REPORT ON THE SPRING VALLEY SOCIAL AUDIT: WATER SERVICE PROVISION BY TRUCKS

RELEASE DATE MAY 2016
We demand the *municipality* to review the practice of providing *water* in an emergency plan which has *high cost* implications, reflected in this report.
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This report presents the main findings of a social audit that was conducted in Spring Valley informal settlement, in Emalahleni Local Municipality in Mpumalanga Province, during the month of February 2016. The social audit was conducted by Spring Valley community members in partnership with Planact, with the support of International Budget Partnership and other partners namely; Social Justice Coalition (SJC) and Ndifuna Ukwazi (NU). Planact partnered with the Spring Valley community on the social audit following the Spring Valley resident’s dissatisfaction with water service delivery in the settlement. The delivery of this service is the responsibility of the Emalahleni Municipality but in the case of water delivery to Spring Valley, the Municipality outsources this service to a private company who delivers water by truck to the area. The Social Audit aimed at holding the municipality accountable for water provision in the informal settlement and ensuring that residents exercise their constitutional rights.

Post-apartheid South Africa witnesses a violation of its Constitutional mandate as low-income communities such as Spring Valley remain marginalised by the existing development processes, in particular delivery of basic services. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, No. 108 of 1996, (Chapter 2, Section 27(1) (b)) states that “everyone has the right to have access to – Sufficient Food and water”. What the Constitution does not prescribe is the Implementation of this right. This leaves municipalities like Emalahleni interpreting the implementation of this right in their own way. In his presentation during the Consultation with State Actors on Good Practices in Water, Sanitation and Human Rights, in UN Geneva 20-21 January 2011, The Chief Director Helgard Muller touched on a number of issues that speak to the implementation of this right by the Department of Water Affairs.

He gave a brief background to the water services regulation 2001, and stated that it is important that there is adequate supply of water wherein the minimum quantity of potable water is 25L per person per day or 6KL per household per month within the radius of 200 metres of households. He further emphasised the fact that there are several elements that need to be taken into consideration in the water business by municipalities. They need to consider the following;

- Access, i.e. the Infrastructure (tap)
- Operations i.e. ongoing service
- Quality and Quantity (clean water and enough quantity per household)
- Management, Funding and Viability of the service
- Cost recovery and Credit control of the service and
- Communication between the municipality, provider and the residents.

In light of the rights that are clearly stipulated in the Constitution of the republic, Spring Valley Development Committee (SDC) and Planact have been engaging the Emalahleni municipality for the past four years on the issue of water provision for the settlement.

1.1. PROJECT BACKGROUND: Where it all started

Following the call for informal settlement upgrading, instead of relocation by the national department of Human settlement, institutions like National Upgrading Support Programme (NUSP) were set up and agreements laid out to support municipalities and the department as a whole on the key challenges of housing backlog and other technical aspect of the upgrading process. Planact also adopted a programme aimed at empowering communities to participate in the upgrading process of their informal settlements. Through this programme Planact was introduced to Emalahleni municipality and in particular the Spring Valley Informal Settlement.

During the beginning of the partnership Planact and the community encountered challenges around issues of social cohesion and the fact that the community lacked understanding of how local government works. The partners embarked on a training and development programme focusing on municipal legislation that governs the structures and systems of the municipality. The programme also aimed at educating the community about their rights and responsibilities as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and in terms of participating in the governance of their municipality.
To advance social justice in Spring Valley, Planact continues to provide technical support regarding municipal processes - Integrated Development Plan and Municipal Budgeting. The Spring Valley development Forum has also been trained on leadership and conflict resolution skills. The development committee engages the municipality demanding provision of services in the area. To date, the municipality has not been able to provide adequate service delivery in the area, and lack of adequate water is one aspect frustrating the community.
THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL AUDIT

Emalahleni municipality provides the water service through temporary measures. For the past years they have delivered water to the community through the use of service provider (Pholabas General Dealer) by Trucks, but there have been numerous challenges with the delivery of this service and the demand from the community is to have a permanent solution that will give the community dignity and sense of relief.

One of the issues faced by the Spring Valley community is insufficient water supply through the current arrangement. Water runs out before all residents can get a supply in a given water tank or station. Residents also struggle with the inconsistency of water supply. The community does not have a reliable clear schedule for the delivery of water, hence, they never know when next to expect a delivery. The water delivered by the trucks is also sometimes found to be dirty, and community members are concerned that it may cause health hazards. In this case they will not drink the water but will use the water delivered by the tankers for things like bathing.

As a result of these issues many residents are forced to rely on water from the nearby spring or have to buy from shops for drinking and other domestic purposes.

In the process of trying to work with local government to address water issues in Spring Valley, Planact and SDC have also engaged the Nkangala district municipality to provide a permanent solution for water supply. They appointed a service provider and drilled 5 boreholes in the community, pipes and taps were laid down across the piece of land that belongs to the municipality. The boreholes were going to be powered by generators that had been purchased by Nkangala District Municipality. However, they got stolen from the community holding centre and for this reason the boreholes are still not being utilized. Planact used the Social Audit as a tool to further engage the municipality.

1.2. SPRING VALLEY COMMUNITY

Spring Valley is an informal settlement community in Emalahleni Local Municipality in Mpumalanga Province. Emalahleni municipality is located at the western side of the province bordering Gauteng province (see attached map). It is in the Nkangala district municipality and the name Emalahleni is isiZulu for coal. According to the 2007 census Emalahleni municipality has a population of 435,226 with the household complement of 105,593. Spring Valley is a community consisting of approximately 2,200 households. The community mainly comprises poor households and lacks access to basic services.

This settlement is located on 42 hectares of council land at the edge of one of the suburbs called Ryno Ridge. The settlement is established on what was previously a farm with a school which was built as far back as 1962 but it is being refurbished and extended by the department of education. Shacks are reported to have been built as far back as 1980s and early 1990s by a group of evictees from nearby farms.

Most of the people who have settled in this community come from other provinces of South Africa, which are Limpopo, KwaZulu Natal and Gauteng. There is also people who migrated from Lesotho, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and neighbour ing states.
The informal settlement lacks most of the basic services needed in any settlement. There is **no electricity or proper sanitation.** Water is brought into the community by trucks, and there is **poor solid waste disposal** due to lack of proper refuse collection facilities and **lack of proper environmental management** by the municipality. The area is also characterised by **poor infrastructure**; the **roads are in a bad state.**

The biggest challenge facing the community is lack of security of tenure. There is a realization that although the community is settled on the 42 hectares of council land, there are also a huge amount of shacks that have spilled over onto the privately-owned land that the municipality does not have control over. Spring Valley Development Committee was formed by a number of other structures that exist in the community. They came together to ensure that they had a single voice when engaging the municipality. The community had been under threat of eviction, and the relationship with the municipality was strained because of their violent protest against eviction and lack of basic services. The **Tenure road map was developed with the community with the help of Urban Landmark to assist the partnership to have a coordinated effort towards the goals to be achieved.**

All the work that Planact and SDC are focused is part of building the campaign around the security of tenure. What the road map also focuses on is the campaign towards administrative recognition of the community by the municipality. Lobbying the municipality on a permanent solution for water and sanitation are the most important campaigns that were started, and informed the decision to conduct a social audit.

### 1.3 ROAD MAP BUILDING UP A COHESIVE, COORDINATED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STRUCTURE

The Social Audit is part of the road map to support open and meaningful dialogue between the community and the municipality with the intention of working towards recognition for the community and the provision of permanent solutions to the water service delivery challenges in the Spring Valley community. There are permanent options like using boreholes with the pumps that are powered by generators or solar powered pumps. Both of these options have been proposed to the municipality, and accepted, but there have been delays in implementation by the municipality.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIAL AUDIT PROGRAMME

Planact as an organization has three programmes running, namely;

- **Integrated Human Settlement** (concerned with informal settlement upgrading)
- **Community Economic Development** (organizational development and livelihoods support)
- **Participatory Governance** (focusing on budgeting performance and accountability)

Monitoring and evaluation of the engagements with municipality forms part of the process within all the programmes. Based on experience of social audits conducted by other organizations in other parts of South Africa, Planact felt that it was a methodology that would help us and our partners to monitor and effectively advocate for improved service delivery in informal settlements.

Through the Participatory Governance Programme, Planact worked with SDC to ensure they are equipped with knowledge on how government works, especially municipal practices and processes. Part of the training was introducing the community to the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, the municipal legislative framework (e.g. MFMA-Municipal Financial Management Act), and the municipal systems (e.g. IDP, PMS etc.). This training was to empower communities to meaningfully participate in municipal processes such as the Integrated Development Plans and Municipal Budgeting.

As a follow up to this initial training, Planact introduced the social audit methodology to the committee to provide them with a tool they could use to monitor and evaluate service delivery by the municipality and the private contractors they employ.

Through training and watching videos of other institutions and communities that have used social audit as a monitoring tool, the SDC was encouraged to adopt the tool. Planact and the SDC agreed that this would be a helpful tool to hold the municipality accountable for the water delivery to Spring Valley and subsequently a mass meeting was held with the community of Spring Valley to explain the monitoring tool. The community agreed that this would be a helpful advocacy tool in the context of their ongoing campaign for improved water provision in their area, and they gave the SDC and Planact the mandate to use the methodology.

Training Session: Introduction to Social Audit.
2.1. WHAT IS

A Social Audit is a form of citizen participation that focuses on government performance and accountability. It is qualitatively different from other forms of audit and citizen participation (Berthin, 2011).

Social auditing can be used as a tool in providing critical inputs and to correctly assess the impact of the government activities on the social well-being of the citizens, assess the social costs, and measure the social benefits accrued as a result of any programme implementation. This is exactly how Planact is using the methodology, assessing service delivery in Spring Valley community. Social audits have both negative and positive outcomes (Eavani, Nazari and Emami, 2012). Social audit process takes into account financial and non-financial utilization of resources, delivery of outputs and outcomes of an activity or programme or organisation in a participatory manner by consulting all stakeholders. It is conducted through systematic analyses of secondary and primary data of unit of social audit. The analysed data or social accounts should be disseminated often in a public meeting called social audit meetings where all stakeholders are invited (Eavani, Nazari and Emami, 2012). Social Audit is a conscious lengthy process which should be implemented in the most participatory manner to gain maximum benefit.

Members of the community collectively participate in a process of verifying government (or private company) documents by comparing them with the realities on the ground and the experiences of the community. Evidence collected during the audit is then reported to the responsible authorities at a public hearing. Community testimony, knowledge, and experience are a legitimate and central part of this evidence, which explains why the Social Audit team conducted interviews with the community. Government documents may include budgets and reported expenditure, tenders or contracts, invoices and receipts, as well as supporting laws, reports, policies, plans, or norms and standards.

A social audit provides a way to build effective and meaningful public participation in poor and working class communities by providing a means for the community to engage with the governance processes that affect their lives (Social Audits in South Africa, 2015). Social audits empower communities to gather and legitimise evidence of their experience of service delivery, and through this process enables them to claim and realise their constitutional rights to democratic participation and accountable government.

Social audits build community power, deepening the culture of participatory democracy and public deliberation (Social Audits in South Africa, 2015). They provide an opportunity for vulnerable and marginalised voices to be heard, and a space for people who have been excluded and discriminated against to achieve a measure of justice and to hold government to account. In conducting this social audit Planact and SDC adhered to the above-mentioned principles of a social audit.
2.1.1. SOCIAL AUDIT METHODOLOGY

This section explains how the social audit was conducted. It discusses the methods used in the audit, indicating the periods during which each step of the method was employed. It also explains who was involved and their roles. It explains the limitations of the audit, what efforts were made to address them, and how the data was analysed.

Based on the Social Audit guide the method has two key phases. The first phase is focused on preparing the process or setting the scene. The second phase is made up of ten steps.

The Guide to Social Audits in South Africa gives clear guidance on how to conduct a social audit, but the practical implementation can combine the steps or even add more steps depending on the context. The following are the standard guiding principles for a social Audit Process:

Phase 1: Preparation and Planning for a Social Audit

This phase is critical because the plan will determine if the social audit process is legitimate and if it succeeds. Open communication and sharing of information is an important part of this phase.

Phase 2: Conducting a Social Audit

This is the phase where the process work is done in the community with all participants that are involved. The phase needs commitments on time and resources. A core group of people needs to be available throughout this phase to make sure the process is conducted to the last item.

Source: (Social Audits in South Africa, 2015).
2.1.2. BACKGROUND TO THE SOCIAL AUDIT FOR PLANACT AND SDC

Planact, through the support of Raith Foundation, was introduced to the SJC. SJC is an organization based in Khayelitsha Township in Cape Town, in the Western Cape. They started doing social audit work in the year 2013.

A representative from Planact participated in one of SJC’s social audits in Khayelitsha, one focussed on refuse collection and the other on the janitorial service for flush toilets. This sparked interest for Planact to learn more and consider mainstreaming the methodology within its programmes. Planact considered being the implementing agency in the Gauteng and Mpumalanga provinces where Planact implements programmes and has already established partnerships with the communities.

Participation in subsequent international learning exchanges to India and the Philippines also motivated Planact to adopt the methodology. The methodology was also shared with the SDC in Spring Valley and one of the SDC members participated in the social audit in Cape Town that was run by SJC and NU in 2015. During meetings and discussions in the community it was clear that conducting a social audit on water provision would advance the advocacy agenda for Spring Valley informal settlement.

Planact, SDC and the Spring Valley community agreed to use the Social Audit as a Platform to advocate for:

- A more permanent water solution for the community of Spring Valley
- Highlighting the plight of people in the informal settlement in terms of water provision and the inconsistency in service delivery, which leaves people frustrated with lack of water and the feeling disappointment due to the violation of their human rights.
- Highlighting the wasteful expenditure by Emalahleni municipality by continuing to give secondary priority to a water service. This is a practice of providing a temporary intervention measure for a basic need with no forward permanent plan being put in place.

2.2. PREPARING AND PLANNING

As indicated in the social audit method, it is important to prepare and plan properly to ensure that the process succeeds. There were several activities that were done to prepare for the social audit. Below is the time line that shows some of the activities.
2.2.1. TRAINING OF TRAINERS – THE CORE GROUPS

Planact conducted training of trainers for some of the volunteers chosen by the SDC to be community facilitators or community workers. This came about because the committee realised that most of its members are old people who mostly neglect the needs of the youth but also find it difficult to mobilize due to some competing demands.

During the month of August 2015, the facilitators underwent training that would equip them to train other residents on how to conduct or implement:

- Sustainable livelihoods assessment,
- Project management principles and
- Community mobilization.

The facilitators were also introduced to social auditing as a method for community monitoring and holding local municipality accountable for service delivery. This was in anticipation of the social audit in Spring Valley. The facilitators also agreed with the SDC that the Spring Valley community needed to conduct social audit on the water services brought by the local municipality.

Planact's facilitators together with the SDC conducted a water campaign in January 2016, in a bid to mobilize community for water services constraint. The community welcomed the idea of conducting a social audit of the services and gave the mandate and made a commitment to support the process.

This prompted the start of request for documents from the municipality to be able to conduct the social audit with the community.

2.2.2. ACCESSING DOCUMENTS FROM THE MUNICIPALITY

The social audit team established that water provision to Spring Valley had been outsourced by the Emalahleni municipality, to a private company – Pholabas. Pholabas was using tankers to deliver water to this area. Because the service is delivered by a private company, the social audit team established that there must have been a procurement process through which this service provider was appointed, and a contract specifying the details of the service.

The desktop research conducted in an effort to locate the contract did not yield positive results. Emalahleni municipality does not make contracts available on-line and some of the other procurement documents were also missing, yet they have a legislative mandate to publish the contracts once they are allocated for public benefit.

Planact and SDC wrote a letter which was signed by both the director of Planact and the chairperson of SDC to Emalahleni Local municipality (addressed to Mr Mashile – the head of Technical services and Mr Van Vuuren- the municipal manager) requesting the following documents:

a) Service delivery agreement between Emalahleni Local Municipality and Pholabas
b) Emalahleni Local Municipality water services implementation plan
c) Tender document
d) Contractor’s water delivery reports
e) Payment schedule and invoices
f) Municipal budget for informal settlements water provision.

There were several attempts made to follow up and access information through the local activists Thabo and Phaka. A response was received from Emalahleni Municipality after a month, advising the social audit team to use the PAIA application rather. The PAIA application was drawn and submitted to the records department of the municipality and a period of 30 days lapsed with no response from the municipality.

A number of follow-ups were made and it became clear that the municipality was not willing to share the information as they argued that it involved a third party, referring to the service provider. An attempt was also made to speak to the service provider directly. The meeting revealed that the service provider’s contract had expired last year (2015). The Municipality had initiated a procurement process to appoint a new service provider but for some reason has been unable to award the contract. As a result, the Municipality had requested that Pholobas continue to provide water on a month to month basis.
Eventually through the assistance of an IBP official, the audit team managed to get documents that gave some information about the water service provision. The following documents were obtained:-

**DOCUMENT** | **INFORMATION**
---|---
Municipal Implementation Plan - Transportation of portable water in Emalahleni | - This clarified the number of tanks and water stations that the service provider must service in Spring Valley.
- It clarifies the number of days that the water should be delivered.
- States the name of the service provider and
- States the name of the person who has to monitor the service for the municipality
The Invoice/proof of payment | - These are the invoices that the service provider submits to the municipality for payment of his service.
- It shows the amount he charges and it also shows that there is someone who signs it off to confirm that water was delivered to the satisfaction of the municipality.
- Statement of payment.
The tender document | - This is the copy of tender document that was advertised but no service provider was appointed.

The Documents that the municipality provided helped the team to continue with the social audit process. By obtaining relevant information from the municipality, the community was able to clarify the delivery schedule and the cost for their water delivery service. The community was also able to clarify the quantity of water they should expect to be delivered though the documents did not clarify the quality standard and remedial action should there be non-delivery by the service provider.

Although we were finally given the requested documents, gaining access to the documents was a struggle. The municipality was not willing to provide the documents despite numerous letters, visits and meeting requests from Planact and SDC. It was only through the intervention of a third party that the documents were finally accessed.

---

**2.3. CONDUCTING A SOCIAL AUDIT**

**2.3.1. FACILITATORS TRAINING AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS**

SDC helped in identifying a number of volunteers including the trained facilitators. The core group for the social audit was made up of 16 members from Spring Valley with 3 staff member from Planact. The criteria was that it should be people who can commit their time for the duration of the process and they should be able to read and write to be able to handle interviews and writing.

The training was conducted by a team from SJC, NU and IBP with assistance from Planact. The training was conducted over a period of 3 days. Below is the overall objective and the specific objectives achieved:

The overall objective of the training was to:-
- Equip the Spring Valley social audit core group, consisting of Planact staff members and Community volunteers with tools to support the implementation of the most challenging components of the social audit process (i.e. document analysis, social audit data analysis, engaging government during social audit process and follow up).
- The specific objectives were to deepen participants understanding of:-
  - How to read and analyse government documents, with a focus on tender documents.
  - How to analyse data gathered during the social audit to produce a set of findings.
  - The role of government in a social audit, how work with them to map out the government stakeholders relevant to their social audit, and brainstorm ways of connecting with and involving these individuals
  - The follow-up component of the social audit process and support their process of preparing for follow-up.
The training equipped the participants with the knowledge of social audits, its principles and the method to follow using the Social Audit guide developed by SJC, NU and IBP with the help from EE and OSF. The training session also equipped the participants with practical lessons on developing questionnaires and data analysis using the previous work done by SJC.

The next 2 days were critical for the team as it had to look at the documents received from the municipality and draw information that could be used to interact with the community. Participants used their skills from the previous sessions where they learnt the theory on document analysis and did simulation using documents from previous work to identify the relevant information. They formulated the questions to ask, and identified potential participants in the social audit survey.

2.3.2. DEVELOPING SOCIAL AUDIT TOOLS AND PREPARATION FOR FIELD WORK

A number of questionnaires were developed by the team to facilitate the social audit process.

- Questionnaire to interview Residents was developed with 22 questions (see annexure A)
- Questionnaire to interview the Driver was also developed with 8 questions
- Verification form was also developed to help the team to verify and collect evidence about the water tanks and water stations.

The service provider questionnaire was also developed but he was not available for the interview.

The next step was to conduct the role play/simulation using the questionnaires to train and give support in preparation for the field visit. The role play helped the participants to revise the questions to the satisfaction of everyone.

Teams were allocated and times set for the actual field visit. The field work was divided according to the sections in the settlement with more teams focusing on the residents and 2 teams focusing on physical verification and driver interview.

2.3.3. FIELD WORK AND DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of government documents on water service delivery.
The field work was done within a period of 3 days. The community was divided into sections and the teams allocated accordingly. There are four sections in Spring Valley i.e. A, B, C, D. The team interviewed 678 households. The team that focused on Physical verification managed to verify all the 9 water tank stations. The stations are spread around the different sections as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewed Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECTION A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This social audit was a community led process and as such the team from the community was engaged in full. During the data analysis stage the team worked together to verify the data and analyse the findings. The verification was later done again by Planact staff members.

The challenges during the field work were that:

- There was a lot of empty houses/shacks, a lot of community people were not in their houses during the times we conducted the field work. This is due to various factors which the team did not establish and cannot substantiate in this report.
- There was isolated incident of harassment and disrespect, some of the female team members complained of harassment by some of the men in the community when they entered their yards or household. The harassment was more verbal than physical but the team managed to deal with the situation.
- As the social audit was carried out in summer, it was very hot and walking in the settlement was challenging.
- The interview environment was also not conducive, most people stay in shacks which become very hot during the day, so it was not easy to sit inside for interviews. It was equally challenging to sit outside because as there was no shelter.
SUMMARY OF THE SOCIAL AUDIT FINDINGS

The Social Audit process conducted in Spring Valley and document obtained from Emalahleni Municipality reveal the following facts:

3.1. WATER DELIVERY SERVICE PLAN AND COSTS

- Emalahleni Municipality appointed a service provider to deliver water by trucks to the community since March 2013.
- The service provider is paid R3,000 per/day for the delivery of water in all service areas and this costs the municipality between R400,000 and R500,000 a month, thus makes it a very expensive exercise.
- There are 9 water stations with JOJO tanks in Spring Valley and nine more stations that still need Jojo tanks. In these stations without tanks people get water from the trucks straight to their buckets or containers.
- The service provider has three trucks with 20 000l tanks that he uses for this service to Spring Valley and other service areas according to the contract.
- The service provider’s contract expired last year in 2015 but he continues to give service based on verbal contract.
- The truck drivers mentioned that they know that water has to be delivered to the community three times a week. He also said that they do not go to all the water stations in a day, they go to the average of seven water stations in a day.
- The community confirmed that they do not know exactly when to expect water as they are not aware of the delivery schedule.

Below is some of the statistical data captured for the process based on the specific questions asked to the residents
DO YOU KNOW THE SERVICE PROVIDER FOR WATER?

Yes – 40
No – 638

Most residents indicated that they do not know the service provider, his name and company name even though they see the trucks delivering water in their community.

HOW MANY TIMES DO YOU RECEIVE WATER PER WEEK?

1-5 per week – 521 (77%)
6-10 per week – 11 (2%)
Unknown – 146 (21%)

Most residents said that they receive water up to 5 times per week. The findings is consistent with what the drivers said when they indicated that they bring water for up to seven times a week but not to all the water tanks and water stations.

HOW MANY WATER STATIONS ARE THERE IN SPRINGVALLEY?

0-5 – 284 (42%)
6-10 – 171 (25%)
11-14 – 35 (5%)
15-19 – 7 (1%)
Unknown – 181 (27%)

The municipal documents indicate that water should be delivered three times a week, on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday but the trucks are seen in the community everyday even though they do not go to all service stations. The residents said they receive water three times a week; the municipal plan does not reflect the reality on the ground.

The municipal documents indicate that water should be delivered three times a week, on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday but the trucks are seen in the community everyday even though they do not go to all service stations. The residents said they receive water three times a week; the municipal plan does not reflect the reality on the ground.

Water delivery per week

Knowledge of the service provider

Number of water stations

The residents say water that is delivered by the trucks is dirty. And even though there is no statistics of illnesses caused by dirty water they believe this has negative effects on their health.

• The Water looks grey and if they leave it in the bucket overnight they find dirty residue at the bottom of the bucket or find living organisms floating around in the water
• There are days when the trucks do not come and people rely on getting water from the stream. Although there is no proper mechanism to draw water, this is the water that they share with animals too.
• There is no conclusive evidence as to what is causing the water to be dirty, the water might already dirty at the source where the trucks collect it, it could be getting dirty inside the tanker trucks if they are not cleaned regularly and it could also be from the Jojo tanks where the water is delivery as they have never been cleaned.

3.2. WATER ACCESSIBILITY, QUANTITY AND QUALITY

• Most residents rely on the tanks and trucks for water but there are those who go to the stream to get water.
HOW MANY LITRES OF WATER DO YOU USE PER DAY?

- Less than 20L – 82
- 20-49L – 233
- 50-69L – 107
- 70-89L – 59
- 90L- upwards – 100
- Unknown – 97

Most residents made an indication that they use up to 60 litres of water per day. This is consistent with the fact that most residents have up to five people staying in the house.

IS YOUR WATER CLEAN?

- Yes – 178 (26%)
- No – 402 (59%)
- Unknown – 98 (15%)

Most residents attested to the fact that the water from the tanks or the trucks is always dirty.

HOW FAR DO YOU WALK TO GET WATER?

- Less than 6mins – 368
- 7-10mins – 94
- 12-15mins – 35
- More than 20mins – 82
- Unknown – 10

For most residents the Jojo tanks or water station is just six minutes’ walk away, but there are those who stay in areas where there is neither Jojo tank nor station and they have to walk for almost 20 minutes to the nearest tank or to the stream.

3.3. MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING RELATED TO WATER DELIVERY

- The municipal documents shows that Cllr B.D. Nkosi is responsible for confirming the delivery of the water, but residents have never seen him monitoring the service.
- The municipal documents do not clarify who is responsible for maintaining the Jojo tanks.
- Some of the Jojo tanks do not have covers, hence, there is a need for them to be cleaned.
- There is no one dedicated to cleaning the ground around the Jojo tanks.
- Most of the residents also indicated that there is no one they know who monitors the water stations.
- Some residents mentioned said that they know of an SDC member named Richard who is responsible for water. Even though they said he does not do much, they said they always report to him if there is no water or there are conflicts in their stations.

There were several questions asked to the residents regarding their knowledge about the maintenance and monitoring of this water service. Below is the findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever seen any municipal official monitoring water delivery?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the residents indicated that they have never seen any municipal official monitoring the delivery service here in Spring Valley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your water station clean?</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of residents said the water stations are not clean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is consistent with the physical verification that was conducted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team members found that almost all the stations have grass and weed growing around them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there someone who monitors the stations (resident or none)?</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most residents said there is no monitoring in the stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there someone who confirms that you received water?</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents carrying a large number of containers for water collection (Source: Mark Lewis, 2016).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

This Process of Social Audit has helped Planact, SDC and the volunteers to realise a number of things that needs to be rectified, clarified and dealt with by both the municipality and the community.

THE FOLLOWING WILL BE REQUESTED OF THE MUNICIPALITY:

1. We request that the municipality reviews the practice of providing water in an emergency plan which has high cost implications, and that this be reflected in this report.
2. We request that the municipality consider working with Nkangala district municipality as a matter of urgency to find a lasting/permanent solution for water provision in Spring Valley.
3. We request that the municipality allocate an official whom the community can talk to in case there is no water or the quality is compromised.
4. We request that the municipality consider supporting the maintenance of the water stations through the local people, thus creating jobs in the community.
5. We request that the municipality revise the ratio/quantity of water delivered to ensure that enough water is stored in the tanks for the consumption of the community.

THE FOLLOWING WILL BE THE RECOMMENDED TO THE SDC AND THE COMMUNITY:

6. We recommend that the SDC ensure that there is also monitoring from the side of the community to be able to give feedback to the municipality timeously when necessary.
7. We recommend that the community rations water equally when they go to draw water when the trucks come, to afford everyone an opportunity.
The public hearing was held on the 12th March 2016 in Spring Valley Community.

Residents of the settlement were there with the SDC and CPF managing the proceedings. Planact and the social audit team were responsible for the report back part.

Invitations were extended to the Emalahleni local municipality, in particular the municipal manager and the director of technical services and the Nkangala District municipality. None of them honoured the invitations.

Some of the team members presented the social audit findings to the residents. The residents were then given the opportunity to give comments and ask questions to the team and the municipality in absentia. The residents expressed their anger and frustration about the inconsistent delivery of water by the trucks. They indicated that one of the reasons they always go to the stations to draw water carrying many buckets/containers is because they never know when the trucks will deliver water again.

Some of the questions raised are:-

- In terms of accessing municipalities how can Planact assist the community?
- Has Planact been welcomed by the SDC into the community?
- Is Emalahleni Municipality aware of the quality of water that is delivered in Spring Valley?
- What is the methodological process of social audits?
- How possible is it for a resident to install their own Jojo tank inside their homestead?
- Is it possible to get a prompt response from municipality regarding water and generators?

The community suggested that a representative from Planact be present to sign delivery of water on behalf of the community. The community also indicated that they would like to send a delegation to the municipality to engage it regarding the poor quality of water.

REFERENCES

Attached below as Annexure A is all the questionnaires used during the study. These were developed by the social audit team after studying the documents received from the municipality. And Annexure B is the municipal document that were analysed to inform the social audit process.

### SPRING VALLEY SOCIAL AUDIT - FEBRUARY 2018

#### RESIDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you ever seen any municipal official monitoring the water delivery service?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you stayed in Spring Valley?</td>
<td>[Number of years]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In which month is the rainfall highest?</td>
<td>[Month]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the water being supplied to your home sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many people in the house share one tap?</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you pay for the water provided?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Where do you get water from?</td>
<td>[Source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How much water do you use per day?</td>
<td>[Liters]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you think the water is safe to drink?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Have you ever seen any municipal official monitoring the water delivery service?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Have you ever seen any municipal official monitoring the water delivery service?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How many tanks do you have in your house?</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How many hours does it take for the water to reach your house?</td>
<td>[Hours]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How many people share one tap?</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you think the water is safe to drink?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### SPRING VALLEY SOCIAL AUDIT - FEBRUARY 2018

#### DRIVER QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many days do you need water per week/month?</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many kilograms of water do you use per day?</td>
<td>[Kilograms]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many people live in your household?</td>
<td>[Number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you think the water is safe to drink?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Do you think the water is sufficient?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>