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# Introduction

This report documents the outcomes, opportunities and challenges of conducting community-based planning education studio projects in informal African urban contexts. It draws on the lessons of a series of studio projects jointly organized by Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI) and the Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS), between 2011 and 2014.

The report intends to serve as a summary of the key challenges and lessons that emerged from each of these studios. It further intends to act as a resource and set of guidelines for other educational institutions, government agencies or civil society organizations seeking to implement such projects in their own contexts.

The report is arranged in several parts. Section 1 provides background to the AAPS-SDI partnership and the rationale of the studio series. Section 2 briefly describes each studio project and the institutions involved, their thematic focus, duration, and so on. Section 3 documents the lessons emerging from the studio projects, particularly pertaining to studio preparation and implementation. Section 4 provides a synthesis of some of the key issues and opportunities emerging overall from the studio series.

# Background to the AAPS-SDI studio series

In November 2010, representatives of the Association of African Planning Schools (AAPS) and Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI) signed a Memorandum of Understanding, designed to promote collaboration between these two entities and their affiliated institutions.

The signing of the Memorandum followed the success of the AAPS conference on ‘Revitalizing Planning Education in Africa’, held in Dar es Salaam in October 2010. Several SDI representatives attended and provided invaluable input to that conference. Jane Weru and Lamech Nyariki of SDI presented to the conference and both highlighted the practical and experiential benefits conferred by a cooperative agreement previously forged between SDI and the urban and regional planning department at the University of Nairobi (Kenya).

The following extract from the Memorandum document outlines the purpose of the partnership agreement:

*To promote the collaboration of SDI and SDI country-based affiliates with members of the AAPS in order to promote initiatives, plans and policies which encourage pro-poor and inclusive cities and towns in Africa. The Partnership recognizes that planners play an important role in either facilitating or hindering the inclusion and improvement of informal settlements and slums, and that the education of planners has a fundamental impact on both their values and understanding, responses and practices, in relation to urban informality. The Partnership recognizes that one of the most effective ways to change the mind-sets of student planners is to offer them direct experiential exposure to, and interaction with, the conditions and residents of informal settlements and slums.*

As part of the agreement, AAPS undertook to encourage its member schools to establish collaborative relationships with SDI affiliates in their respective countries. Such relationships could potentially include the arrangement of student internships with SDI affiliates, inviting SDI staff to give input and lectures to students, as well as the conduction of research and/or teaching projects (particularly in informal settlements) in partnership with SDI affiliates.

In 2010, AAPS secured project funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to implement the partnership between AAPS and SDI. This funding included provision for organizing six joint AAPS-SDI studios in different African urban contexts. Each studio would involve an AAPS member institution working collaboratively with the relevant local SDI affiliates.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The aims and objectives of the studios were:

* To act as experimental platforms to explore alternative methods of planning with local communities.
* To serve as catalysts for continuing engagements between SDI affiliates and AAPS members.
* To provide a basis for mainstreaming critical community-based engagements and informality into university planning curricula.

A number of principles were set out to inform the studios, including:

* The studios should be consultative and coproduced to ensure that they serve the needs of local communities, SDI, AAPS and university curricula.
* Settlements setting a stronger precedent in terms of community mobilization and *in situ* incremental informal settlement upgrading should be given preference.
* Studios should seek to balance short-term development needs with broader issues around land, services and shelter.
* Communities should be engaged in a non-patronizing attitude, by recognizing the critical role of communities in expressing their conditions, needs and priorities.
* Community-based enumeration and mapping is an important mobilizing, organizing and data collection tool, and the studios should seek to utilize and enhance this potential.
* Planning is a dynamic process of negotiation and building consensus. In this spirit, student planners should be exposed to the real conditions and challenges of informal settlements, and not just limited to desk research or studio based planning.
* Studios should encourage the involvement of other stakeholders, particularly local government officials, consultants, as well as other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs). The studio is an opportunity to challenge the thinking of other actors within the city.

# Description of studio projects

This section provides basic information on the various AAPS-SDI studio projects, in terms of their location, duration, the actors and institutions involved, the key issues addressed, and the characteristics of students involved.

Two parallel studio projects were conducted in **Malawi** from July to August 2012. One was held in Nancholi settlement in the city of Blantyre, and involved the physical planning, architecture and land surveying departments of the University of Malawi, The Polytechnic; the Malawi Homeless People’s Federation (MHPF); as well as the NGO, Centre for Community Organization and Development (CCODE). The project focused on the spatial layout, circulation and sanitation issues of Nancholi and was carried out by third- and fourth-year undergraduate students from the various departments.[[2]](#footnote-2) The other Malawian studio was held in Salisbury Lines settlement in the city of Mzuzu. It involved the land management department of Mzuzu University, MHPF, CCODE, as well as the Mzuzu municipal planning department, and focused on issues surrounding water and sanitation, transport infrastructure, and electricity services. Second-year undergraduate students participated in this project.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The **Uganda** studio project took place over four months during the course of 2012. Employing a slightly different model to the other projects, the studio focused on settlements in Kampala and Jinja, Mbarara, Arua, Kabale, and Mbale municipalities. It involved the architecture and physical planning department at Makerere University, the National Slum Dwellers Federation of Uganda (NSDFU), ACTogether Uganda, as well as visiting students from New School University (New York). Ninety-six third-year urban and regional planning students participated in the project.[[4]](#footnote-4)

A studio project was organized in **Kenya**, specifically the Kiandutu settlement located in Thika. The primary project partners included the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at University of Nairobi, as well as the NGO, Muungano Support Trust (MuST). The studio process focused on the issue of sanitation.[[5]](#footnote-5) At the time of writing, this studio and the evaluation report had not yet been completed.

In **Namibia**, a studio was conducted in Freedom Square settlement, and involved the land management and architecture departments of the Polytechnic of Namibia, the Shack Dwellers’ Federation of Namibia (SDFN), the Namibia Housing Action Group (NHAG), as well as the Municipality of Gobabis. The project focused on water supply and sanitation issues, and commenced in September 2013.[[6]](#footnote-6) At the time of writing, this studio and the evaluation report had not yet been completed.

For **Tanzania**, the studio project addressed two different informal urban sites, both focusing on water, sanitation and storm-water management issues. The first was Kombo settlement (population 36,000), while the second was Maganga settlement (population 9,000). The primary project partners included the Department of Housing and Infrastructure Planning of Ardhi University, the Centre for Community Initiatives (CCI), as well as Temeke and Ilala municipalities. Third-year students participated in the studio, which took place from March to June 2013.[[7]](#footnote-7) No studio evaluation report has been produced by Ardhi University or SDI.

Aside from these studios, which were funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, similar projects were arranged by AAPS members and SDI affiliates in Cape Town in 2012 and 2014 (involving the University of Cape Town), and Lusaka in 2014 (involving the University of Zambia). Lessons from all these studio projects fed into a workshop meeting on community engagement in planning education jointly organised by AAPS and SDI in Cape Town in February 2012.

# Lessons learnt

## Studio preparation

*Planning a studio project*

Running a community-based planning studio in an informal urban setting is no simple task. It requires time, resources and commitment from all project partners to make it a valuable exercise, from the perspective of both the university and the local community.

AAPS member universities interested in conducting a collaborative studio with a local SDI affiliate were first asked to describe how the studio project would fit into or complement their planning curriculum. The schools were asked to consider which students (i.e. from which department and year of study) would be best suited to participate in the project. For some universities this was not a problem, as studio courses already constituted part of their curriculum and were seen as an important technique in training planners. This was an ideal situation, as the objectives and modalities of the existing studio project simply had to be altered or refined. However, in other cases the studios had to be arranged in parallel to the normal curriculum, as a kind of extra-mural event. This situation can create issues relating to staff and student commitment, if these actors do not see the value in participating in an event regarded as being ‘beyond the brief’. For the most part this was not an issue, as the involvement of community and NGO partners can add a sense of urgency and importance to studio proceedings. Nevertheless, these are factors worth considering before deciding to embark on such a project.

*Choosing a community and studio project site*

Experiences from the AAPS-SDI studio series showed that it is often useful to choose a site that has already been targeted by previous interventions from the local government, the SDI federation or external development agencies. These agencies are potential sources of not only funding for project activities (or even implementation of development proposals emerging from the project), but also maps and resources that can be used as part of the studio process, providing baseline statistics and helping to identify project focus areas.

In choosing a project site it may be helpful to produce and complete settlement profile sheets, as was done during the Tanzanian studio (an example of a settlement profile sheet is attached as Appendix 1). These can help the university or NGO partner to easily compare and assess the merits of working in different local settlements.

For most of the AAPS-SDI studios, university partners were able to engage local communities though the relevant SDI federation, which could then act as a key intermediary between the various parties. However, in the case of the Salisbury Lines project, the settlement lacked an active federation. This called for careful preparatory work:

*Forging of new networks became essential. Staff from Mzuzu University utilized previous engagements to reach both the local community and MHPF, while MHPF itself sought to establish a new branch in the area. Introducing the studio to the community in Salisbury Lines was key to cultivating their interest in the project not simply as an academic exercise for students, but one that would ultimately lead to an improvement in living standards and livelihoods. Prior visits by lecturers to the area to meet with leaders had to be undertaken.*

*Choosing a studio focus*

The thematic focus of an educational studio targeting community-based settlement upgrading can be informed by various factors. Firstly, the choice will be informed by the types and level of skills and knowledge held by the students. It makes little sense to ask students to provide workable upgrading solutions in relation to a topic with which they are not familiar or adequately competent in practical terms.

Secondly, the desired learning outcomes of the project, in relation to the educational curriculum as a whole, will bear on any choice of topic or theme. This issue also impacts on the scale at which local problems are to be analysed and addressed.

Thirdly, and most importantly, the choice of studio theme(s) will be determined by the development needs and priorities of the participating local community. If an SDI federation or another agency has already worked with the community residing in a particular settlement, it is likely that that process would have identified several key issues and priorities that could form the focus of subsequent work. This was the case in the Tanzanian studio, where key project themes were selected by the federation based on their previous work conducted in the area.

Fourthly, some priority issues will be informed by geographical features in combination with the realities of service deficits in the area. For example, the fact that the terrain of Nancholi settlement is extremely rugged, with steep inclines, coupled with the lack of a networked sewer infrastructure in the area, made circulation and drainage issues a key priority for this project. Similarly, Salisbury Lines settlement is situated on a wetland with limited infrastructure services, meaning transportation, water and sanitation services emerged as key development issues for the community.

Finally, some priority issues will present themselves on a more fortuitous basis. In the Tanzanian case, the studio was conducted during a rainy season in Dar es Salaam, which meant that drainage and sanitation issues dominated the discussions of local development challenges.

*Managing expectations*

A key lesson from both the AAPS-SDI studio series and the general literature on community service learning (see Appendix 2 for a list of references) emphasizes the need to set out clearly the project objectives, as well as the roles and expectations of the various actors involved, as a means of managing the expectations of studio partners. In particular, projects failing to meet the expectations of local poor communities are often a source of ‘community fatigue’ and may serve to undermine trust between the project partners, thereby threatening the sustainability of the partnership.

In setting out objectives of the studio project, it is important to note that different projects may have different objectives, depending on issues including the needs of the local community, the status of local government planning processes in the project area, the level and types of skills possessed by students, the desired learning outcomes, and so on. In most cases, the various AAPS-SDI studio projects sought to collect and analyse data as a basis to propose development solutions in the locality concerned. As in the Tanzanian studio, the learning objectives were to enable the students to identify a planning problem, to develop appropriate plans and designs, and to present a report effectively. However, the Ugandan studio adopted a different approach. Here the main objective of the exercise was to verify and analyse (previously collected) enumeration data, and to organize these data into reports for the various municipalities to use in the course of developing their strategic development plans. The verification exercise arose out of community needs to present concise reports to authorities about their areas in order to create awareness and leverage resources. It was intended that through the exercise students would be exposed to the strength of community-collected data, would gain skills related to the production of quality, standardized reports, while building a relationship between local communities and the university.

A key means of managing expectations in studio projects is the development of memoranda of understanding between the project partners. These documents should be produced prior to the start of the project, and should be endorsed by all parties (for an example of such a memorandum, please see Appendix 3). A typical memorandum of understanding should:

* Identify all the parties to the agreement
* Detail the beneficiaries of the programme
* Detail the period of duration
* Detail the objectives of the project (for all parties concerned)
* Detail the roles and functions of the various actors or institutions involved

It is worth noting that more than one memorandum of understanding can be developed. As part of the Namibian studio, two memoranda were produced: one between the local municipality, the Shack Dwellers Federation of Namibia (SDFN) and Namibia Housing Action Group (NHAG); another between the Polytechnic of Namibia, SDFN and NHAG.

*Engaging government*

Government agencies, particularly those at the local level, can be important partners in studio projects. Often these agencies may see the studio outputs as resources to inform their official planning activities for the area. This was true in the case of the Freedom Square studio in Namibia: “Municipal officials were present during the preparation meetings and the activities during the weekend. Two dedicated meetings with the officials took place, one on Friday before the studio started and one following the activities in the community. Mr Mbala, the new strategic executive for local economic development, urban planning and health [in the Municipality of Gobabis] indicated that the Council should not continuously resettle communities from one location to the other, but should aim for proper planning which can result in secure tenure for the residents.”

However, the question of how and when to engage government partners remains. If possible, local government agencies should be involved from the outset of the project, to provide input on its preparation and key focus areas. For example, in the Ugandan case the nature of the studio evolved from municipalities’ interest in producing local strategic plans for various settlements, and their need for verified data to do so.

## Studio implementation

*Choosing a spatial focus*

Considering the scale and complexity of many informal areas in African urban contexts, unless a studio project targets a relatively small settlement, it will often be unfeasible to address the development challenges facing the entire community or locality. For this reason, in the Kiandutu, Nancholi and Salisbury Lines studios a ‘cluster’ concept and approach was adopted, where the studios focused on one or more ‘pilot’ sub-clusters within the settlement as a whole (with a view to working in the other sub-clusters in the future). In the case of the latter project, each group (comprised of students, federation and community members) was assigned to analyse all the development issues affecting a particular sub-cluster – although experience reveals that this arrangement undermined the group work process, suggesting that a better approach would be for a group to focus on a single theme for the entire cluster, as was done for the Salisbury Lines studio.

In Uganda, however, a different approach was used. Here a much larger group of students worked in the five administrative divisions of Kampala, as well as the five secondary cities of Jinja, Mbale, Mbarara, Kabale and Arua. This approach was not without problems: financial constraints meant that the students working in the secondary cities could only spend a total of three days in the field. They were unable to travel back and verify, in person, the data they had acquired with the relevant communities. However, “the students were able to overcome this challenge by getting feedback from community members via mobile telephone and electronic mail especially about any gaps/uncertainties in the data. Though not ideal, this mode of contact between the students and some community members helped in ensuring that some of the gaps that were identified are addressed”.

*Studio phases and work plan*

The various AAPS-SDI studio projects typically followed a similar succession of three phases of implementation. These were

1. Data collection, settlement profiling and mapping: collect primary and secondary data
2. Situational analysis: analyse collected data to see interlinkages between issues and identify key ‘leverage points’ for possible interventions
3. Proposal development: produce workable solutions to key development challenges

However, not all of these phases necessarily have to be executed. In the case of the Freedom Square (Namibia) studio, only two phases were planned: site evaluation (building on data already collected by the community and SDI federation), followed by layout planning and re-blocking (to take place the following semester).

In order to solidify arrangements for the studio and to assist with the management process, it is important to develop a comprehensive work plan setting out all the various project activities, their importance or objectives, the dates at which they should be implemented, and their expected outputs (see Appendix 4 for an example of a studio work plan).

The work plan was typically initiated by a launch event drawing in all the project partners.

*Studio launch events*

The events at which the various studios were launched turned out to be vitally important for the success of the projects as a whole. As the first occasion where the project partners (particularly the students and community members) could meet, and develop a common understanding of the studio process, these events set the tone for subsequent activities. Their purpose was generally to:

* Introduce the students and the studio project to the community, and the process of enumeration
* Discuss development issues in the settlement including the aspirations of the community, previous projects and interventions in the area, opportunities and challenges, as well as the socio-political organization of the community
* Select a section of the settlement as the focus of the studio
* Introduce the structure and work plan of the studio
* Develop the studio theme(s)
* Develop working teams
* Decide on and introduce tools and equipment for data collection and mapping

The launch of the Ugandan studio was held at Makerere University, and highlighted the importance of involving community representatives at this early stage of the project:

*At this event, ‘community professors’ Katan Gorreti, Bwanika Zan and Kasalu Ronald from the Ugandan slum federation briefed students about savings, enumerations, mapping and how these processes had created social and political as well solidarity within slum communities. The ‘community professors’ had the opportunity to make two visits to the university, to interface with the students before the exercise commenced. The reason for these visits was primarily to build and foster rapport between them as community representatives and the students. By sharing their experiences with the students in their own learning environments, it helped both sets of actors (students and community ‘professors’) to realize and actualize their value to the planning and development process.*

The various studio reports highlighted the importance and inductive of the student briefing process. In Nancholi:

*Students were first briefed separately to introduce them to codes of conduct when working with communities and then a joint briefing was held with all participants to develop a strategy for data collection. Teams agreed on general approaches: sketch mapping, use of mapping sheets, photography, interviews, measurements, GPS locators and observation techniques. Each team was allowed to develop its own mapping codes and system of capturing the attribute data (e.g. checklists, casual interviews and note taking). Emphasis was placed on data capturing methods that communities could easily understand and engage with.*

Aside from local community and federation processes, the Ugandan studio also revealed the importance of introducing students to the wider strategic plans and objectives pertaining to the project site within the project brief: “… students met the municipal leaders and technical officials and were briefed about their interaction with the Cities Alliance-funded Land Services and Citizenship programme for Transformation of Slums in Uganda (TSUPU) programme”.

However, it is important to emphasize that significant preparation should be conducted prior to launch events. Studio partners will need to assemble various resources (such as base maps of the local area) prior to the event. Furthermore, ideally the students should be briefed on the studio’s rationale, process and key techniques before holding such an event, to ensure a smooth start to proceedings. In the case of the Salisbury Lines studio, for example, “… students underwent initial lectures on various approaches to resolving the challenges of rapid urbanization and informality as well as the procedures or steps of upgrading processes. One federation leader was requested to make a presentation on the community approach to housing, including savings schemes and sustainable human waste manure utility”.

*Data collection*

As mentioned previously, some of the studio projects (for example, those conducted in Nancholi and Freedom Square) built upon enumeration and mapping exercises that had already been completed by SDI affiliates in the settlement. In the case of Freedom Square, the studio exercise started off with residents giving feedback on the data collected and mapped through the Community Land Information Programme (CLIP) that was carried out in the settlement between February and June 2012, with the support of NHAG and Habitafrica, and assisted by the Spanish Cooperation. In Nancholi, an initial mapping and enumeration exercise had focused on housing and water facilities in the settlement, and the community saw the AAPS-SDI studio project as an opportunity to build upon the existing information.

In some cases it may be desirable to undertake a **community profiling** exercise as a preliminary step in the data collection process. This was the case with the Ugandan studio (which focused on several different settlement sites), where the National Slum Dwellers Federation of Uganda (NSDFU) conducted sample-based profiling (or, the qualitative assessment of settlements) throughfield surveys, including interviews and focus group discussions with members of the various communities. The profiling exercise involved active participation of community leaders, municipal officials and local residents. A series of meetings with the municipal officials and division leaders were held to obtain secondary data about the informal settlements and the entire municipality. The profiling team then met with the local communities and councillors to identify the local teams to work with the slum dwellers’ federation during the exercise. The local teams were trained to ensure that the information gathered during the profiling exercise was accurate. All collected data were verified by both the communities and the municipalities: endorsed settlement profiles could then be used as a basis for collaboration between the organized slum dweller communities and the municipality in subsequent development processes.

Settlement profiling is then followed by **enumeration**.Enumeration involves the collection of qualitative data by the community on the settlements in which they live, through the administration of household surveys. Enumerations do not rely on samples, but survey each and every willing household in a given settlement. In the Ugandan case, the enumeration team also mapped out the area, including counting the number of households, examining the sanitation facilities and other utilities. A description of the various stages of the enumeration process is provided in Appendix 5.

The **themes of data collection** (i.e. whether the studio focuses on issues of sanitation, circulation, housing, land subdivision, and so on) will also largely be informed by the community’s development priorities within the settlement, as well as the nature of any previous research work done in the area. In Nancholi data were collected on plot layouts and structures, circulation networks and services, as well as sanitation and environmental issues. For Salisbury Lines, the students and community members were split into four mixed teams, each focusing on a specific theme. These themes included water and electricity, sanitation (toilets and solid waste management), drainage (storm water and grey water), as well as circulation and land use. Alternatively, in Uganda students focused on local housing, sanitation and education issues.

Mapping is the key **technique of data collection** employed in these studios. The process involves collecting (object and attribute) data on the settlement, and allows students to interpret the emerging spatial issues in relation to existing socio-economic data (secured through community-based enumerations) and the wider policy context for urban planning. The Nancholi studio emphasized the importance of this technique:

*During the studio process mapping proved to be very useful in understanding the current status of the settlement as well as projecting its future development. Never before had the community undertaken such a detailed mapping exercise in their settlement.*

The process of community-based mapping can also have important learning outcomes. In the Salisbury Lines studio, while all participants learnt important skills relating to ground mapping, verification and the scaling of objects, the students “…were able to realize their technical limitations with regards to mapping and in particular mapping complex spatial environments such as informal settlements. The teams mapped the unmapped: informal land subdivisions perceived to be contested were profiled while establishing the causal factors linked to the subdivisions”. As such, “the exercise enabled participants to appreciate the role and implications of traditional land governance to contemporary urban governance”. These experiences therefore point to both the research and educational benefits of enumeration-based mapping processes (see Appendix 2 for further resources to assist with community-based mapping procedures).

*Data analysis*

The AAPS-SDI studios revealed the important role of community members in aiding the processes of data collection and analysis. Community involvement not only serves to verify the collected data, but also aids the learning process by providing qualitative insights into informal urban contexts. This was clearly demonstrated in the case of the Freedom Square studio in Namibia:

*With assistance from the community and guidance from the lecturers and NHAG staff, the students carried out the site evaluation – community members teamed up with the students visiting each structure in the nine blocks, employing local knowledge to clarify the use of structures, accessing of services in and outside the settlement and to explain the way of life of residents in the blocks… The importance of community participation in the whole exercise was echoed and appreciated by many of the students to get a better understanding of the cultural dimension of a site for planning a settlement layout through an insider’s perception.*

Community participation also helps to secure access to data, as was found in Nancholi: “the community team led the students in engaging residents to identify boundaries of their plots. Without the community leading this process the sensitive data on plot boundaries would not have been collected, at least not without resistance from plot owners”.

A key challenge facing such studios is enabling students to work with data collected by enumeration processes. Other challenges were identified based on the experiences of the Ugandan studio:

* *Student numbers, capacity and staff workload*: In handling the assignment students demonstrated greater motivation in the first part of the semester, which involved the fieldwork, but data analysis and report writing proved more challenging. The slum dwellers’ federation expected students to work independently so as to lighten the workload of its staff. However, this did not happen and instead a lot of time and human resources were needed to support the students’ work, thereby increasing the workload on federation and university staff tremendously. This showed that in future the number of students to be engaged in such an exercise would have to be reduced and greater involvement of university staff would have to be organized.
* *Student skills, equipment and timeframe*: Students lacked skills in report writing and this was further aggravated by their inability to access required technology. The exercise clearly showed that access to technology was a serious concern the university needs to address. Students also felt that the time they had in the field was not sufficient to comprehensively carry out the assignment at hand. They felt that they could have done the work better if they had access to GPS equipment, and had two to three weeks (rather than two days) for fieldwork.
* *Collective learning*: Although group work was an intended aspect of the assignment, some students found it challenging. At times it was not easy to make students follow their instructions. For example, data collection templates that were given to students were not followed in the field. Therefore, students had to repeat the analysis process, which ended up taking two months. In addition, group work was weak. However, this was understandable in some instances due to challenges posed by transport costs and the lack of Internet and computers at home.

*Mid-studio events*

A number of the APS-SDI studios made use of mid-stage events to mark the completion of the situation analysis phase, to inform the community of the results of the research process, and to secure community feedback. In some cases, this event also served as a way to ensure continued engagement between the studio partners. In the case of Tanzania: “it should be noted that, after data collection, the students had been absent from the community and thus there was a need to bring the community up-to-speed with the studio progress”. These events were held in the respective settlements and were seen as a success: “… with present community members actively participating by sharing their views on the emerging issues and consequently proposing what could possibly improve their situation. Narrations were given on previous interventions, community coping mechanisms and ongoing efforts to improve the situation.” A full-day workshop was then held with the student and community teams at Ardhi University. The workshop was aimed at refining the situational analysis after the community feedback forums and to start developing tentative development proposals for preliminary sharing with the community. This played an important role in promoting a healthy working relationship between the studio partners: “It was observable that, at the end of the day, both the student and community teams had a common understanding of the issues at hand, which set an impetus for active participation in the proposal phase of the studio”.

The value of providing the local community feedback on the research process was also highlighted in the case of the Ugandan studio, as “many community members had earlier complained of lack of feedback from people who come to their areas and conduct exercises or research and without giving them feedback”.

Mid-studio events can also be an opportunity to refresh the focus and rationale of the studio, as in the case of the Kiandutu project, where a presentation by a university staff member “highlighted the objectives of the studio, the methodology used in the studio, the existing conditions in Kiandutu, emerging issues and the recommendations. This was also backed up by the community planning team validating the facts provided in the presentation as the reality of the situation in Kiandutu”.

*Proposal development*

The final phase of a studio project involves producing development proposals for the settlement, and presenting these to the local community and other project partners. For the Salisbury Lines studio, for example, proposals were developed based on three main principles:

* The need to develop proposals that the community could implement with limited external funding
* The need to create minimal disruption to the existing spatial configuration of the settlement and its social fabric
* The need to develop proposals that build upon the existing capacities and opportunities present in the settlement

The development proposals are then presented at a final event that includes community members as well as the other project partners. Generally this event will be held within or nearby the project site, so as to allow community members to attend easily. These presentations can be made using various techniques, including PowerPoint, pin charts, maps and oral presentation. They do not necessarily have to be made in a unidirectional manner ‘to the community’. In the case of the project conducted in Maganga settlement in Tanzania (which had a strong community team in comparison to the other project site in Kombo), presentations were held jointly made by students and community members.

Experiences showed that the final studio event should be designed to stimulate interest and evoke reactions from the communities on the way forward for improving their settlements, and to bring into focus other development issues that may have been overlooked in the original thematic collection and analysis of data. During the event, proposed upgrading projects can be categorized into those that should be supported externally (e.g. by government agencies) and those that could be implemented by the community or individual households. Finally, the outcomes of the event should be compiled into a comprehensive studio report or local plan, which can then be handed over to the community federation and relevant local government agencies as a resource for future work (this report should also be translated into the local language, if possible).

*Evaluating the studio*

The final step of the studio process involves evaluating the project, and all its component events and phases, in terms of its perceived successes and failures. Evaluating a studio project is particularly important for pilot projects, and will set the standard and agenda for any future projects of a similar nature.

For the studio projects described above, AAPS commissioned a staff member from the relevant university to write an evaluation report and to prepare a presentation on the key outcomes of the project. These outputs were funded separately from the main studio budget. Organizing a local debriefing event drawing in university, federation and NGO representatives is another useful technique for evaluating a project. Such events can help to maintain trust between parties and to secure commitment for future work in the local area.

# Synthesis

This section attempts to present some of the overall lessons emerging from the AAPS-SDI studio series, focusing on the challenges and potential benefits of these projects, and provides some recommendations for conducting similar projects in the future.

*Challenges*

* **Staff and student capacity**: Studio projects can place large work burdens on both university and federation staff, which highlights the importance of long-term planning and intensive preparation. University study timetables may be constrained due to the intensity of the studio work. Staff and students may show unequal degrees of interest in and commitment to the studio process (as in the case of the Nancholi studio, where the lack of provision of financial allowances for Polytechnic staff led most to abandon the project). In addition, it may not be appropriate to conduct such projects with relatively inexperienced undergraduate students, as they may lack the contextual, practical and theoretical knowledge necessary to produce high-quality research and design outputs.
* **Fieldwork**: If timeframes for collecting and analysing data are too short this can seriously compromise the value of the studio exercise both in terms of its research outputs (analytical reports and development proposals) and learning outcomes (for the students and community).
* **Language**: If students do not speak the local language of the community data collection can be compromised and establishing trust between partners can prove more difficult. As such it is important to consider using interpreters to ensure that data is collected efficiently and rigorously.
* **Dealing with community fatigue**: providing feedback to community members on the data collection, analysis and proposal phases is vitally important to maintain trust and an open, functional working relationship.
* **Costs and finances**: If the studio site is located relatively far away from the university, transport costs may prohibit adequate fieldwork, data collection and verification. A lack of projects funds may also limit the scope of the project as well as the number of students able to participate.

*Benefits*

For students:

* **Learning**: Through studio project students can gain work experience and develop their practical and analytical skills in a way that links theory and practice. Students learn about the internal systems and dynamics of spatial and socio-political organization in informal settlements, which tend to be overlooked by formal planning processes (instead tending to see informal communities and spaces as homogenous and pathogenic). Students gain experience in identifying entry points when dealing with communities and in developing rapport with community members. In Uganda and other contexts, students felt that analysing the enumeration data and producing reports that the community needed and appreciated made them feel valued. Community-based studios also provide an opportunity for students and staff to test the relevance of their training against the realities of urbanization unfolding in their respective contexts. This opens the way for a much wider and more significant critical learning process. As concluded from the experiences of the Malawian studios, “the spatial complexities displayed by… informal settlements compel planners to think about sustainability in new and realistic approaches”.
* **Changing attitudes**: Studio projects can contribute to a shift in mind-set amongst students, as they are exposed to urban areas and realities they have not encountered previously. Students can come to appreciate the work of the community and how it can contribute to inclusive planning practices. They can begin to see that poor urban communities have values and aspirations for their own development, rather than simply being passive recipients of state resources. Seeing informal community members as agents of development change lays the foundation for developing upgrading approaches that are based on enhancing the capacities of community members to improve their urban environments.

For informal communities:

* **Learning**: Educational studio projects provide important opportunities to acquire new, or improve existing skills in community-based development planning and urban planning. They can enable community members to enhance their understanding of the legislative framework for planning and development, and the ways in which these regulations and policies affect their own development aspirations. Community members can also learn much about the approach of universities to planning education.
* **Enhancing development capacities**: Multi-partner studio projects give informal urban communities a platform for a stronger voice to air their views, and can expand their options regarding local development strategies. Studio outputs can act as a basis for communities and federations to influence future investments in the upgrading of the settlements. Considering that upgrading projects often include significant funding for conducting preliminary surveys and mobilizing communities, studio outputs provide a database that can be updated regularly and thereby allowing funds that would normally be allocated to information collection to be channelled to other project activities. In addition, sustained studio projects and their outputs can be used to leverage resources (from local and national government, as well as external donors) for the implementation of various development projects.

Overall, community-based studio projects allow for the knowledge-based, institutional and practical ‘gaps’ existing between civil society, academia and state agencies to be overcome. A particular ‘gap’ that can be addressed in conducting these projects is that between the provisions and standards of municipal legislation, on one hand, and the realities of urban informality on the other. As the Salisbury Lines studio report stated: “If significant progress is to be made, this gap needs to be narrowed in a clear and coordinated manner that draws communities into the framework as partners and drivers in a responsive planning and upgrading process”. This points towards the potential of studio projects as key opportunities to develop new planning approaches and practices. The same studio report concluded:

*Coproduction of upgrading projects with communities can significantly contribute to shifting from the use of communities as seedbeds for testing the viability of abstract upgrading theories towards more pragmatic and productive interventions.*

*Recommendations*

**Site selection**: Choose a site situated relatively close to the university. However, if the most conducive site and community is situated far away from the campus, SDI affiliates, local government and donor agencies are potential sources of funding to cover transportation costs (as was the case in the Ugandan studio).

**Studio preparation**: Experience showed that universities often underestimate the degree of preparation required prior to conducting community-based educational projects. As such, extensive studio preparation is required, particularly in contexts where such projects are being undertaken for the first time. Preparation needs to go beyond organizing launch and briefing events, to conducting pre-studio workshop meetings involving all project stakeholders (university, community federation, local government, SDI affiliates) as well as other parties (local schools, churches, donor agencies, NGOs) to secure maximal awareness, participation and cooperation between parties. Due consideration has to be given to issues of staff and student capacity, and the availability of mapping technologies, for example, prior to starting such projects. In order to increase supervision and mentoring capacity, one option is to make entry to these projects competitive, limiting student numbers so that only befitting students are selected. The application process could be used to assess students’ commitment to the work. The competitive nature of the studio could build its reputation and enhance its benefit for participating students. If the studio involves undergraduate students, the idea of using graduate students in the exercise should be encouraged, as means of sharing knowledge and experience.

**Data analysis**: Giving feedback to communities by organizing joint events and presentations is vitally important and can help to alleviate issues relating to community fatigue, sustaining interest in and commitment to the project. Data verification techniques are also essential, and can help to turn studio products into workable resources for local government planning processes.

**Being strategic**: It is essential that educational studio projects are seen as part of a far larger challenge that calls into question the ways urban planning and management in African cities is shaped towards the exclusion of the urban poor. However, planning schools are only one of many organizations that affect the urban landscape and while working to reimagine planning will make strides in changing current perceptions of African urbanism, this is only part of the task of rethinking African cities. In order to drive this challenge, it is vital that studios are not isolated events, conducted only when external funding is available, but are part of an incremental process of sustained engagement between university, NGO and community partners. This can have a knock-on effect in terms of promoting the review and reform of official urban development strategies, norms and standards towards more inclusive forms. To achieve this it will, in most cases, be necessary to ‘sell’ the studio approach and its rationale widely to policymakers, politicians and senior planners, who may wish (for various reasons) to maintain the status quo of ‘modern’ planning practices and standards that are intolerant of informal urban conditions.

**Promoting sustainability**: Studio projects often result in opportunities for continued collaboration on local development projects, and tend to energize or create momentum around local upgrading efforts. Yet these communities can lack the appropriate skills to carry out development proposals emerging from a studio. This opens room for planning schools, municipality and federation agencies to further engage with and support local communities in advancing their development agenda. It is vital for projects partners, including planning schools, to capitalise on these opportunities for continued engagement. The interests and development priorities generated by communities are not always capital intensive, and thus can be advanced with existing technical and financial resources. One practical way of promoting sustainable partnerships is to ensure that studio outputs are tailored for actual development projects. Another is by incorporating the studio interventions into the agendas and plans of external agencies (such as international donors) in order to build local capacity and institutionalize participatory urban development practise and policy.

# Conclusion

The experiences gained from the AAPS-SDI collaborative planning studios have shown that these are highly valuable learning projects, although practically they can be difficult to organize and implement. They allow university, community and NGO partners to learn simultaneously in a way that both enhances local capacities for development and challenges conventional planning thought and practice, while opening new possibilities for intervening in informal urban contexts.

Yet, beyond these learning benefits, which could be seen as relatively short-term in nature, a major rationale for undertaking this series of studio projects was to effect longer-term impacts on planning education and practice in Africa. One way of doing so is by embedding such projects within the curricula of African planning schools. The Nancholi studio in Blantyre, for example, was one project that instigated wider curriculum change. At the time of writing in 2014, plans were being made for planning students to work in an informal settlement in Ndirande with CCODE and MHPF members. Similar projects were being written into the planning curriculum of the Polytechnic of Namibia. The new postgraduate degree in spatial planning offered at the University of Zambia since 2013 also includes collaborative studio projects as a central and compulsory aspect of the programme. These experiences in ‘mainstreaming’ studio teaching and informal settlement upgrading practice provide important reference points for the future progress of African planning education.

The secretariats of AAPS and SDI deemed these projects successful enough to warrant the writing of a funding application to undertake further studios. The proposal, entitled ‘Creating momentum for change through innovative information generation and engagement at the city level in Africa’ was submitted to and approved by the Cities Alliance Catalytic Fund in August 2014. It will provide for four additional AAPS-SDI teaching studios in Kitui (Kenya), Lusaka (Zambia), Gobabis (Namibia) and Kampala (Uganda). In this series of projects one of the primary objectives is to upscale community engagements and informal settlement upgrading initiatives to the city scale. This offers a major opportunity to contribute to future planning practice in Africa, as many urban upgrading and mobilization initiatives tend to remain localised in scale, and often fail to generate lasting impacts on urban management and planning. The hope is that these studios can catalyse news ways of thinking about and responding to urban informality in African cities.

# Appendix 1: Example community profile sheet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of the Settlement** | Kombo (Dar es Salaam, Tanzania) | |
| **Size of the Settlement** | ***Estimated Land Coverage*** | ***Estimated Population Size (No. Of HH and total Population)*** |
|  | Population: 36,000  Households: 4716 |
| **Location:**  Vingunguti ward, Ilala Municipality | ***In relation to the CBD and the University*** | ***Coordinates (a Kmz file can be attached or a google earth image)*** |
| * 6 km to city centre * 15 km to Ardhi University |  |
| **Brief Description of the Settlement (history, topography, socio-economic, e.t.c)** | Kombo settlement is located in Vingunguti ward and has existed since early 1960s. Early residents were famers who came from Ilala and Makuburi areas. Larger part of the settlement is on the upper side and remaining area is in the lower side where there are also Waste Oxidation ponds owned by Dar es Salaam Water and Sewerage Authority (DAWASA). The settlement was named after an old well existed in the settlement which was called Kombo Gradually residents shortened it and called the settlement Kombo. Majority of residents have low incomes and are engaged in petty trading, they are selling food stuffs, fruit and vegetable groceries, hair plaiting (women), market traders, labourers in nearby industries and few have permanent employment by government, private sector and industries. Land is owned by government and the upper side has been regularized and has residential licences and many of those located in the lower side have not been regularized and their houses are informal. Part of the settlement has been affected by flooding. | |
| **Brief Description on its Accessibility** | There few access roads in the area which have been upgraded but larger part of the area have no road access. | |
| **Brief Description of the Community Leadership structure and mobilization (federation, other leadership structures)** | Two federation groups exist in this settlement. Both groups have leadership involving chairperson, secretary, treasurer, Jenga treasurer and five federation committees which are mobilization, savings and auditing, project design and management, enumeration and advocacy and loan committees. | |
| **Feedback from the Engagements with the community about the studio** | The leadership of the Federation has been informed about the studio work and look forward for it. | |
| **Previous planning/upgrading efforts in the settlement** | Upgrading of infrastructure including road, drainage, streetlights and community toilet has been done to some parts of the settlement by Ilala Municipal Council under its Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP). Ilala Municipal Council and Plan Internal have implemented community water projects which reach some parts of the settlement. Plan International has also supported construction of classrooms at school and provision of school equipment including desks for pupils as well as supporting children living in vulnerable environment an providing education regarding children’s rights (at school). | |
| **Overview of Current challenges facing the settlement** | Poor solid waste management system, lack of proper drainage system (especially in the lower side of the settlement), existence of brothels, high level of crime, poor latrine, limited water services and flooding. | |
| **Community priorities (probably this forms the focus of the studio)** | * Drainage system * Water * Garbage collection | |
| **Information available  Base maps, surveys, enumeration profiles, etc.** | There is a settlement map at ward offices, CCI and federation conducted profile in 2009 and in 2012 sanitation mapping was done in some parts of the settlement. | |
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For further guidance on community-based projects, you may consult the following resources:

* A handbook produced by the Community Architects Network and the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights on the topic ‘Comprehensive site planning: Transform community to better living place for all’, available at <http://www.africanplanningschools.org.za/images/aaps/can-achr_comprehensive_site%20planning_handbook.pdf>
* A handbook produced by the Huairou Commission on community mapping, available at <http://huairou.org/sites/default/files/Community%20Mapping%20Handbook.pdf>
* A handbook produced by WaterAid on ‘Community Mapping: A Tool for Community Organising’, available [here](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CB0QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.wateraid.org%2F~%2Fmedia%2FPublications%2Fcommunity-mapping-programme-partner-guidelines.pdf&ei=ISsHVLugKary7AahrYHoDQ&usg=AFQjCNHAjCYh1KdyMHuOKlAKWh-rOIyOrw&sig2=_zMAmSdj7J3rqSQponw7bQ&bvm=bv.74115972,d.ZGU).

# Appendix 3: Example memorandum of understanding

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CITY COUNCIL OF NAIROBI, PAMOJA TRUST, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, AND THE RESIDENTS OF MATHARE

**Parties to the Agreement**

1. Nairobi City Council
2. Residents of the following settlements in Mathare: Kosovo, Mathare 4B, Mabatini, Mashimoni No. 10
3. Pamoja Trust
4. University of Nairobi

**Preamble**

Taking Note that the City Council of Nairobi, the University of Nairobi and Pamoja Trust have been working closely with the residents of the above named four informal settlements of Mathare towards improving their living conditions

Now therefore, the City Council of Nairobi, Pamoja Trust, and the University of Nairobi have entered into this agreement in furtherance of their common goal of upgrading the four settlements.

**The Beneficiaries of the Programme**

The Beneficiaries of the programme shall be all the residents, both tenants and structure owners, currently resident in the above named settlements of Mathare and any relocation, or spill over site that may be identified and agreed upon by the parties.

**The Programme Period**

The programme shall commence on the 1st of January 2009 and shall run for a period of two years, ending on 31st of December, 2011.

**Objectives of the Programme**

The programme will have the following broad objectives:

* To improve the living conditions of the residents of the four informal settlements of Mathare through:
  + The provision of secure tenure.
  + The provision of sufficient infrastructure and services.
  + Increased access to improved housing.
* To enhance the residents’ capacity to participate in the upgrading of their settlements and to thereafter manage and maintain any improvements made.
* To improve the livelihoods of the residents through the development of skills and the promotion of income generating activities. This will amongst other things enable the beneficiaries to address the social and economic issues that affect their lives such as insecurity, HIV and AIDS and its effects.
* To ensure greater access to public services such as schools, health facilities, waste collection, youth centres and recreational facilities.

**Roles and Functions**

*City Council of Nairobi:*

* Coordinate the formulation of integrated settlement plans for the five settlements of Mathare.
* Liaise with the Ministry of Lands and other Government departments to facilitate their approval and adoption of responsive settlement plans by the City Council and respective Government Departments.
* Provide secure tenure to the residents of the planned settlements through block titling.
* Provide leadership to all actors and stakeholders in order to ensure efficacy of the planning process.

*University of Nairobi:*

* Formulate, in consultation with the residents, the City Council of Nairobi and Pamoja Trust, responsive settlement plans for each of the five settlements for consideration by the Council.
* Identify specific settlement planning problems through Research as a basis for seeking sustainable solutions to the identified problems.
* Based on Documented best practices, prepare a draft settlement policy planning framework for adoption and approval by the Council.
* Assist in the monitoring and documentation of the process of upgrading and disseminate the lessons learnt from the programme to the outside world.
* Train planning students through field work, and practical experience on participatory planning approaches and the formulation of responsive settlement plans.

*Pamoja Trust:*

* Liaise with other stakeholders, both public and private, in order to mobilize resources for the implementation of the integrated settlement plans formulated for each of the five settlements.
* Assist in the Enhancement of community cohesion through the facilitation of meetings, informal discussions, public fora and any other activities.
* Co-ordinate the gathering, collation and analysis of social, economic and spatial data and further produce information that can be used by the two universities as a basis for formulating integrated settlement plans for the target settlements.
* To provide a documentation of settlement profiles of all unplanned settlements in Nairobi as a basis for the preparation of a planning policy framework for the City of Nairobi.
* Build Awareness on the risk of displacement arising out of settlement planning and further build consensus on relocation mitigation strategies for those likely to be displaced.

Any dispute arising out of the interpretation of the Memorandum of Understanding will be settled amicably by consultation between the institutions, as this Memorandum is not legally enforceable.

In witness therefore, the representatives have signed this Memorandum of Understanding on 9 December 2008 in Nairobi.

Director, Department of City Planning

CITY COUNCIL OF NAIROBI by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Director

Department of Urban and Regional Planning

University of Nairobi by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson

Pamoja Trust

Nairobi by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Director

Muunganano (Federation)

Mathare by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson

# Appendix 4: Example studio work plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDIO WORK IN DAR-ES-SALAAM, TANZANIA. BETWEEN COMMUNITY FEDERATION, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ARDHI UNVERSITY AND CCI: 4 MARCH 2013 to 14 JUNE 2013** | | | |
| **Activity** | **Importance/objective** | **When** | **Output** |
| **1. Launch of the studio work**  - Orientation  - Assessment of existing data  - Agree on focus, approach and work plan  - Tools and equipment for data collection, mapping | * Understanding of community/ university studios * Identify the focus of the studio * Balancing expectations between the university and community federations on the output of the studio | To be agreed (1st week) | * Introduction to studio for community members and university students * Structure of the studio * Develop the theme of the studio * Develop working teams |
| **2. Enumeration and mapping of the settlement** | Students and community collectively understand the essence of data collection | To be agreed (2nd week) | Data collection on infrastructure and environmental aspects are collected |
| **3. Situational analysis** | Analysis of key challenges affecting the community and discussions on feasible solutions | To be agreed | Spatial outputs and reports on the situational analysis |
| **4. Presentations of the situational** **analysis to the community** | Community to feedback on the situational analysis | To be agreed | Present the situational analysis to community, including maps, charts and tables |
| **5. Developing proposals with community on the feasible interventions** | Both students and community work together to develop plans for interventions. Students to provide theoretical knowledge and community to provide practical knowledge. | To be agreed | Upgrading options |
| **6. Presentation of proposals to communities** | Obtain comments from communities | To be agreed | Community and students present proposed interventions |
| **7. Further refinement of proposals** | A refined document | To be agreed | A ‘way forward’ action plan |

# Appendix 5: Description of enumeration process for Uganda studio

| **Stage of enumeration process** | **Actors/institutions** | **Actions/techniques** | **Objective** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Preparatory meetings* | Community members, local municipal authority and local leadership | Different meetings held at parish and division levels in the municipalities in which projects were taking place | * Identify community challenges and other issues to be included in the enumerations tool/questionnaire. * Sensitize community elders, opinion leaders and the entire community about the importance of the enumeration exercise |
| *Mobilization/sensitization* | Teams of five community members, comprised of two (respected and well-known) community members and three federation members from each of the administrative zones | Door-to-door mobilization of community members | Create awareness about the process and importance of the enumerations exercise |
| *Training of the enumeration teams* | Training done by federation members who had participated in previous enumeration exercises, supported by staff from ACTogether | Training was done at two levels:   * Organizing a workshop where members were guided through the interpretation of the questionnaire * Practical learning by participatory field training | * Enable community members to identify their settlement boundaries and produce settlement sketch maps * Develop a settlement numbering system with community members to promote community ownership of the exercise |
| *Numbering structures in the settlement* | Data management teams (composed of selected community members) | * Each structure (including business structures, business structures, toilets, community centres) was assigned a unique code which was later reflected on the enumeration and mapping sheets * Data management team summarized the numbering data at the end of each day and thus helped both the community and ACTogether to monitor and evaluate the process on a daily basis | Enable the community to better understand the services available to their settlement |
| *Data collection* | Students, federation members | Questionnaire distributed to households and business owners within the settlements. | Gather information on structure, household details, occupancy details, population and available services in the house. |
| Physical observations | * Verify previous data collected NSDFU * Contextualize the data and collect more detailed information not captured in the questionnaires or interviews |
| Interviews: face-to-face interaction with different respondents such as technocrats and local residents | Record views, suggestions and observations from key local actors |
| Photography | * Ensure efficiency in data collection, analysis and presentation * Corroborate findings obtained using other methods |
| Secondary Sources: Secondary data included available census data, official documents and case studies on the five areas. Secondary data were also gathered from dissertations, internet, books, journals and publications | * Consolidate secondary data on the project areas * Corroborate findings obtained using other methods |
| *Data management and entry* | Community members (computerized data entry performed with assistance and supervision of ACTogether) | * Chart was organized in each tallying centre where information collected was tallied on a daily basis * Community registrar was created where each settlement had its details and this information was made available for use by community members * Computerization of data * Data analysis and report writing undertaken after data is verified | Help community members to understand and appreciate the ongoing exercise |

1. SDI observes a typical organizational structure and working model in all its countries of operation. This involves establishing ‘federations’ to mobilize communities through the use of ‘rituals’ such as self-enumeration and financial savings schemes. The federation is supported in its work by an NGO partner, which provides skills and resources needed to mobilize and empower community federations. In the case of these studios, therefore, university departments worked with both SDI federations and support NGOs. For more information on the nature of SDI’s work, please see <http://www.sdinet.org>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Information on this studio and quotes are drawn from the studio report produced by Grace Khumalo (University of Malawi, The Polytechnic), September 2012, and the overall report on both Malawian studios, entitled ‘Learning Differently: Malawi Community Planning Studios’, by Baraka Mwau, Noah Schermbrucker and Adi Kumar (SDI Secretariat), January 2013, available for download at <http://www.africanplanningschools.org.za/images/aaps/malawi_studios_booklet-final_draft-low_resolution.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In addition to the report on both Malawian studios compiled by Mwau *et al*. (‘Learning Differently: Malawi Community Planning Studios’), information on this studio and quotes are drawn from the studio report produced by Mtafu Manda and Dominic Kamlomo, Mzuzu University, December 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Information on this studio and quotes are drawn from the studio report produced by Dr Stephen Mukiibi, Makerere University, October 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Information on this studio and quotes are drawn from the following online article: <http://www.centreforurbaninnovations.org/content/kiandutu-settlement-joint-studio-2014>, date accessed 28 August 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Information on this studio and quotes are drawn from the following online article: <http://namibia-shackdwellers.blogspot.com/2013/09/freedom-square-informal-settlement.html>, date accessed 28 August 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Information on this studio and quotes are drawn from the studio report produced by Baraka Mwau, SDI Secretariat, May 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)