

Urban Community Development Fund, Thailand

The Experience of the Urban Community Development Office (UCDO), (Community Organizations Development Institute - CODI)

By Somsook Boonyabancha

1. 1. Introduction

An urban poor development fund is a powerful development mechanism, allowing urban poor communities to organize themselves into saving groups and improve their financial and managerial capacity to manage the loans for community development activities for the members or for the community as a whole from the fund directly. It is a mechanism that enables urban poor organizations to tap development resources directly by building up their own capacities. It is an alternative way of avoiding traditional bureaucratic mechanisms which decide development activities on behalf of communities. This new approach allows communities to decide and design various development activities by themselves, on a large scale, and later to link together into networks of learning and sharing of knowledge. The networking has become another important development mechanism in the cities, not only as a means of sharing knowledge but also of working together with local development agencies, cooperating and planning for urban poor community development as well as other local development activities, and building better local partnerships.

The ***Urban Community Development Office, UCDO*** was set up in 1992 as an organization in charge of managing the *Urban Community Development Fund* of 1,250 Million Baht (US\$ 28 million) granted by budget from the Thai government. Before 1996, UCDO granted loans to community organizations in a rather scattered way, by dealing directly with individual community groups. Since 1996, the emergence of community networking has brought a completely new dimension and development vision to the way UCDO operates. Community networks and building up local partnerships to broaden community development activities have become the leading new development directions. While UCDO still supplied and actively supported communities with various kinds of community development loans, UCDO also acted as facilitator for larger city collaborative development activities.

As a result, when UCDO merged with the Rural Development Fund to become CODI (Community Organizations Development Institute) in October 2000, not only has the total amount of the Fund been increased by about 36% from the original amount, but UCDO has been able to expand its development activities to 53 out of Thailand's 75 provinces. About 950 community saving groups and more than 100 community networks have been set up. And total assets generated in Thai urban communities from the process could be roughly calculated to be well beyond 2,000 million Baht, which generated partly from the loans from this Community Development Fund and partly from community's own savings and credit activities themselves.

Regarding housing activities, there are several kinds of housing projects which have been developed through community initiatives, ranging from initiatives to buy existing slum land to resettlement nearby or further away from former community locations, and loans for housing improvement in existing slums or housing repair after crises. Recently, when the community network process became stronger, city-wide housing development activities have been introduced in the cities of Nakornsawan, Ayuthaya, Uttaradit, Chiangmai, etc. This is a new direction in which the community networks, together with the city, develop and plan for security of tenure for all existing slums in the city. Apart from housing, community environment activities, community welfare and community enterprise activities have also been actively developed. Some cities have shown great potential for stronger community networks to link with other civic groups to work in a broader city development issues like planning, environment, solid waste management etc.

Furthermore, because of the close collaborations and learning from each other among groups in different countries in Asia, facilitated by the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights, the experience of UCDO has been widely disseminated to several other countries in the region. Several countries such as Cambodia, Laos PDR, Vietnam, India, South Africa and Zimbabwe have learned about the powerful roles of community development funds and have developed similar Community Fund in their countries.

In October 2000, UCDO was merged with the Rural Development Fund to become CODI, to be able to work with a much broader scope, including urban and rural areas and with a new legal but very flexible institutional status as public organization.

2. Situation before 1996 and after

UCDO was set up in 1992 at a time of steady high economic growth in the country since 1980s. In those years under the period of economic growth, it was no surprise that the country achieved annual two digit economic growth regularly. The growth has been the big long boom after stronger democratic system has been secured since early 1980s allowing economic development base on various forms of foreign investment to gradually gain their weight. The country from this period transformed rapidly: private sector development boomed, easy access to loans and finance for development from commercial banks, so many huge infrastructure and building activities developed throughout the country, greater expansion of urbanization to most urban centers in the country, growth of middle class and service sectors, private real estate housing sectors boomed, land prices sky-rocketed. Despite such a boom and such rapid growth, income disparities between rich and poor grew very wide. Income shares of first highest quintiles has increased from 51% in early 80s to more than 60% in 1990s and the shares from bottom quintiles has decreased from 5% to 3% in the same period.

This growth drew more people to come to cities for greater employment opportunities in both formal and informal sectors. The urban poor people also enjoyed greater employment opportunities contributed from the economic growth. However, the fact that most urban poor communities usually have weak land tenure security resulted in more eviction problems. Eviction problems have been wide spread on both public and privately-owned land, since economic growth and increasing land prices have both encouraged and pressured landlords to redevelop land for more profitable uses. At the end of 1980s, about 24% of Bangkok's population lived in about 1,500 low-income settlements and about 21% of those settlements reported to have problems of eviction. In theory, all slum communities can be evicted since there are no legal protections whatsoever, no matter how long the settlements might have been established.

The general threat of eviction in most slum communities, on the other hand, has become a major factor in bringing communities together into organizations, to learn how to survive and negotiate and coordinate with others, as well as searching for more secure development options. In early 1990s, before the setting up of UCDO, some innovative housing options such as land-sharing, community-driven housing activities, the formation of a few community networks and more and more numbers of community saving and credit activities were initiated. These innovative initiatives were organized against the lack of sufficient formal institutional support and were still based on fairly conventional approaches. On the private sector development side, which have immensely transformed the urban human settlements context in Bangkok and several cities, the real estate housing boom has, in general, not able to reach the 30% poorer population. The real drive of the private sector's market housing boom has also been generated by speculation and easily-accessible finance for the upper and middle class, who mostly have the luxury of owning more than one house, mostly 2 to 3 if not more.

The problems from such unbalanced growth has brought the country to serious consideration and to an attempt to review the development direction under the 8th National Social Economic Plan (1997-2001) to concentrate more on such unbalanced and disparity and to reorient the

country's development to focus more on people, social equity and sustainability. In fact, the preparation process of the new approach in the national plan has started to change the development approach before 1996 to be more people and community oriented, holistic approach, localization and to be more integrated.

This was the general situation until the first half of 1997, when the severe Asian economic crisis hit the country hard, and which will take a long time to recover from. The crisis has had a great impact on all sectors of people in the country, especially the middle class. Many private sectors and financial institutions collapsed, causing serious unemployment and lesser incomes throughout.

The urban poor also faced serious problems. According to the survey on impacts to the poor from a country-wide survey of about 130 communities conducted 1998 by UCDO, it was found that 60% of the urban poor had less income and increasing debts. Savings activities in many communities also faced crises and near collapse.

However, eviction problems were reduced. Furthermore, the crisis, has brought several other government programs that was able to use the crisis to implement new development opportunities by communities in massive national scale on various development activities. Furthermore, the crisis also become a good hard cause bringing people in the whole country to rethink and review all related structural development directions in the country which bring about drastic structural change in political system, economic development, city development, environment and sustainable development, etc.,.

3. The Approach adopted to address the problems

3.1 General approach/ development process

UCDO was set up in 1992 to manage Urban Community Development Fund in response to bridge the large gap created between the formal system and informal urban poor and it has been designed from the wealth of experiences and potentials learnt from various initiations in the 80s. It has developed various process by *trial and error* until around 1996 when the new thinking started to reform the way the Fund operated. Then came the economic crisis in 1997 which affected communities and UCDO's loans seriously causing UCDO to change the way it operated more drastically and to use the crisis to be an opportunity in changing into a new quality.

UCDO was set up as an attempt of the Thai Government to take a new approach and develop a new process to address urban poverty. The Government granted a revolving fund of 1,250 million Baht (about US\$ 28 million) through the *National Housing Authority*^[1] to set up a special program and new autonomous unit of Urban Community Development Office to address urban poverty at national scale. The program sought to improve living conditions and increase the organizational capacity of urban poor communities through the promotion of community savings and credit groups and the provision of integrated loans at favorable interest rates as wholesale loans to community organizations. This new *Urban Poor Development Fund* was to be accessible to all urban poor groups who organized themselves to apply for loans for their development projects.

For the urban poor, organizing themselves into savings and credit group is a simple, direct and uncomplicated way of taking care of their immediate day-to-day needs. Savings activities become a tool which links poor people within a community to find ways of working together, from handling simple basic credit needs to managing more complex development activities which help linking them with the formal system. Savings and credit groups become a significant entry point for a community's own development process, to come together as a community, and to link with external resources. And the *Urban Poor Development Fund* is

^[1] It was set up as NHA special program to allow fullest flexibility to work under national organization umbrella but under its own development process and separate Board of Directors.

the communal resource base which community people can link with directly to get additional resources to develop themselves.

The idea, however, is not simply to provide low-interest loans to the poor. Community savings and credit activities are seen as a means for engendering a community's own *holistic development*, which should gradually be able to deal with the root causes of poverty. Much more important than cheap loans is the development of community managerial capacity and stronger community organizations which are able to lead various community development processes. It is therefore important that development process include community action planning and the creation of partnerships with other local development actors - especially the municipalities - and to link up with various other local development activities. The process of continuous learning and development within and between poor communities must be the focal development mechanism to address problems of poverty, mainly by the urban poor themselves, using the *Urban Poor Development Fund* as their basic resource.

As regard to the system of loans, there are various kinds of loans offered to community savings and credit groups throughout the country. All kinds of loans are given as low interest, wholesale loans to community organizations or community networks, allowing the organizations or networks to add a margin to cover their expenses or other community development activities or welfare programs. In general, the organizations will add certain margins so the members will receive the loans at the rate that is near to or slightly higher than the prevailing market rates, which, in any case, are still much lower than those informal money lending systems. Various kinds of loans from the Fund offer various kinds of financial resources for various development options to be implemented, decided and controlled by community organizations themselves. The various kinds of loans options are as follows:

Types of Loans	Interest charged(%) From UCDO/CODI		Maximum term	
1. <i>Revolving Fund Loan</i>	10	3		
2. <i>Income Generation</i>	8	5		
3. <i>Community Enterprise</i>	4	7		
4. <i>Housing Improvement</i>	8-10	5-15		
5. <i>Housing Project</i>	3-8	15		
6. <i>Network Revolving Fund Loan</i>		4	5	
7. <i>Revival loan</i>	1	5		
8. <i>(Miyazawa) loan to relieve community crisis and debts</i>	1	5		
9. <i>Guarantee loan</i>	<i>fixed rate + 2%</i>		<i>flexible up to the need for guaranteeing</i>	

* Most cases community will add margin of about 5% from this rate charged by UCDO.

3.2 Approaches adopted after 1996 and in confronting problems from economic crisis

In early stages, loans were granted to community organizations directly and widely. By 1997, the operating process of UCDO came to a significant period of adjustment and structural change, which paved the way for an immense change in urban community development process in Thailand. The change mainly came from the creation of community networks in same cities or constituencies. There are several reasons for this:

1. 1. There has been more and more emphasis on city development processes and on linking community groups with local authorities. Groups in the same city who have similar experiences and have become more mature have met more often at local authority development forums.
2. 2. The UCDO process has been so scattered throughout the country that there was a need to link communities to share and work together in their constituencies, to be self supporting and use self learning among

community groups in the same area. It has also been important to utilize experiences and capabilities of the strong groups to set up and support the new and weaker groups.

3. 3. Between 1997 and 1999, the problems of the economic crisis affected the urban poor's savings and credit groups immensely. The non-repayment rate increased from 1-2% in 1995 to about 7-8% in 1998-1999, and several community savings and credit groups came to the verge of collapse. Therefore, a new and clearer understanding of the process of setting up community-savings groups and a new understanding of how to revive broken groups had to be found and quickly learned from these problems. The whole system of UCDO was totally reviewed. The fragility of the savings groups, without sufficient and on-going horizontal support, was also clearly realized, and there was a need to find a horizontal mechanism of communities and other urban development actors to support. Besides, it is also extremely important to find ways how to transfer the repayment responsibilities to be a more communally responsible rather than single community responsibilities, with probably just a few leaders taking responsibility. All this learning and experience led UCDO to the new direction of bringing groups to work and share responsibilities with each other in the form of networking.
4. 4. Several interventions and programs made since 1996 have started to implement the decisions and work of the networks, rather than single groups, such as community-driven community development activities, community welfare programs, etc. The new approach has proved to be extremely efficient in implementing significant numbers of community development projects by communities themselves, in city and country-scale. With this new approach, it communities themselves can find connections and continuations for those various development programs themselves. Later on, these network processes were mobilized to deal with several other urban community issues such as infrastructure, housing, community planning, education, health and welfare.

4. Institutional set-up and roles of partners

4.1 Institutionalized partnership at highest policy level

Since its inception in 1992, UCDO was governed by a Board appointed from various development partners, especially community representatives elected by community themselves. To be a new kind of institution managed by partnership of development as an *institutionalized "Partnership"*.

The organization was governed by a Board which had complete power to make decisions on all of the UCDO policies. Although UCDO was a special organization under NHA, the UCDO Board had the power to make decisions independently. The crucial point in this regard was the combination of the Board Members which are as follows:

- 4 from government organizations (the Bank of Thailand, Finance Ministry, National Housing Authority and NESDB),
- 4 elected from community leaders,
- 3 experts from NGOs and private sector.
- The NHA Governor is the Chairman and
- UCDO Managing Director is the Secretary of the Board.

Such a combination brought about a process of partnership in the implementation of the programs. This new process brought in all of the relevant and concerned actors, with partnership and cooperation as its core structure, throughout the whole implementation process. The instant that community leaders are having equal status with other government

and development actors have significant implications to the entire development process. Having community representatives sitting at the highest committee also directly caused the whole program to be transparent and participatory at structural level.

When UCDO merged to become Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI), a public organization, the same principles of the partnership Board were taken as the new institutions structure.

4.2. Communities and community networks as key Operating Mechanisms

The organization used the strategy of strengthening communities' managerial capacity as a major strategy, then tried to find a process whereby the activities could be multiplied by the community organizations themselves. So UCDO worked to encourage, facilitate and enable, in all possible ways, various forms of community organizations and federations to be set up or become involved in the program. Communities are key implementators for all development activities through various loans provided.

The very significant aspects is the process of linking together the urban poor savings and credit groups in the same city and district, or with similar development issues and common interests to form many different *community networks*. Networks were also organized at various levels - from national, regional, within-city, zonal and district-wise or organized according to similar interest and problems such as network on same landlords, eviction, community enterprise, welfare, etc.,. In fact, no particular format about community network have been prescribed, but the networks have developed according to the interest and capabilities of the groups involved, in accordance to their own needs, situation and changing context.

Community networking are very powerful platform for larger scale development - a platform which involves a synergy of learning, sharing of experiences, boosting of morale and inspiring each other. The networks have given urban poor groups enormous confidence. Community networking has emerged at many levels and in many forms, and has become the main *community-led* development mechanism to develop a national-scale urban poverty development process and to link with other existing programs by the urban poor community themselves. Later, loans also provide to community networks as well.

4.3 Working with other Existing Organizations

Another major UCDO strategy was to work with as many as existing organizations as possible : Government, Local Authorities, NGOs, Federations, professionals etc., and regards all existing organizations as potential development partners, to be supported and strengthened and to work together in implementing the program. In several cities, attempts to bring all urban groups to work together in the form of *Urban Community Development Committee* were successfully introduced. Building capacity to build local partnership to work together through UCDO interventions has been in regular ways of implementation. Subcontracting development activities to NGOs and municipal governments in several cities have also been implemented.

5. Financial resources

The Community Development Fund was granted from the Thai Government in 1992 in the amount of 1,250 million baht (about US\$ 28 million). It is a revolving fund which provides flexible, low-interest loans to communities. The fact that the grant was in the form of a revolving fund allowed greater flexibility in managing a new development process which is being led by people in communities. The new management of a fund allowed short-cuts to deliver financial resources directly to communities and to be directly managed by communities. It was a new way to liberate communities and urban poor people from the existing restrictions of conventional, expensive and development, decided for them by others who are not poor.

From the very beginning, it was agreed that profit earned on the fund should help subsidize the administrative and development costs in all activities. It was agreed, politically, from the Board that the average interest rate should be around 7% from all kinds of loans. The share expenses for this 7% was divided as follows: 4% for administration and development activity costs, 1% reserved for bad loans, 1% for special community activities and 1% go back to the Fund.

In reality, the actual average interest gains from all loans was only about 5%, since about 60% of total loans granted were for housing projects which pay a low interest rate of only 3%. However, since only about one third of the total fund was being used in various kinds of loans, while two thirds was saved in the bank, that allowed for higher interest rates, especially before 1998-1999. Therefore the interest gained from the Fund averaged about 7% per year, while total expenses for all the development activities and management costs averaged about 3% per year. Therefore, when UCDO merged to become CODI at the end of 2000, the UCDO fund had grown in size to about 1,700 Million Baht (US\$ 38 million).

Apart from activities developed around community savings and credit process generated by the Community Development Fund, when so many community activities and networks emerged and began working actively with other local development actors on a large scale, this development process also began to draw resources from several other development budgets to incorporate in general development activities. Since 1996, there have been several joint-development projects between UCDO and other development programs such as DANCED's *Community Environment Development Activities*, which received the grant to set up urban *Community Environment Development Fund* of about US\$ 1.3 million. Community welfare activities, as well, got a boost from the World Bank's *Social Investment Program* of about US\$ 6 million.

6. Results and impacts

6.1 Increases in community organizations and networks

At the time of the creation of CODI in October 2000, not only has the total amount of the fund increased by 36% from the original grant, but UCDO has been able to expand its activities into 53 provinces (out of 75) throughout the country. About 950 community saving groups, out of about 2,000 total urban communities, and more than 100 community networks have been set up. Besides, there are various kinds of community networks sharing the same interest or same problems across the country, such as network on community on same land, community enterprise, womens groups, etc. Community networks have also been accepted as an important development mechanism by most formal development agencies now.

6.2 Increased in community assets and direct financial resources

More than 1,000 million baht have been granted as various kinds of loans and more than half of the loans have been repaid. On the communities' side, by setting up saving groups, the amount of community savings, when put together, is now more than 500 million baht. These community-owned savings are used as fast-revolving funds which circulate among community members. Roughly calculated, the assets generated within communities as a result of this savings and loan process could be around 2,000 million baht, during UCDO's period of operation, while the original capital in the fund still remains, revolved and has in fact increased. In 1999-2000, the implementation of Miyazawa loans to community networks, for purposes of relieving the effects of the economic crisis in poor communities, found that about half of the 240 million baht which was granted to refund the informal debts of members, which could also amounts to more than 500 million baht in 5 years.

6.3 Increased community management and enterprising capacity

Having their own resource base, linkages with several other groups, and back-up from UCDO as a part of government organization, communities have developed the confidence to implement activities which directly address their own insecure conditions, by themselves.

With a stronger financial base and a strong confidence in their own development capacity, several communities have been able to develop community enterprises and to invest together in many activities. Several groups have subcontracted the work together as a group such as construction work, producing of school uniforms from Municipality, such the ownership and management of petrol stations by taxi driver cooperatives. Taxi drivers can own their own cars from income generation loans, communities can subcontract the management of a large fresh market as a group and communities can own a milk factory together, etc.

6.4 Developing more diverse housing solutions - from individual projects to city processes

Several kinds of housing projects have been developed through loans to community initiatives, including buying existing slum land, resettling to land that is close to former communities, improving housing *in situ* in existing slums and repairing housing after a crisis. Recently, as the community network process became stronger, several city-wide housing development activities have been introduced in the cities of Nakornsawan, Ayuthaya, Uttaradit and Chiangmai. This is a breakthrough, and an exciting new direction, in which local community networks work together with the city to develop city-wide plans for providing secure land and housing for all the existing slums in the city. Some cities have great potential for stronger links to be forged between community networks, local government agencies and other civic groups to work on broader city development issues like planning, environment, solid waste management and in broader city development program such as Healthy or Livable Cities Program.

6.5 Development of large scale community welfare activities

Most of the community networks have developed their own community welfare programs to take care of the more vulnerable groups in their own communities. These welfare programs have been completely designed and carried out by the networks, and include funds for school fees, funds for people who are sick, funds for the elderly, and funds for emergencies within communities. In fact, the existence of these welfare funds allows communities to help each other in such a way that isolated problems become a communal shared responsibilities. They also provide a secure feeling among community members who have never had any sort of welfare protection in the past.

6.6 Communities have stronger status and can develop better partnerships with local authorities and other development actors

Several cities have developed urban community development forums as a collaborative platform for communities and other development actors working together at city level. Many formal development programs have also developed structures of partnership, with community representatives sitting at the highest committee level. It is becoming more and more a culture and belief that communities of the poor should be key development actors and should participate in the decisions which relate to their lives.

6.7 Changing the culture of how development institutions are managed

Most development institutions - whether local, national or international - always preach about decentralization, and participation. But the way they set up their institutional systems and the way they plan, administer and implement their programs is mostly in complete contradiction to that preaching. This new approach has helped demonstrate new development possibilities, in which communities are prime actors and it has given much broader and more sustainable impacts. The process demonstrate the strength and power of horizontal development direction against the traditional unsustainable and expensive vertical system.

7. Replication, follow-up, CODI

7.1 Expanding the experiences of CDF to other countries in the region

Because of the close collaboration and mutual learning among groups in different countries in Asia, as facilitated by the *Asian Coalition for Housing Rights*, the experience of UCDO has been widely disseminated to several other countries in the region. Several countries such as Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, India, South Africa have been able to learn about the powerful roles which can be played by community development funds. Many of these groups in other countries have developed similar models in their countries and there are now many funds operating in Asia and Africa, such as the *Urban Poor Development Fund (UPDF)* in Phnom Penh, the *Pak Ngum Community Development Fund* in Vientiane, Community Development Funds in 5 provincial cities in Vietnam, the *Payatas Urban Poor Development Fund* in the Philippines, the *uTshani Fund* in South Africa, the *Windhoek Urban Poor Development Fund* in Namibia and the *Gungano Fund* in Zimbabwe. Extensive exchange visits among several groups in the region have been organized to facilitate and broaden the development of this direction.

7.2 Institutionalizing links between urban and rural community development

On October 26, 2000, UCDO officially merged with a Rural Development Fund to become a new public organization called *The Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI)*. The royal decree which brought CODI into existence allows development activities launched under UCDO to continue, but the change also provide a new opportunity for a some big changes in how the organization works, how it relates to the poor community organizations it supports. The decree means CODI itself has its own legal entity as public organization to provide larger scope, greater possibilities, greater flexibility, broader linkages and much-expanded possibilities for collaboration between urban and rural groups. CODI can also apply for government budget directly so the additional financial resources will become additional development tools of communities.

The transformation to CODI has brought about drastic changes to the former UCDO's structure, which has become much more decentralized to the regions in the country. Each region will have a committee comprising community leaders and other development actors to direct the development in that region. In each province, as well, there will be provincial development committees selected from various community networks in the province to lead the province's development direction.

8. Lessons learned

8.1 community savings and credit activities and Community Development Fund should be viewed as powerful means for self development process

Community-managed savings and credit is a flexible but powerful instrument for development by people themselves - not as an end or objective in itself. This implies an approach to development not as mere welfare, not only to provide access to finance but a process to build a real community strength and development force from within. The Community Development Fund is set up to support development by communities directly, and allows this "self development" to gradually mature and strengthen, so communities can renegotiate with other sectors in society. If such funds are properly managed, they can generate various kinds of increased wealth and prosperity within communities, while the capital remains or increases.

8.2 The management of Community Funds or poverty programs should be designed on the basis of conditions of the poor - not on the basis of what is convenient for market or bureaucratic purposes.

Most programs are set up to match the conditions and knowledge of non-poor people from the formal system. Many funds tend to worry too much about market mechanisms and conditions, even though these things may not relate to the lives of the poor very much. Some feel too worried about the poor behavior and lack of formal knowledge in community leaders. Too much efforts have been wrongly concentrate on training how to formalize communities with formal knowledge that strange to their lives and ways of living which always end up with

little success. *Effective programs should concentrate on the conditions and potentials of the poor.* The establishment of these funds allow greater flexibility to allow the poor to be the key development actors and learn to better develop thrie lives and community by their increasing capacity and knowledge base on their own survival potentials and at their own pace. These funds will allow financial flow to be secured for various kinds of development by the poor, through their community organizations themselves.

8.3 It is important to deal with poverty issues with deeper understanding

Poverty results from causes that are structural. In order to deal with poverty problems, it is necessary to develop ways in which the poor themselves can become stronger and have more confidence to change and develop by themselves as much as possible. The development may have to be multi-dimensional and continuous. The strength of change developed from within the poor and in relationship to others has to coincide. The stronger the poor become in their confidence, financial status, learning, information, bargaining power and links, the better they become in changing their relationship with the system gradually by themselves. Poverty cannot be reduced by any single program or consultancy. It needs serious ground work with - *and by* - the poor people themselves.

8.4 Partnership in very important but real partnership is difficult and need gradual development

The new institutional set up based on a process of partnership between various actors is a very important and, perhaps, inevitable development direction, however, it can be a rather problematic process. Many existing urban actors, government municipality, NGOs or CBOs emerged from a past culture of confrontative and centralized politics which runs counter to the spirit of a process of partnership and decentralization: the new approach and process has to deal with and work along with this reality. A real partnership is a process to evolve a more equitable political relationship of communities and other urban actors which will have to take time to develop. Needless to say this new process can be easily be obstructed or side tracked by actors with the old mind set.

8.5 Internal institutional development to keep up with actual development realities

It is important to build a development process, within the administrating organization, that corresponds to a "*bottom-up*" community development process: a new type of administrative culture is required to allow and encourage a maturity and strength in development workers that grows along with the community. A failure to carefully build a facilitating, institutional system with a people-centered philosophy and paradigm will obstruct or bring about the failure of the actual development process. Organizational development needs to be emerged in both ways and all directions, complementary and changing each others : from the institution to community and also from community to institution, from communities to communities and from institutions to institutions.

[back to sdi home page](#)