

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PREFACE	xvii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xxi
LIST OF FIGURES	xxiii
LIST OF TABLES	xxiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Aim of project and research products	1
1.3 Time frame for the project	2
1.4 Project staff	2
1.5 Brief outline of the report	2
2 'INSTITUTIONS' AS 'RULES'	3
2.1 Institutions	3
2.2 General discussion of policy, strategy and detailed procedure	3
2.3 Existing examples of policy, strategy and detailed procedure and brief review	4
2.4 More detailed analysis of institutions for the provision of sanitation to low-income communities	7
2.5 Performance indicators as tools to direct performance	14
2.6 General regulatory mechanisms for personnel as distinct from institutional procedures	17
2.7 Values and attitudes as components of institutions	19
2.8 Comment on the identification of institutions	21
2.9 Conclusions	21
2.10 Recommendations	24
3 FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY	27
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Level of detail in assessing financial sustainability	27
3.3 Regional estimates of unit costs for Gauteng	28
3.4 Average unit costs for Johannesburg, derived from summary historical costs	32
3.5 Costs derived from DDPLG Backlog Study	33
3.6 A listing of items that need to be catered for in a determination of life cycle costs	34
3.7 Conversion of capital costs to equivalent monthly costs	36

3.8	What actual tariffs have been used by JW?	37
3.9	What do we know about the problem of non-payment?	39
3.10	Key matters to be addressed in detailed modelling for financial sustainability	40
3.11	Conclusions	41
4	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY	45
4.1	Introduction	45
4.2	Applicable legislation and responsibility	45
4.3	Decision-making at DWAF	47
4.4	Application of the Groundwater Protocol	49
4.5	Groundwater and surface water catchments	52
4.6	Other legislation covering environmental impact of on-site sanitation systems	54
4.7	Conclusions	57
4.8	Recommendations	57
5	DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACHES	59
5.1	The problem of failure of conventional approaches to infrastructure provision	59
5.2	Key elements of a developmental approach to the provision of infrastructure in low-income communities	60
5.3	Demand responsive approach	65
5.4	Establishment of a framework through which demand can be expressed	68
5.5	Conclusions	71
5.6	Recommendations	74
6	CONCLUSIONS	75
6.1	Conclusions	75
6.2	Recommendations	83
7	REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	87
7.1	References	87
7.2	Selected bibliography	90
8	APPENDICES:	93

Pegram, G, Hartley, S, Coulsen, N, Wall, K and Otterman, A (2000) *A Protocol to Support Peri-Urban Sanitation Provision in the GJMC*, prepared for the Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council (GJMC), and funded by the Eastern Metro Local Council (EMLC) and the British Department for International Development Southern Africa (DfIDSA) through the National Sanitation Coordination Office (NaSCO), February.

City of Johannesburg (CoJ) (2002) *Sanitation Policy for the City of Johannesburg*, drafted by Jacky Burke, Environmental Planning and Management: CoJ, and approved by the Mayoral Committee on 28 Nov 2002.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
3.1 HOUSEHOLD COST OF WATER AND SANITATION FOR DIFFERENT LEVELS OF SERVICE IN GAUTENG [R/site/month 2000 costs] (Van Ryneveld, 2000, after Palmer Development Group et al., 1993 and Palmer Development Group 1994)	30
4.1 DIAGRAM OF CONTAMINANT PATH (DWAF, 1997)	49
4.2 GROUNDWATER PROTOCOL FLOWCHART (DWAF, 1997)	50
4.3 AQUIFER CLASSIFICATION MAP OF SOUTH AFRICA (DWAF, 1997)	52
4.4 MAP INDICATING GROUNDWATER CATCHMENTS IN GAUTENG PROVINCE, AND BOREHOLE LOCATION (DWAF, 2000b)	53
4.5 SURFACE WATER IMPOUNDMENT CATCHMENTS IN GAUTENG (Van Ryneveld et al., 2001)	53
5.1 DEVELOPMENT IMPACT APPROACH (DIA) (Marler, 1993; DBSA, 1993) ...	63
5.2 CONVENTIONAL APPROACH (Marler, 1993; DBSA, 1993)	63
5.3 LOCATION OF A DEMAND RESPONSIVE APPROACH WITHIN A MATRIX OF RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND COMMUNITY INTEREST (Source: after early stages of earlier Sanitation Protocol)	69
5.4 ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PROJECT OUTCOME (CII, 1986) CONTRASTED WITH PROJECT CASH FLOW (after Thompson, 1981)	70
5.5 PROJECT CASH FLOW OVER THE FULL LIFE OF THE PROJECT (after Thompson, 1981)	71