) and there is an executive committee of 8 members.

At the beginning of KUPP, KCCC was selected to provide people to start a latrine building enterprise. Later on this sub-group of KCCC also showed interest in the operation of the MOPLE. The latrine building group within KCCC has 7 members. The RC2, chairman of the Katwe management team and KUDEP, and RC1 of Musoke zone are among them.

The primary objective of the group members has always been income generation. They were involved in design development and the construction of 3 models: 3 vault latrines and one pour-flush latrine. The group has fully repaid its loan to the Revolving Fund (see appendix C.).

During the Transition Period the group got a contract to build 46 stance VIP latrines in Banda, another low-income area in Kampala. Activities undertaken during the same period in Katwe were the completion of a private pour-flush latrine (subsidized by KUPP) and the construction of a private vault-latrine (at full cost). The client, an elderly woman, paid for the latrine an amount of Ush 300,000 which equals 5 months rental income which is her main source of income.

As mentioned before (4.2) the quality of the latrine was compromised in order to reduce the costs for the client. There is no improved slab and the vault is so small that one of the two toilets can not be properly used because the hole is too close to the wall. There seems to have been limited communication with

the client on design matters and no supervision or quality control. The client initially approached the local leader, RC1, of her zone for assistance in building a new latrine. He recommended her to contact KCCC. Later on the client went to complain to the same person, but did not receive any help. RC1 has a vested interest since he is member of the latrine building group.

A related problem here is the monopoly currently held by the KCCC group in terms of latrine building. There is no competition (compare Wright 1996).

Desludging was and still is a serious problem in Katwe. One of the three demonstration models is out of use, because the owner does not want to pay for emptying it. Emptying would in this case mean digging a hole and put the sludge, because KCC cesspool emptier cannot reach this spot. In fact, most of Katwe can not be reached by the vehicles currently operated by KCC.

The Manually Operated Pit Latrine Emptier (MOPLE) which was developed by KUPP on basis of a design used in Tanga, Tanzania, has not been put to use during the Transition Period, although the issue was raised at almost every management meeting. Progress was made in obtaining permission from NWSC to dump the effluent into the sewerage system at no costs. Now KCCC has to identify an inlet into the sewerage system. There are some technical issues to be solved as well. It seems that KCCC is reluctant to take over the responsibility of running the machine. They need further capacity building.

KCC has not contributed much to solving Katwe's desludging problem. It is not clear to which extent the public and private good aspects of this problem have been assessed and negotiated during KUPP. A role may play that KCC is a stakeholder being a cesspool operator itself. There is little competition in this field (see 9.2).

During earlier phases of KUPP, KCCC was involved in hygiene education, but this activity stopped during the Transition Period (Monitoring & Evaluation 1995a, b).

Group members have taken little initiative in promoting improved sanitation and finding more affordable but still appropriate technical solutions for Katwe people. Their basic attitude seems to be to stick to the KUPP prototypes and wait for donors. The group members all have other sources of income and do not depend on latrine-building for a living.

### 5.3 Katwe Allied Progressive Association (KAPA)

This is a group of cadres who opted for the drainage component as a business venture. Before KUPP they were earning some income for their organization by transporting bananas and potatoes. About 25 members were trained in fabricating concrete parts for primary, secondary and tertiary drainage and high quality latrine slabs which are reusable.

During the Transition Period KAPA completed the construction of a secondary demonstration drainage in Nawanku. They received one new contract, the construction of a tertiary drain in the compound of a resident of Nawanku. The client paid for all cost except for the concrete slabs which were provided for free from the leftover stock of KUPP. So far, KCCC has not been utilizing KAPA built slabs for their latrine building activities.

According to KAPA's sales records (October 1995 - June 1996) slabs are the most sold product, 10-20 per month. Manhole covers, culverts and other products are sold at a lower rate. Buyers come from a radius of about 5 miles. So far, only a handful of slabs and other products have been sold in Katwe. Production rates are adapted to sales. During the Transition period the average number of days worked per month was 1 1/2. After some reorganization, the number of active people was reduced to 4, and during the first half of 1996 they worked an average of 4 days per month.

Also during the Transition period KAPA was not involved in maintenance issues; these were considered the responsibility of KACOMO and RC2 (Monitoring and Evaluation 1995a). KAPA members believe that RC1s should take a lead in mobilizing the landlords to improve the drainage conditions and residents to maintain them.

Like KCCC, also KAPA members cannot rely on their KUPP activities for a living. The core group, however, seems dynamic and is in the process of establishing themselves as an independent association. They hope to be able to get access to a loan to purchase a machine to fabricate cement blocks. Diversification is their goal. In contrast to some of the other groups they see their future not related to KUDEP. This group has by far the highest amount of debt to the Revolving Fund, almost 2 million Ush (see Appendix C.).

#### 5.4 Katwe Women's Club (KWC)

Before KUPP, KWC was a group of about 30 women earning money with chapatis and selling of handicrafts. They also made traditional fuel products out of mud and charcoal dust. About 8 of them decided to take up the charcoal-briquette production under KUPP. Bananas being staple food in Katwe, it was thought that recycling of banana-peels would contribute to solving the solid waste problem. A small cottage industry was established using intermediate technologies for solar drying, carbonizing and briquette pressing.

According to the record book an average of 1-3 women worked for 5 days per month to satisfy the demand during the Transition Period, and this pattern continued during the first half of 1996. The major problem perceived are the sales. They are low and mainly to customers from outside Katwe. The product is considered to be high quality, but relatively expensive. Other factors hampering sales seem to be unfamiliarity with the product and limited sales techniques. Sales take place predominantly from the workshop which is closed most of the time. The product is not

available on the market of Katwe. This may seem odd, especially given the fact that the women involved are businesswomen. The explanation seems to be lack of ownership feeling. The group has received a lot of attention and had visitors from all over the world. The group had an invitation to go to the Habitat Conference in Istanbul, and is now invited to a workshop in Burkina Faso on recycling technologies.

#### 5.5. Katwe Urban Environmental Protection Association (KUEPA)

KUEPA was newly established during KUPP with the goal to take care of solid waste management in Katwe. The idea was to collect garbage for a small fee from the homes, sort it and then sell it to traders for recycling.

During the Transition Period, waste collection gradually declined and came to a standstill (Monitoring & Evaluation 1995a and b). The following reasons are given:

- a) inconvenience of the used hand cart,
- b) internal problems (financial transparency and management), and
- c) low profit from selling due to small scale of the operation

Some of the internal problems were solved with the help of KUDEP, but the group members did not resume the activity. This group has not paid back anything of their loan to the Revolving Fund (see Appendix C.).

An interesting lesson has been that there is an effective demand for primary waste collection. Many people in Katwe have shown to be willing to pay a small fee for such service. In Nawanku zone, streetchildren are currently collecting garbage from the homes for a small fee. They bring the garbage to skips placed by KCC at different places in the community. Although secondary waste collection by KCC trucks has improved, the capacity of the skips and the frequency of emptying are not yet sufficient. In addition to the normal fee, RCI's have to pay drivers an incentive to come to Katwe.

#### 5.6. Katwe Community Mobilization Committee (KACOMO)

KACOMO was formed during KUPP with the goal to promote the technologies and services offered by the groups through a programme of community sensitization (UNDP 1995). In addition, KACOMO was expected to give a contribution in hygiene education, establishing sustainable operation & maintenance mechanisms, and conflict resolution within the organized groups (Monitoring & Evaluation 1995 a,b,c).

During the Transition Period KACOMO was not very active and activities gradually phased out. The group members started to loose interest due to lack of economic incentives (Monitoring & Evaluation 1995a and b). They have tried selling of t-shirts and calendars, but earnings were little. A proposal to start a drama-group was rejected by KUPP staff on the advice of RWSG-EA because of lack of funds.



During the Transition period, software aspects were to a certain extent handled by KUDEP, in particular the RC2. During the first half of 1996 KACOMO has not undertaken any project related activities.

### 5.7. Conclusion

During the Transition Period, three of the groups, KCCC, KWC and KAPA, had problems due to lack of demand for their services both within and outside Katwe. KUEPA met enough community interest but the members found the work too cumbersome and the earnings too low. KACOMO did not succeed in finding any profitable venture and the members lost motivation.

It has not been possible to fully assess the managerial and technical capacities of the groups. The groups could benefit from better established vertical and horizontal linkages. KCC has been mentioned in the context of desludging, secondary garbage collection and quality control. Collaboration with other communities could expand markets and assist in problems of scale (f.e. sorting materials for recycling).

In order to protect the customer, a system for quality control is required. Involving the private sector and breaking the monopoly of the groups may also have a positive effect on demand.

In the KUPP approach, the organized groups are expected to play two roles: supply the services required to improve water supply and sanitary conditions, and represent the demand side. However, despite the involvement of the groups in the design process, there is no effective demand for the technologies. Various factors seem to be at stake:

- group members do not depend on the group activity for a living; it is a complementary source of income
- the design process has been essentially technology driven
- the existing private sector has not been given sufficient opportunity to participate
- the idea that new donors will be found and subsidies will continue to be available

The organized groups are currently operating below capacity or are inactive. The members are waiting for new income opportunities in the future to arise. New opportunities can be a result of outside funding; new mobilization and sensitization efforts; enforcement of laws and by-laws on landlords; a new credit scheme etc.

## 6. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT RESULTS

### 6.1 Introduction

In this chapter the sustainability aspects of the services and facilities provided under KUPP will be discussed. A certain overlap with the previous and next chapter is unavoidable.

The KUPP approach has been to fully or partially pay for facilities which had a demonstration function. As a result, all facilities built before the Transition Period have been subsidized.

In order for people to decide for themselves to replicate a model, they need sufficient information on the financial, maintenance, organizational etc. aspects. of owning such facility.

### 6.2 Sanitation

During KUPP, two demonstration latrines (ventilated improved vault) were constructed. In the Transition Phase a pour-flush latrine was constructed as a model. Up to date, however, there is no water connection, because the owner found its construction too costly.

The two demonstration latrines in Nawanku and in Musoke zone are privately owned by landlords and have a combined private and public function. The landlord's renters can use the latrine for free, while others have to pay for every time they use it. The KUPP concept was that this way latrines can (partially) pay for themselves.

#### **Nawanku demonstration latrine**

This latrine was utilized during the Transition Period but went out of order in the beginning of 1996, because it was full. According to a survey held in March 1995 an average of 40-45 people were using it on a daily basis. It was estimated that the latrine will have to be emptied every nine months (UNDP 1995).

The information received on why the landlord does not empty the latrine is somewhat confusing. KUDEP members said the problem is that the KCC cesspool cannot reach the latrine and the MOPLE is not yet functioning. Renters said that the landlord does not want to pay for emptying (there are traditional (on-site) ways), because she considers it a KUPP facility despite its formal 'handover' to her.

#### **Musoke demonstration latrine**

The demonstration latrine in Musoke is still in operation and kept in a proper state by an attendant. The total costs of the facility (4 stances) was Ush 1,275,000 of which the owner had to pay 23%. By the end of the Transition Period

80% of the loan was paid off to the Revolving Fund (KUPP 1995).

Two stances are reserved for the renters of the owner and two for the public. This latrine has to be emptied every 5 months. The KCC emptier can reach this latrine. The owner of the latrine raised the users' fee from Ush 50 to 100 to meet the increasing costs for desludging. It can be concluded from various interviews that there are official and unofficial rates, and that the drivers are quite autonomous. The number of customers varies per season (more in the wet season), but is seldom more than 10 per day.

None of the project participants (the owners of the latrines, KCCC, KUDEP, KCC) was able to give a clear overview of the projected and real operation & maintenance costs of the latrines. What is the economic feasibility of such a latrine when built at full costs? What is the expected price of services by the MOPLE?

As mentioned before, there has been one replication at full costs (5.2). This experience questions the technical skills of KCCC members to modify the prototype design and to find more acceptable and affordable solutions, and also their social and marketing skills. The group lacks also supervision. There is no community organization or other facilitating agency who fills this gap.

### 6.3 Drainage

#### **Main drain**

In the opinion of Katwe people and KCC staff spoken to, the major accomplishment of KUPP has been reducing the problem of flooding by reconstructing the main drain. The question of its maintenance, however, has remained an unsolved problem (see UNDP 1995 and Monitoring & Evaluation 1995). Discussions between KCC, RC2, RC1's and KUDEP members on who is responsible for maintaining the main drain continued throughout the Transition Phase. The community paying taxes to the municipality, tried to push full responsibility up to KCC, while KCC tried to push (part of) the responsibility back down. Once the RC3 stepped in to finance urgent desilting. Although KCC agreed to be responsible for this trunk facility, it was not until June 1996 (just before the elections) that KCC came forward with an amount of US\$ 500,000 for cleaning of the main drain. KCC expected Katwe and neighboring communities to show some commitment by providing workers. It seems that nobody wants to take full responsibility.

Without going too much in detail, relevant points seem to be:

- a) negotiations on maintenance issues were not finalized before construction took place; there was not even a sound maintenance system when the drain was handed over to the community (compare M&E 1995a)

- b) there seems to be a contradiction in terms when a trunk facility is 'handed over' to a community such as Katwe, and
- c) KCC, being the implementing agency of KUPP, is also responsible for providing trunk infrastructures.

### Secondary drainage

Two secondary drainage systems (Nawanku and Musoke) were constructed as demonstration facilities and fully paid by KUPP, including all labour. The Nawanku system was completed during the Transition Phase.

It seems that in both zones the drains are insufficiently kept clean, and dumping of human and solid waste is continuing.

According to the KUPP concept, maintenance of secondary drains is the responsibility of community members and their leaders. Developing mechanisms for cleaning and control on dumping was a task of the mobilization component of KUPP, the advisor and KACOMO. After the handover these activities stagnated (see 5.6).

No information was collected on the Musoke situation. In Nawanku zone, the local leader (RC1) considers the maintenance of the secondary drain 'his' responsibility. The people in Nawanku are currently contributing to the up keep of the drains through their monthly fees paid to the RC1. The amount leftover for the upkeep of the drainage system, however, is insufficient to properly maintain the system (see chapter 11.). In Chapter 11. we shall discuss the issue of by-laws.

While Nawanku residents are actually contributing to the upkeep of the secondary drainage system by paying taxes, dumping of waste remains a problem. In addition, hygiene education has had little impact on people's behavior. By-laws exist to some extent but are seldom enforced (see chapter 11.).

Similar to the primary drain, a system for the upkeep was not fully established before the construction started. In addition, people are not likely to consider themselves as owners of an infrastructural facility, if they have not participated in any sense in the development of such systems.

## 6.4 Garbage collection and recycling

### Garbage collection

The KUEPA group has not (yet) succeeded in setting up a reliable and sustainable system of garbage collection. In fact, the activity has stopped to exist. The members find the primary collection fees too low, the work too cumbersome and the profit from selling sorted materials for recycling too little as they cannot meet the required quantity of sorted materials.

Garbage collection from homes, however, is an existing private activity of the poorest of the poor in Katwe. The scale of the

activity, however, is not known. Important is that residents are prepared to pay for this service. Mentioned earlier is the existing private business of collection of banana peels for fodder. This activity is so profitable that motorized transport is utilized.

Removal of solid waste by the municipality has improved over time, but the community has no influence on this service. It seems, KCC is not accountable for the number of skips placed nor the number of times per week they are emptied. Similar to the cesspool emptiers, fees for removal are not fixed but depend on negotiations between drivers and in this case RC1's. RC1's pay from the same fees mentioned in the previous paragraph.

### Recycling

KWC charcoal-briquette making seems a technically and managerial sustainable activity. The availability of raw materials, banana peels, is no problem. Sales, however, are so far insufficient for the activity to be more than a supplementary source of income for a few women. Since no marketing study has been undertaken it is at this point not clear what the marketing potential of the product is. The women themselves see two major constraints:

1. unfamiliarity of potential customers with the briquettes, and
2. many people prefer to use faster cooking fuels such as kerosine and ordinary charcoal.

Up to date the contribution of this activity to the organic waste problem of Katwe as a whole is minimal.

### 6.5 Water supply

To the dissatisfaction of KUPP management, water supply was never adopted by an 'organized group' (UNDP 1995). According to the KUPP concept, water is a public good, should be provided at the lowest price and be managed by a committee including water users. Profits made are to be put into a special revolving fund to be used for construction of more communal water points (UNDP 1995). This lack of business perspective may be one of the reasons why the organized groups were not interested.

KUPP built two demonstration stand posts, both in Nawanku. The first one was at 20% cost recovery basis, the second one at 45%. The two stand posts were relatively easy to install (connected to NWSC water supply) at an average cost of about 1 million USH. From the start, however, there were misunderstandings on ownership (private or public) and other organizational and managerial problems. These issues continued during the Transition Period.

The Monitoring & Evaluation Team stated in their May-June 1995 report that "the first kiosk has proven to be a viable and replicable facility if management is effective and transparent". In the next report (July-August) they mention the non-existence

of management committees and the September-October report they wonder 'what is happening with the committees'. Residents spoken to consider the water points as private property of the respective landlords and RC leadership.

Both water points have a paid attendant. One 20 liter jerrican costs 50 Ush, but three jerricans cost only 100 Ush (price fixed by KUPP Advisors). In whole Katwe piped water is sold by families having house-connections. The prices is the same USH 50 per jerrican, but no reduction is given for 3 jerricans. Water vendors also sell for 50 Ush. per jerrican, but they get free water from contaminated sources in Katwe. There seems to be little awareness among the population of the effects of using contaminated water.

No detailed information on the operation & maintenance costs of the water points was obtained. At KUDEP level no information was available on the amount available in the Revolving Fund for water activities. While the loan for the first water kiosk has not yet been paid back, the loan on the second has been paid off (see Appendix C.). Participants of the KUDEP Management Orientation Workshop held in December 1995 identified water supply as one of the most promising income generating activities to support KUDEP in the future (KUDEP 1995).

## 6.6 Conclusion

During KUPP the major focus was on technology development and putting up demonstration models. Since the project had only 2 years, there was a feeling of hurry and software aspects therefore tended to be neglected. According to insiders, sometimes negotiations on cost recovery took place after the utility was built.

The handover of the project was premature in the sense that mechanisms for operation & maintenance were not yet fully established or even agreed upon. There are various reasons why during the Transition Period not much progress was made in this respect. KUDEP nor any of the organized groups has been particularly dealing with these issues (compare Wright 1996). The contribution of the RC's has been variable. Finally, and maybe most important, all parties involved (KCC, KUDEP, organized groups, RC's and community members) were stakeholders. There was no neutral entity to facilitate bargaining processes.

Information on the sustainability of the various project services and facilities in terms of running costs, capital costs and income could help the groups to make management decisions and are a prerequisite for people to decide for themselves if they want to invest effort and resources in such activities.

## 7. REPLICABILITY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

### 7.1 Introduction

Probably the issue of most concern to all parties involved in the project is the lack of effective demand of the Katwe residents for what the project has to offer; there has been few examples of spontaneous replication of the proposed facilities, both at individual and more collective level.

Only few people may have been willing to invest their resources in the suggested facilities, but quite a number of people have shown to appreciate them and to be prepared to pay for services: public latrines, clean water and garbage collection. In addition, most people are contributing through paying their taxes to the upkeep of the installed facilities, in particular primary and secondary drainage and garbage removal.

### 7.2 Effective demand

Demand is defined here as people's willingness to invest in the replication of proposed facilities.

On basis of the held interviews a list of possible factors can be made why replication did not 'take off' during the Transition Period:

- a. affordability: the offered products (VIP latrines; drainage components; briquettes; standposts) are just too expensive; all parties spoken to agree that they are not 'low-cost',
- b. appropriateness: the project has not been real demand-driven; offered technologies are not based on felt needs and preferences; no low-cost options for improvement of existing facilities or options for upgrading,
- c. awareness of potential health benefits: seems to be low; hygiene education did not receive enough priority in KUPP,
- d. perception of the existing situation: the most urgently felt problem, flooding of large parts of Katwe, has been solved with the help of KUPP and Irish Aid. Prioritization of other problems was not detailed enough.
- e. promotion strategy: the number of demonstration facilities is too small and too few options; only two out of seven zones have a model. In addition, there was too much reliance on the organized groups for dissemination.
- f. socio-cultural factors: these have not sufficiently been taken into consideration or were not effectively addressed:
  - tenure situation: no public land; most residents are tenants and not owners of the land and houses. The landlords have not sufficiently been targeted;

- problem of transition: a large part of the population does not have roots in Katwe and stay only temporarily
  - lack of cohesion within Katwe: many different ethnic and socio-economic groups; many people live in Katwe but work elsewhere and other way around
  - role of women: women have not been explicitly targeted and have little participated in all aspects and all phases of the project.
- g. reputation of the organizations involved: KUDEP, organized groups, KCC and RC's wear different hats at the same time,
  - h. monopoly of organized groups: may have a negative effect on the price and quality of the products; the potential of the private sector has not been utilized,
  - i. perception of responsibility: lack of definition of ownership and responsibilities; Memoranda of Understandings can not force commitment,
  - j. unclear cost recovery policy: guidelines for cost recovery are not well defined and not consequently followed,
  - k. donor dependency: donors are expected to provide subsidies; expectations of continued assistance were raised by concept of 'pilot project'. (Compare Blackett 1994; Evans et al 1990; Evans 1992a).

### 7.3 Strategies for replication

According to the final report of KUPP staff, replication during the Transition Period was to be promoted by social marketing and product marketing. In addition, it was considered necessary to follow a participatory planning procedure at neighborhood level to identify problems, needs, available resources, technical options, costs and methods of payment etc. This important but complex task was given to KACOMO, the organized group for mobilization and sensitization, and would have to be coordinated by the Katwe Development Agency (KADEVA), later called KUDEP. (UNDP 1996:104).

Unfortunately, as was discussed earlier (chapter 3., 4. and 5.) these activities received not much attention during the Transition Phase for different reasons.

Earlier during KUPP the costs recovered from the demonstration facilities were put into a Revolving Fund. This fund was meant to function as a credit scheme for replication. 'The community' was supposed to decide on the use of the fund (UNDP 1995:40). As mentioned in 3.3 and 4.3, during the Transition Period the fund was managed by KCC and later by the Katwe management team and KUDEP. No loans for replication were provided during that period. Also in the first half of 1996 no loans were provided directly



for this purpose. The Revolving Fund, however has been indirectly used for replication, by funding KUDEP establishing itself as an independent NGO. According to KUDEP's financial statement Dec 1st - May 17th 1996, about 2/3 of the content of the Fund has been utilized for the construction of an office and a timber business shade; purchase of an electrical typewriter; and payment of monthly salary of a secretary and office costs. A balance of about Ush 900.000 is remaining, with almost 3 million still outstanding in loans (see appendix C.).

#### 7.4 Conclusion

Further replication of project activities within Katwe will probably to a large degree depend on:

- the organized groups' attitudes, motivation and ability to adapt their products and services to community members' needs, priorities and willingness to pay; they will have to get the design right and provide good value for money,
- KUDEP's success in finding donors who are willing to subsidize replication,
- the supporting role of local leadership (chapter 8.), and
- the 'enabling environment' (chapter 9.).

## 8. LOCAL POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

### 8.1 Introduction

The RC-system (Resistance Councils) was part and parcel of the National Resistance Movement. During the Transition Phase the name was still RC-system, but now it is called LC- (Local Councils) system. Its function seems to have remained the same. The lowest level is the village or zone; Katwe parish is divided in 7 zones. The RC1's, are directly elected by the population in their zone (every 3 years). The ballot is not secret. The RC2 (parish level) is elected by the RC1's. The RC2 and RC1's do not receive a salary.

### 8.2 Leaders and local environment

In the KUPP approach the local political leaders, the RC2 and RC1's in particular, were used as an entry point into the community and a tool for mobilization. They were invited to various seminars. (UNDP 1995). During the Transition Period several political leaders were incorporated into the project to the point that they were chairman of the Katwe management team and director of KUDEP, and member of various organized groups. As such the political leaders have become stakeholders in the supply side of the project. This may have both advantages and disadvantages.

The Katwe experience has shown that some RC1's are more active and committed than others (UNDP 1995). During the Transition Period most activities have continued to be concentrated on two zones in Katwe, Nawanku and Musoke. It is in these zones that the RC1's have been and still are most involved in the project.

It is not clear from the UNDP 1995 document to which extent project activities have been building upon existing roles of local leaders and have tried to enhance these. While the local leaders have potentially an important role to play there are constraints as well. Their potential role is among others:

- a. revenue collection: RC1's collect fees on behalf of the residents (agreed upon in the council) to pay for construction and maintenance of secondary drains and solid waste collection by KCC
- b. regulations: use of by-laws against dumping of human and solid waste, and land lords who do not provide proper sanitary facilities to their tenants

In one of the zones monthly fees are collected (different fees for tenants, landlords and business people who do not live in the area). This money is used for the most part for security, but also for paying KCC drivers for emptying the skips. Leftover money is used for cleaning of secondary drains, but is not sufficient. Although fees and their allocation are in principle democratically decided upon in the village council, in reality problems of transparency and accountability do exist.

In some zones in Katwe by-laws have indeed been established during KUPP to regulate dumping of waste. Fines can be paid in money or in labor. So far, however enforcement has proven to be a problem. The RC1's spoken to find it hard to sanction their 'neighbors'.

During the Transition Period, there was a case of a person who had dumped into the main drain. The RC1 took the case up to KCC (RC3) for follow up. Unfortunately, and discouraging for the local leadership, there was no action undertaken by KCC.

### 8.3 Conclusion

There is not enough information to draw clear conclusions. The Katwe experience is that local political leaders can potentially contribute in a positive manner to developing and sustaining community-based environmental improvements through the mechanism of local councils, tax collection and the use of by-laws. It is not clear to which extent decentralization policies will have a positive effect on bottom-up planning and decision making. Only the future can tell. The Katwe experience, however, shows that there is a danger that being both a political leader and a stakeholder in a project reduces their credibility and therefore their affectivity.

## 9. INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES

### 9.1 Introduction

Katwe community, like other low-income urban areas, can not solve its environmental problems by itself; it needs linkages and partnership with outside institutions. This issue of 'an enabling environment' has not been an explicit part of the project concept (UNDP 1995). As a result, during earlier phases of KUPP these areas and required linkages have not been systematically identified and addressed. Their relevance, however, became evident during implementation, and not in the least during the Transition Phase.

Currently linkages exist mainly with the Kampala City Council and the National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC). Linkages with the private sector and other communities are underdeveloped.

### 9.2 Kampala City Council

Problem areas which were not yet solved when the Transition Period started:

- \* maintenance of the main drain
- \* desludging
- \* quality control on construction activities of the organized groups
- \* primary garbage collection
- \* hygiene education
- \* enforcement of existing laws and regulations

All these issues are to a varying degree in the realm of KCC. Nevertheless, the KCC team has not contributed to much progress in these areas during the Transition Period. These issues may not have been considered to be part of 'backstopping' as defined in the handover (see 2.), but they definitely fall within the category of a municipality 'facilitating' community-based management. More important, however, is that there is a conflict of interest if they would get involved, as KCC is a stakeholder in many of these areas (see 4.2, 5.2, 5.6, 6.2, 6.4 and 6.6).

KCC and their people on the ground (RC3 at divisional level in particular), could play a very supportive role by enforcing existing laws and regulations, especially the Public Health Act and building laws. These could for example be utilized to oblige landlords to provide and maintain proper sanitary facilities and prevent people from dumping human and solid waste.

The RC3 (divisional) level is the most important level in the decentralization process which is currently taking place in Uganda. This level will be considerably autonomous in revenue collection and allocation, and can play an important regulating role as well. The future will show if these changes will be positive for community-based infrastructural development.

### 9.3 National Water and Sewerage Corporation

The NWSC is a privatized institution, which provides Katwe with piped water supply. It seems that the collaboration with this organization never caused problems (UNDP 1995). Also during the Transition Period there seem to have been no problems concerning the KUPP water standposts and NWSC.

During the Transition Period, the Katwe community team and NWSC came to an agreement on emptying the MOPLE into the sewerage system. There will be no costs involved, but the community must find its own inlet. Apparently, NWCS has so far been a straightforward partner.

#### 9.4 Private sector

Characteristic of the KUPP approach has been its non-involvement of the existing private sector. Major arguments were:

- a. creation of new employment; helping the poorest,
- b. many entrepreneurs in Katwe do not live there, and
- c. need for people with right motivation: both business and community oriented.

As has become clear in this report the chosen strategy of establishing new businesses within existing community organizations has had some disadvantages (5.). It has proven to be difficult to combine business with community development; group members have other sources of income; running a group-business is not easy.

KUDEP, consisting of organized group members, has not taken any initiative to further involve the private sector. In fact, they consider initiatives in the same area of expertise as rivalry. This is unfortunate, because people in Katwe could benefit from some competition and also from people experimenting with ideas introduced by KUPP. Technical options may evolve which are replicable at low-costs.

#### 9.5 Other communities

The potential of horizontal linkages with other communities have so far not been fully utilized. These could be useful for reaching economies of scale in recycling of garbage (see 5.7), for marketing of products (slabs, charcoal briquettes, latrine building etc.) and for negotiations with institutions such as KCC on for example the maintenance of the main drain, charges for waste removal and the cesspool emptier.

#### 9.6 Conclusion

For Katwe community to take charge of improving its own environmental conditions, it must be able to claim what has been promised, to stand up for itself in bargaining processes with outside institutions and to establish or strengthen partnerships. During KUPP the emphasis has been training in technical and business managerial skills, and not on community management skills. During the first part of the Transition Period KCC gave some training in project management. Katwe still may need an

independent organization, for example an NGO, to facilitate negotiations with outside institutions they need in order to improve their living conditions.

st-

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Katwe Urban Pilot Project has been successful, because so many lessons -both from achievements and from failures- can be learned from it. For developing new programmes the following aspects may be relevant:

### Situational analysis and strategic planning

- at an early stage there is a need for a situational analysis and identification of problem areas; public and private (landlords; tenants etc.) goods; stakeholders; ability and willingness to pay; possible entry points for technology options; horizontal and vertical linkages, and partnerships etc.
- gender specific baseline information is required on who to target (who makes decisions; who has the resources; who are the users; etc.); perceived problems; possible improvements of existing situation and facilities; who feels responsible for which aspect; possible legal tools; land tenure issues etc.
- strategic and bottom up planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation

### Institutional arrangements

- implementing agency: a local or international NGO which can function as a facilitator of bargaining processes between all stakeholders
- KCC (RC3): as municipality responsible for creating enabling environment; trunk facilities; regulations and quality control
- RC-officials: should be involved as politicians, but not have direct responsibility for implementation; they can play a positive role in mobilization; regulations; maintenance of infrastructures;
- existing private sector: design development; construction; maintenance; piped water; possibly also for cess pool and MOPLE operation and waste removal

### Community participation

- given the complexity of the urban context, the concept of community participation should evolve through experiences acquired in implementation and resultant negotiations between stakeholders.
- community participation in all phases of the project cycle must be guided by non-stakeholders. These may be for example, an NGO with adequate experience in low-income urban areas. Roles and responsibilities within the

hierarchy of different stakeholders must be negotiated within the process (different stages of the project cycle).

#### Technical options

- find designs which are technically adequate, affordable for most people and acceptable to the users.
- build on local practices; improve existing facilities and provide upgrading possibilities; involve male and female users and landlords in design development
- involve existing private sector
- solving the desludging problem is as important as latrine building
- demonstration models: users should be involved in whole process (design, setting up financial arrangements and operation & maintenance mechanism, choice of location, construction) ;
- establish a system for quality control (may be standardization)

#### Promotion strategy

- assess what people's motivations are to adopt new facilities or not; build a strategy on this
- hygiene education should be an important component of any program, because it influences people's ideas and behavior and as such promotes demand, effective utilization and sustainability
- demonstration model: there should be sufficient variety (also improvement of existing facilities) and number of facilities (in each zone)
- costs and pricing of all options should be accessible to the public
- promotion of new options by existing private sector

#### Financing mechanisms

- special expertise is needed to develop proper mechanisms; assess ability and willingness to pay; assess required subsidy level (if possible no subsidy) and establish cost recovery policies; set up a credit scheme if required; costing and pricing of various options;



**Budget**

- the project budget must be flexible in order to be able to finance necessary trunk facilities, and if unavoidable subsidization of facilities
  
- when needs are identified, which fall outside the framework of the project document, measures should be taken to assist in the articulation of this component. In working with the community to develop a feasible assessment and project proposal. This will assist in attracting other donors to help out, and promoting sustainability of the community's ability to perform beyond the period of the project phase.

## REFERENCES

- Bakhteari, Q.A. and Wegelin-Schuringa, M. (1992), *From Sanitation to Development: the case of the Baldia soakpit pilot project*, The Hague, International Water and Sanitation Center, Technical Paper Series no. 31
- Blackett, I.C. (1994), *Low-cost Urban Sanitation in Lesotho*, Washington D.C., International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Water and Sanitation Discussion Paper Series no. 10
- Cairncross, S. (1992), *Sanitation and Water Supply: practical lessons from the Decade*, Washington D.C., International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Water and Sanitation Discussion Paper Series no. 9
- Evans, P., Pollard, R. and Narayan-Parker, D. (1990), *Rural Sanitation in Lesotho: from pilot project to national program*, Washington D.C., International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Water and Sanitation Discussion Paper Series no. 3,
- Evans, P. (1992a), *Paying the Piper: an overview of community financing of water and sanitation*, The Hague, International Water and Sanitation Center, Occasional Paper no. 18
- Evans, P. (1992b), *Community Management of Improved Water Supply Systems: a preliminary review*, The Hague, International Water and Sanitation Center, mimeo
- Evans, P. and Appleton, B. (1993), *Community Management Today: the role of communities in the management of improved water supply systems*, The Hague, International Water and Sanitation Center, Occasional Paper no. 20
- Hommelgaard, L. (1995a), *Back-to-Office Report 4/7/95*, RWSG-EA Nairobi
- Hommelgaard, L. (1995b), *Back-to-Office Report 21/12/95*, RWSG-EA Nairobi
- KCC (1995), *Terminal Tripartite Performance Report Katwe Urban Pilot Project*
- KUDEP (1995), *Post-terminal Planning Workshop report, dec. 13th 1995*
- KUPP (1995), *Memorandum of Understanding on Transition Management Phase, june 27, 1995*
- McCommon, C., Warner, D. and Yohalem, D. (1990), *Community Management of Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Services*, Washington D.C., International Bank for Reconstruction and

Development/The World Bank, Water and Sanitation Discussion Paper Series no. 4

Monitoring & Evaluation Team (1994), *Evaluation Report Katwe Urban Pilot Project, may '93 - november '94*

Monitoring & Evaluation Team (1995), *Evaluation Report Katwe Urban Pilot Project, dec.'94 - january '95*

Monitoring & Evaluation Team (1995a), *Evaluation Report Katwe Urban Pilot Project, may '95 - june '95*

Monitoring & Evaluation Team (1995b), *Evaluation Report Katwe Urban Pilot Project, july '95 - august '95*

Monitoring & Evaluation Team (1995c), *Evaluation Report Katwe Urban Pilot Project, september '95 - october '95*

Monitoring & Evaluation Team (1995d), *Comprehensive Evaluation Report on the Project Transition Period of the Katwe Urban Pilot Project UGA/92/001 july '95 - november '95*

UNDP (1995), *The Katwe Urban Pilot Project: Experiences gained and lessons learned, Volume I and II*

Wegelin-Schuringa, M. (1991), *On-site Sanitation: building on local practice*, The Hague, International Water and Sanitation Center, Occasional Paper Series no. 16

Whittington, D., Lauria, D.T., Wright, A.M., Choe, K., Hughes, J.A. and Swarna, V. (1992), *Household Demand for Improved Sanitation Services: a case study of Kumasi, Ghana*, Washington D.C, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Water and Sanitation Discussion Paper Series no. 3

Wright, A. (1996), *Back-to-Office report, TWUWS, 11/3/96*

## Appendix A.

Program mission

- 24/6/96 Travel by road from Wundanyi to Nairobi. Meeting with Ms. Mukami Kariuki (RWSG-EA). Accompanied by Mr. Leif Hommelgaard (RWSG-EA) travel by air to Kampala. Meeting with Ms. Andrea Bauer, Project Officer UNDP.
- 25/6/96 Introduced by Mr. Hommelgaard to relevant institutions and individuals. Visit to Katwe Parish and met with Mr. Ayub Lutori, chairman KUDEP and Mr. Fred Kakembo, Monitoring & Evaluation Team. Orientation walk through Katwe.
- Meeting at KCC with Mr. F. Mutuza, Water, Sanitation & Waste Disposal Advisor.
- Brief visits to World Bank and UNDP offices.
- 26/6/96 Meeting with KUDEP's Executive Committee on Transition Phase and current status. Arrangements for future meetings with organized groups; project documentation.
- Telephone conversation with Mr. Patrick Curran of the Irish Embassy on experience with funding of primary drain in Katwe through Irish Aid.
- 27/6/96 Public holiday because of elections. Work on collected documents and information.
- 28/6/96 Meeting with Mr. Ayub Lutori, chairman KUDEP. Visit to Nawanku zone. Discussions with various people on functioning of first water kiosk, other water supply facilities, drainage management, latrine-use and emptying and solid waste collection. Meeting with Ms. Andrea Bauer of UNDP and consultation of project documentation.
- 29/6/96 Meeting with Mr. Wouter van den Wall Bake, consultant. Visit to Muwanga and Musoke zones in Katwe. Accompanied by KCCC member spoken to owners, users and attendants of three project latrines; visit to water sources and private water tap; discussions on water use and selling, solid and human waste management, drainage. Visit with KWC chairperson to briquette workshop and KAPA workplace.
- 30/6/96 Meeting with Ms. Marcella Ochwo, KUPP Community Management Advisor. Reporting.
- 1/7/96 Meeting with Mr. Steven Talisenza, treasurer KUDEP. Visit to KAPA workshop and discussions with chairman and treasurer. Discussion on community waste and drainage management with Mr. Musoke Jahaya, LC1,

Nawanku. Discussion with Mr. Ali Mubiru on functioning KCCC. Meeting with Mr. Mugizi-Rwandume at Kampala City Council. Meeting with Mr. Cris Mukunya, Coordinator Kalerwe Pilot Program, an UNDP funded, ILO implemented one-year pilot program focussed on community-based drainage improvement in a low-income area in Kampala.

2/7/96

Meeting at Kampala City Council with Mr. J. Kiiza and Ms. J. Kasule. Meeting with Mr. Alex Shekanabo on KCCC and desludging. Return to Nairobi.

## Appendix B.

Persons Contacted**RWSG-EA, Nairobi**

Mr. Leif Hommelgaard, Water & Sanitation Advisor  
 Ms. Mukame Kariuki, Acting Manager  
 Mr. Tore Lium, Manager

24

**UNDP, Kampala**

Ms. Andrea Bauer, Project Officer

**Kampala City Council (KCC)**

Mr. Mugizi-Rwandume, Programme Coordinator  
 Mr. J. Kiiza, National Project Coordinator  
 Ms. J. Kasule, Community Management Advisor  
 Mr. F.A. Mutuza, Water, Sanitation & Waste Disposal Advisor

**Katwe Urban Development Programme (KUDEP)****Executive committee:**

Mr. Ayub Lutori; Chairman; KCCC member; LC2 Katwe Parish  
 Mr. Ali Mubiru; KCCC member; LC1 Musoke zone  
 Ms. Nalongo Ddamulira; Community Development; KWC member  
 Mr. Steven Talisenza; Treasurer; KAPA member

**Monitoring & Evaluation Team:**

Mr. Fred Kakembo; KUEPA member

**Organized group members:**

Ms. Sarah Kabi, Chairperson KWC  
 Mr. Muhamed Kyagera, Chairperson KAPA  
 Mr. Sammy Mubiru, Treasurer KAPA  
 Mr. Alex Shekanabo

**Katwe Urban Pilot Project (KUPP)**

Ms. Marcella Ochwo, KUPP Community Management Advisor

**Katwe community**

Residents of Nawanku, Muwanga and Musoke zones, including  
 landlord, tenants; owners and users of KUPP demonstration  
 models; water sellers; business people; local leaders.

**Others**

Mr. Patrick Curran, Charge d'Affaire Irish Embassy  
 Mr. Cris Mukunya, Coordinator Kalerwe Pilot Project, Kampala  
 Ms. M. Wegelin, International Water and Sanitation Center,  
 Nairobi  
 Mr. Wouter van den Wall Bake, Rural Development Consultants,  
 Netherlands

THE REVOLVING FUND ( NOVEMBER, 1995 )  
(MINIMUM PAYMENTS DUE PER MONTH)

NAME	Date Signed	Type of Enterprise	No. of people Involved	KUPP Investment	Amount owed to revolving Fund (UGS)	Amount paid to Revolving Fund to date	Percent Paid	Balance owed to revolving fund to date
1st Water Kiosk	19-Oct-95	Water Kiosk	8	1,336,900	267,380	0	0%	267,380
Mr M. Kayongo (2nd kiosk)	14-Nov-94	Water Kiosk	1	813,700	366,165	366,165	100%	0
KAPA (culverts, 90,60,30 cm)		Culvert	4	2,144,950	965,227	0	0%	965,227
(installation)		Installations	6	2,919,790	583,958	486,350	83%	97,608
(maintenance)				1,954,915	879,712	0	0%	879,712
Haji Juma Kayongo	22-Jul-94	Drain Construction	1	216,315	216,315	142,040	66%	74,275
KUEPA (waste collection)	15-Feb-95	Waste Disposal	35	890,000	388,950	0	0%	388,950
KWC (Charcoal)	Signed	Charcoal Making	12	1,019,200	90,000	60,000	67%	30,000
KOOC (latrine construction)	Signed	Latrine Construction	12	683,500	272,925	273,000	100%	0
Latrine (D. Lubega)	15-Nov-95	Latrine Construction		1,275,065	300,000	240,000	80%	60,000
Latrine (L. Namazzi)	02-Nov-94	Latrine Construction	1	644,800	200,000	200,000	100%	0
Latrine (C. Nanfuka)	11 May-95	Latrine Construction	1	1,827,650	560,000	560,000	100%	0
TOTALS:				15,726,785	5,090,632	2,327,555	46%	2,763,152

