

Imperatives for Community-Led Settlement Management in African Cities

Basirat Ashabi Oyalowo

Department of Estate Management / Centre for Housing and Sustainable Development, University of Lagos, Nigeria
Email: boyalowo@unilag.edu.ng

Abstract

The failure of previous attempts by governments to address slum proliferation necessitates the emergence of new approaches. We propose a process of slum management founded on urban regeneration principles as opposed to slum eradication and slum clearance. The research question that this study answers therefore is what are the imperatives for the community-led settlement management in cities of Sub-Saharan Africa? Using the institutional framework for Lagos as one of the four most populous cities in Africa and the most populous in West Africa, we develop a line of action for community-led settlement management taking into consideration the diversity of urbanization across African cities and the need to develop bottom-up initiatives. The action plan is particularly directed at catalysing projects in slums and informal communities, which abound in most cities of the continent. This will serve as a framework for ensuring that living conditions in slums of the urban areas are improved upon without evoking evictions and displacement.

Keywords: community management, community participation, slum management, urban management.

Introduction

The population of African cities over the next decade shows no sign of declining so that the implication for existing and new demand for infrastructure, housing and other physical amenities and facilities remain critical. The rapid rate of urbanization has given rise to slum formation and informal communities in several cities across Sub-Saharan Africa. Slum communities are generally characterized by lack of basic, public services such as water, electricity, healthcare, basic education, roads with drainage system and solid waste management. Houses are generally in poor condition with palpable evidence of physical deterioration, lack of indoor sanitary and cooking spaces and in some cases, half completed units suffice as a roof over the family's head.

African governments have a long history of inappropriate responses to slum proliferation such as slum clearance and evictions, and the resulting externalities are well documented in both advocacy and academic literature (see Oyalowo, Nubi and Lawanson, 2018). It has also proven to be extremely expensive to tackle the social and economic costs of these responses. The negative impact, and the lack of tangible outcomes to these responses dictates that the approach needs to change. Participatory approaches have gained traction in policy and advocacy circles as an alternative. A community-led settlement management encompasses all activities geared towards residents' management of community with the support of stakeholder groups. It is an approach that projects communities as the initiators of regeneration projects in their localities, putting them ahead of governments, and ensuring that they have capacity to negotiate their interests should a government-led project be created in their locality. However, it does not portend an adversarial relationship with governments and its agencies, but rather seeks to ensure that intervention projects are people-led and people-centred. There is a need to however develop a template for complimentary action with governments and their agencies. The research question that this study answers therefore is: what are the imperatives for the community-led settlement management in cities of Sub-Saharan Africa? Adapting the institutional framework existing in Lagos as a frame to capture the key issues to be addressed, this article presents these imperatives as a template that can be adapted to all cities in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The study's significance lies in the capacity of the framework to be used as a tool by multiple audiences, including advocacy, government and community groups. It also contributes to academic knowledge of the issue of slum management, while it is hoped that it would trigger some debates on the efficacy of community-led settlement management in general and community-based slum management in particular.

A contextual report of Lagos and its dire urbanization circumstances is presented in the subsequent section, where issues relating to the causes of slums are also identified. In the third part of the article, the key elements of the action plan are laid out. The fourth section concludes by reiterating the importance of complementary activities with Government.

Context

The Lagos State government (2013) suggested that 75% of its 20 million inhabitants (attributed to 2011 estimates of the Lagos Bureau of Statistics) live in substandard housing areas, recognizing that 15 million inhabitants experience poor living conditions (such as living in overcrowded housing units with lack of indoor cooking and sanitary facilities; as well as poor waste management and drainage).

It is important that the historical causes of slum formations are understood. This is because the origins of each community differ and an understanding of the historical processes would ensure that deep-rooted problems are addressed. The causes of slums in Lagos can be traced in part to the historical growth of the city as the seat of colonial administration facilitated by its port location and the connectivity its inland water ways offered to the rest of the country. These pull factors were significant in drawing a diversity of population to the Lagos Island (the origin of Lagos). But the resulting intense competition for land for commerce and manufacturing had grave implications for its fast-expanding residential communities, leading to the creation of slum settlements in the inner city and emergence of new ones on the Island. In his 1968 seminal work, renowned Sociologist, Akin Mabogunje provided a treatise on 19 communities he categorized as lower-medium grade and low-grade residential districts of Lagos on account of their abysmal level of access to basic amenities of water, kitchen arrangement, toilet facilities and electricity, all early indicators of slum characteristics.

The Lower-medium grade communities were identifiable as communities that had witnessed planning interventions after a slum clearance exercise in 1930, but where these interventions had not been successful in eliminating the slum conditions so that they became ‘oasis of planned layouts in a wilderness of confused housing’ (Mabogunje, 1968, p. 302). Examples include Isale-gangan, Oke Awo, Idumagbo and Obalende (which in particular, had been attractive – and still is – for migrants from Togo and Ghana). On the other hand, were the low-grade residential neighbourhoods comprising communities which as at 1968 had never been planned, and included the oldest districts on Lagos Island ‘with their narrow, confused lanes and generally poor housing conditions’ and the newly developed low-class residential districts outside the municipality. Here, slum conditions had been created by hasty, speculative development, absence of effective planning authority and the difficulty faced by government in extending the framework of basic amenities across the then municipal boundaries. Examples were Idumota, Ebute Ero and Idumagbo in the North West of Lagos Island (identifiable as inner city slums of the Old Lagos); Epetedo in North Central Lagos, and hamlets such as Ijesa, Onitiri, Onike and Iwaya which were then expanding in considerably unplanned manner to provide living quarters to workers who serviced households found in the medium grade districts of Yaba, Surulere and Ebute Metta East of that time.

In the SNC Lavalin Report of 1995 which identified 42 slums in Lagos, Obalende, Mushin, Somolu and Ajegunle-Ajeromi reappeared, including inner city slum areas of Old Lagos broadly categorised as ‘Lagos Island’ and several communities in Yaba East (Makoko, Iwaya, Shogunle). In 2011, the Lagos State Urban Renewal Agency (LASURA) identified an additional 21 slums, although there was no official pronouncement of this. In a recent multidisciplinary research by the Centre for Housing and Sustainable Development at the University of Lagos, eight of these communities are found to still retain their slum characteristics. Thus, unfortunately, 51 years later, a significant number of these communities are today, still in the same dismal state.

Rapid population growth due to rural-urban and inter-urban migration emerged in the 1980s and along with state-wide urban deterioration is seen as another major cause of slums in today’s Lagos. The Lagos Resilience Office (2019) reports that over 3000 people enter into Lagos on a daily basis in search of livelihood opportunities. Most of these remain in the state and seek abode in informal settlements and slum

communities, mostly amongst relatives and friends already established in the area. They add weight to already strained facilities and live in over-crowded spaces.

There is a lack of affordable decent housing options in the major relatively highly serviced residential, employment and commercial zones of Victoria Island, Lekki and Ikeja to mention a few; and new housing development projects are priced out of the reach of low-income groups in both formal and informal sectors. Households resort to cheaper accommodation in informal and slum communities. Migrants continually seek cheap accommodation that is to be found in informal and slum communities. Housing unaffordability is caused by several interconnected factors, such as poverty, low income levels, high land values in central city locations, and lack of widespread, structured finance to promote long-term investment in decent housing (CAHF, 2018, Lall, Henderson & Venables, 2017). This accounts also for the emergence of the formation of informal communities in peri-urban areas in addition to socio-cultural factors that make residents reluctant to leave communities in which they have generational linkages. This is particularly true in the inner-city slums such as Isale-Eko, where households live in inherited family compounds that are also close to commercial centres and are reluctant to be relocated.

Unfortunately, the urban planning response to slum emergence has been quite slow, such that new slum communities expand and become entrenched before government action occurs. When it does occur, it is generally to the extreme with massive slum clearance such as the Maroko debacle of 1990s which evicted thousands of households, and in recent times, the February 2013 demolition of Ijora-Badia community and March 2013 demolition in Odoragushin community (Heinrich Boll Foundation, 2015).

In all these, it is important to point out that Section S.53 (2) of the Lagos State Urban and Regional Planning and Development Law No 3 of 2010, provides legal support for communities to work with the implementing agency (Lagos State Urban Renewal Agency, LASURA) to initiate Renewal Processes. Interview with LASURA indicates that close to 10 years after, they have not utilized this provision in any of their slum upgrade projects. This template speaks to this issue, providing a structure for catalysing actions towards the implementation of this law.

Past Efforts at Slum Upgrades in Lagos

It is recognised that in recent years, there have been concerted efforts at slum upgrades in various parts of Sub-Saharan Africa. In Lagos for example, the World Bank's LMPDG project carried out 'critical infrastructure funding' directed at slum upgrade projects (such as school construction, market construction and water supply), drainage provision and solid waste management in 9 slum communities and which ended in 2013 (The World Bank, 2015). The UN-Habitat in partnership with the ACP (Africa, Caribbean and Pacific) Secretariat and the European Commission initiated the Participatory Slum Upgrade Project (PSUP) an inclusive slum upgrade intervention implemented by the Federal Government between 2011 and 2015 (UN-Habitat, n.d). Lagos, along with four other locations in Nigeria (Onitsha, Lafia/ Doma and Karu) benefitted in 2011-2015. In 2017, the French Developmental Agency AFD initiated a \$100m development loan to intervene in waste management and slum upgrade in Ifelodun and Bariga, residential communities categorised as low-grade residential district in 1968. LASURA has also carried out its own intervention projects in several communities. These efforts have not been seen to have achieved impact at a scale to reduce the emergence of new slums and the management of existing ones in the State. The project had an overall impact assessment of the LMDGP which for instance shows that it achieved a 'moderately unsatisfactory' impact indicating that slum conditions remain (The World Bank, 2015). They have also been top-down, in the sense that an external agent: such as the Government or an International Development Agency, initiates action, thereby not capturing the priority needs of affected people.

There are also other factors such as lack of scale which sees interventions limited to only a few communities in the state. LASURA's own projects are generally case-based interventions with little spatial linkages across cases at any one time. The projects initiated by LASURA also face significant challenges due to bureaucratic processes that see it being dependent on other ministries for project funding and implementation, dependence on direct government budgetary allocation and changes in agency leadership

and government priority. The nature of LASURA's work with slums and communities and the funding required means that the support of the Governor is required. In any administration where slum intervention is not a priority, the outcome is lack of executive support and in some cases, project truncation. With internationally funded projects, in addition to lack of scale, there are gaps in State ownership that are key for continuity. For instance, the LMDGP and the PSUP were not directly implemented by a Lagos State Government Agency, rather they were implemented by a LMPDG office and by the Federal Ministry of Housings respectively.

All of these factors provide a necessity for proposing this initiative that would promote state-wide approaches, anchored by a State agency, utilising an inclusionary, participatory framework geared at achieving measurable and globally acceptable outcomes that would bring visible change to the current situation. This provides a justification for the need for another approach to slum management and the prioritization of community managed systems become critical.

Community-Led Settlement Management Programme

Community-led settlement management refers to a programme of activities initiated by the community with support from the government and advocacy groups, with the strategic vision of bringing these communities to decent standards. Communities could be involved in intervention projects in their localities in several ways, some of which are:

- (i) Enabling communities to initiate priority upgrade projects and with the government's support, implement this with support from other stakeholders.
- (ii) The government agency carrying out a participatory baseline needs assessment in Slum communities and other settlements and thereafter mobilizing for budgetary allocation in implementing this.
- (iii) The government agency carrying out pilot community-led projects and then using this as a benchmark for other communities.
- (iv) The government agency developing a participatory slum upgrade template that can be tested with pilot projects.

The first option is more aligned with the community-led settlement management approach, as it is a more realistic and potentially more impactful means of addressing the micro and macro challenges associated with urban settlement. By putting the intervention agenda in the hands of the communities, it will enable more inclusive upgrades that minimises evictions and displacements and that are also capable of providing best practices for other slum upgrade projects in the state.

Modelled after the Participatory Slum Upgrade Programme of the Un-Habitat, ACP (Africa, Caribbean and Pacific) Secretariat and the European Commission; but with state government ownership, this initiative is envisioned as one that would entrench principles of inclusiveness, mind-set change, zero eviction amongst others, whilst also helping to actualize the targets of SDG 11 in Lagos.

The focus of intervention projects would be to address, as may be necessary, the five social, physical and legal deprivations associated with slum communities: lack of safe water, access to sanitation, durability of housing, overcrowding, and security of tenure. Added to these are neighbourhood facility upgrades for provision of roads, open spaces and drainage (amongst others); community empowerment, poverty alleviation and economic infrastructure to promote micro, small and medium scale enterprises in the communities.

A community-led settlement management programme will enable the determination of specific needs to be prioritised in each community and the specific funding model that can be used to actualize this. Some interventions such as public primary schools and access roads can be funded from the State's Government's budgets, some others such as housing upgrades, could require credit support to households, and others could require land acquisition.

The Lagos State Government provides estimates that 15million of its residents live in sub-standard housing which offer cheap housing to the poor. Facility upgrades would bring about improved rental values for cash-poor property owners in inner city slums and access to basic amenities would increase the quality of life of over 15 million residents. Slum communities can be found in the city peripherals. Comprehensive upgrades such as road construction would be enjoyed by people who are not residents.

The resulting increase in property values as a result of road accessibility would also benefit property owners in areas in close proximity.

Residents of slum communities and property owners will also benefit from such a project, as they are the direct beneficiaries of this project. A community-led settlement management project will utilize the capacities of local contractors. These contractors will deliver on some range of projects such as roads and drainages, housing remodelling and reconstruction, materials supply, and so on.

Key Considerations for Workability

In pursuance of this model, it is critical that the proponents work with some considerations. These are identification of anchor agency, identification of other government champions, funding consideration, timing, recognition of opposition groups, promoting collaborative actions, and risks management.

Anchor Agency: This programme has to be anchored by an agency which will have statutory recognition and powers of implementation. This is important for sustainability. In Lagos for instance, Part IV of the Lagos State Urban and Regional Planning Law No 3 of 2010 acknowledged the Lagos State Urban Renewal Agency (LASURA) as the institution responsible for monitoring and identifying areas qualified for upgrading and advising the State government on redevelopment or renewal programmes accordingly; and preparing and implementing approved state urban upgrading and urban redevelopment projects among other functions. Already, there is a state agency for urban renewal, although there are concerns that the agency is quite powerless in the face of the massive problems it has to solve (Heinrich Boll, 2015). Ideally, it should be a multi-disciplinary agency with specialised staff: legal, engineering and project management, social workers, urban planning. This is important to ensure that multidisciplinary approaches are utilised.

Other Government Champions: There is enough scope for state houses of assembly to champion this programme, especially as the members represent constituencies which also accommodate the slum communities. The State House of Assembly House Committee on Physical Planning and Urban Development have legislative oversight over the Lagos Urban Renewal Agency and often act to ensure equitable outcomes of projects for Lagosians. Their activities have become more visible and the need for members to encourage actions at their wards and councils and constituencies representative units offer some encouragement that the House adds its weight to bring about these activities.

There are also political appointees who have direct access to the Governor. For example, the Special Adviser to the Governor on Physical Planning and Housing would provide visibility to the initiative and can be a significant influence for ensuring that the state government continues to prioritise it. As appointed officers who have some closeness to the Governor, they could be enlisted as champions for community projects, fund mobilizers and liaise with advocacy and funding groups to actualize the projects.

Local Government Chairmen are significant leaders at the local level and are consulted before any community intervention project is carried out, they could also promote community buy-in. However, their role has been understated due to Nigeria's intractable political configuration that subjugates the role of local governments to that of the state and has successively weakened them.

Funding considerations: Being a long-term programme, full scale implementation across all communities would run into billions of naira, also considering the scale of the problem. An estimated total financial cost will not be feasible without first identifying the particular upgrades that are required across all communities. This could be actualized through a participatory baseline needs assessment exercise.

However, there are some indications of the scale range of funds that might be required for pilot projects.

- (ii) The PSUP of the UN-Habitat, released US\$120,000 for intervention projects across four locations in Nigeria, although it is not clear how much was allocated to each city.
- (iii) The French Development Agency has proposed \$100million as a loan to fund slum upgrades in Bariga and Ifelodun communities.
- (iv) The LMDGP project estimated US\$40.15m for slum upgrade projects but spent US\$138.42m at project closure (The World Bank, 2015).
- (v) Budgetary allocations from state or regional government are available for this initiative. In the 2016 Fiscal year for example, N16.3billion naira was earmarked in the Physical Planning Budget for the upgrades of slums in Badiya, Amukoko and Bariga amongst others (The Lagos State Government, 2016).

However, budget performance may be a risk factor. The possibilities for joint funding with other government agencies for specific project elements can also be explored. An example of this is the Lagos Building Investment Company which provides home improvement loans for households.

Timing: While a programme of this nature could span the long term, especially if seen as a strategic tool, projects have to be actualised in the short term. In consideration for political stability and the achievement of multiple goals, short-term successes are seen in three-year cohorts. The following activities are proposed with suggested time frames.

Phase 1: Pre-Project Planning (6 months-12months, based on experience): This include all activities required to institutionalize the programme, such as appointment of an expert programme manager from within an anchor government agency, in this case: LASURA, public enlightenment, technical document pro-forma preparation such as the community tender form, linkages to partners, setting up monitoring and evaluation protocols and other internal processes LASURA might need to take to prepare for programme implementation.

Phase 2: Participatory Slum Management Programme Release: This includes all activities required to release the application forms, the period required to fill them, train communities to conduct a needs assessment for their communities, linkage of communities with advocacy groups and prequalification of communities for specific projects. This will include the actualization of all technical processes such as carrying out a community needs mapping and analysis. It also includes all works for design of preferred projects. Previous experience suggests a period of 9months as sufficient for this, depending on contextual factors. A period of 9 months is proposed to complete this.

Phase 3: Pilot Project Implementation of Specific Projects: Implementation of specific projects in each prequalified community. This includes all works for implementation at 12 to 18 months duration, depending on the contexts.

Phase 4: Monitoring and Evaluation and Roll-over.

Opposition Groups: It is not impossible that a programme of this nature will meet with opposition and this may truncate its actualization. Opposition could come from disenfranchised community members, especially where they are uninformed, or where there are splintered community groups and factions. Where projects could lead to demolitions of properties to make way for infrastructure for instance, property owners might perceive this as a vulnerability on their part and might resist the project. In addition, with a strong presence of government, there would be strong resistance if projects are not inclusive in planning, design, implementation and management. The role of civil societies and advocacy groups should also be considered, especially because they have often acted as advocates for communities in face-offs with government. Where there are perceptions of potential injustices against civil rights, they would oppose such vehemently. It is appropriate that such groups are carried along at first steps to ameliorate opposition.

For instance, the current Lagos State government had indicated an early orientation towards a more inclusive and socially oriented approach built around key deliverables amongst which are infrastructure development, social investment and enterprise and improving the environment and public spaces (All Peoples' Congress, 2019). As this initiative promotes core governance priorities in an integrated way, it is expected that this will convert to some political support. However, given the recent demolitions in informal communities of Taqwa Bay, there is a deep-rooted distrust of government action towards slum communities. There is thus a need for improved attention to the plight of concerned communities, and this also amplifies the need for community-led approaches that is also backed by the physical planning law to ensure that government respects its own laws and is required by social advocacy to implement them.

Collaborative Effort: In most cities, the functions of urban departments that provide and manage infrastructure usually overlap. The multiplicity can sometimes lead to resource inefficiencies. It is desirable that 'joined-up' working is encouraged across all government public service agencies to develop and implement projects in a cohesive manner. For instance, there is the Lagos State Ministry of Physical Planning and Urban Development responsible for all physical planning, urban development, urban regeneration and building control policies of the state. It is responsible for initiation, formulation of policies, coordination of programmes and review of all aspects of physical planning, urban development, urban regeneration and building control in the state. In the state's hierarchy of governance, it has oversight duties over LASURA. There is also a sister Ministry of Housing which has oversight for housing development matters and several other ministries whose duties overlap.

In addition, there are international development organisations such as the UN Habitat whose Housing and Slum Upgrading Branch has in recent times engaged in capacity building activities for city governments of Kenya, Tanzania and Cameroon, showing how the PSUP philosophy can be translated into a financing strategy (Un-Habitat, n.d). This support could be tapped into for added value in Lagos State.

Partners in the collaborative effort include the Community Development Associations: These represent the community and are usually the 'gate-keepers' of such community. They provide liaison services between the community and the project initiations and could be influential in building trust necessary for a state-wide venture.

Finally, advocacy groups are key elements to this project. For instance, in Lagos, the Justice and Empowerment Initiative (JEI), Slum Dwellers International, Federation of Slum Dwellers and Socio-Economic Rights Advocacy Centre (SERAC). These are civic society organizations that are based in Lagos and have fostered considerable relationship with slum dwellers. They are trusted by the locals and their participation in the planning and implementation of the projects will be instrumental to getting the necessary community involvement.

Transdisciplinary Research Support: Researchers provide a rich resource to the management of this project. They can create transdisciplinary teams that will document the whole process and create the opportunity for capacity building, engagement, data profiling and storage.

Risk identification

There are possible risks that could affect the implementation of this project. These are:

- (i) There is a risk that slum upgrades project could be adopted without the recommended participatory approach leading to conventional top-down, shock generating interventions such as slum clearance.
- (ii) There is a risk of resistance by communities due to lack of trust in government policy and fear of eventual displacement.
- (iii) Where interventions are neighbourhood facilities and housing based, there is a risk that tenants and vulnerable occupiers: single, female-headed households, elderly, low income workers, even unemployed youths may be priced out of space once the communities are restored and now command higher property values.

- (iv) There is a risk that funding mechanism could change leading to incomplete projects that increases stress and reduces well-being.
- (v) There is a political risk associated with change in government during the project implementation stage which would undermine the completion.

Expected Outcomes

The anchor state agency will carry out periodic assessments to assess outcomes and quantify impacts. Outcomes arising from this initiative will be measured upon the intervention being carried out. In general, the initiative will measure outcomes associated with the five deprivations of slum communities, as addressed by the project.

- (i) Access to safe water: This will measure the number of households newly connected to indoors safe water supply infrastructure
- (ii) Access to sanitation: This will measure the number of households now having in-door kitchen and toilet facilities
- (iii) Durability of housing: This will measure the number of houses now reconstructed to planning standards, capable of resisting flooding and fire outbreaks,
- (iv) Overcrowding: this will measure the number of beneficiaries of home improvement projects that improves room to occupant ratio
- (v) Frequency of forced evictions: This would be measured from the number of reports on forceful eviction due to lack of title documents in the assessment period range.

It is also possible to identify other outcomes that can be measured, including how they can be measured.

- (i) Prevalence of disease outbreak: This will be measured with (a) specific focus on diseases associated with poor sanitation such as cholera, Lassa Fever, Dysentery etc.(b) focus on the prevalence of endemic disease ailments.
- (ii) Vulnerability to flooding: This would be assessed as cases of reported flooding incidence and associated scale of losses to life and properties within post-project time frames.
- (iii) Vulnerability to macro-economic policies: The vulnerability of communities to macroeconomic policies will be assessed through comparative changes in household income levels, employment sector and propensities to save for the future.
- (iv) Number of recorded community level civil unrest as a result of intervention projects.
- (v) Frequency of building collapse incidences: This assessment will be scaled to reflect incidences occurring at construction and post construction phases, as well as frequency of collapse of old buildings and recently constructed buildings.
- (vi) Daily frequency of intra-community access routes congestion: This is measured as the number of man-hours spent in traffic congestion within the ambit of the community.
- (vii) Frequency of power interruption: This will be measured as the number of hours of provision of power supply from the National Grid.
- (viii) Number of home improvement schemes: This would be assessed on the basis of communities' willingness to participate in a home improvement scheme that would bring their homes to decent standards.
- (ix) Mileage of road rehabilitation: This would be assessed as (a) the length of access roads reconstructed in the community over the assessment period (b) the length of pedestrian access with provision in the community over the assessment period.

(x) Access to economic infrastructure: This will be measured as (a) the extent of provision of improved community level economic infrastructure such as spaces for markets and artisans, banking halls and non-banking financial services such as e-commerce and e-banking. (b) number of new employment and jobs created in the community in the assessment period.

(xi) Rate of spatial expansion of community into neighbouring ones: This will capture the intercity externalities arising from intervention project.

Conclusion

In general, there are insinuations even in global circles, that the African governments have not done enough to tackle the challenges associated with physical planning processes that allow the perpetuation of slum communities; and lack of essential public services in those settings. There are also misconceptions about the sincerity of government in carrying out meaningful interaction at scales wide enough to instil impact. These are despite efforts by government agents to address local problems in a piece-meal fashion in each community. The limitation of these past approaches lies in their top-down nature, and this increases the vulnerability of the community to evictions, displacements and relocation. Participatory, bottom-up approaches would provide opportunities for communities to pre-empt and negotiate such negative actions.

Residents in several slum communities in particular are already self-organized, and are ready to participate; some have taken ownership of the need for this activity and have gone as far as collaborating with NGOs to prepare their masterplans and intervention projects. It might be worthwhile to empirically identify these communities and to promote their inclusion in a pilot project. This provides a positive environment that the Government can lean on in adopting this framework. It is recognised that the political economy of slum management is very contentious. There have been indications that slum management fails because governments lack the political will to take action. It can also be argued that where there is a political will *not* to act, there is also a political will *to act*. This framework puts slum management in the hands of the community in a bid to address the issues that are of priority to them, to promote equity and accountability.

There is no doubt that there is need for significant government support in these programmes, in as much as home improvements might need planning permits, and others might be infrastructure-based that will require direct inputs from the government agencies. There are also risks attached to the project, such as a commercially-driven regeneration project muscling in to overtake the project especially for slums that lie in highly valued lands. In addition, the short-term nature of project should be protected to ensure that it does not suffer from setbacks where there is a change of government. In addition, it should be noted that the vulnerability of the programme arises from its greatest strength, which is its dependence on community networks.

References

- All Peoples' Congress (2019). *Vision for a greater Lagos*. Political manifesto of Babajide Sanwo-Olu, APC Governorship Candidate. Lagos: APC.
- Centre for Affordable Housing Finance in Africa (2018). *Housing Finance Year Book (2018)*. Johannesburg: Centre for Affordable Housing Finance in Africa.
- Lall, S., Henderson, V, Venables A. (2017). *Africa's cities: Opening doors to the world*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Heinrich Boll Foundation (2015). *Housing, slums and informal settlements*. Lagos: Heinrich Boll Foundation.
- Lagos Resilience Office (2019). *Lagos preliminary resilience assessment updated version*. Alausa: Lagos Resilience Office.
- Mabogunje, A. L (1968). *Urbanization in Nigeria*. London: University of London Press Ltd.
- Oyalowo, B., Nubi,T., Lawanson, T. (2018). Housing affordability, government intervention and housing informality: An African dilemma? *Journal of African Real Estate Research*. *Journal of the African Real Estate Society managed by University of Cape Town*. 3(2), 63-86.
- The Lagos State Government (2013). *Lagos State Development Plan 2012-2025. Main Document (2013)*. Alausa: The Lagos State Government.

- The Lagos State Government (2016). Citizen's guide to Yr2016 Budget. Available at <https://mepb.lagosstate.gov.ng/wpcontent/uploads/sites/29/2017/01/2016-Lagos-State-Citizens-Guide-Budget.pdf>. Accessed 17th Sept 2019
- The World Bank (2015). The inspection panel LMPDG Report. Report Number: ICRR14610v. Available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/261101475093138405/pdf/000012394-20150409083400.pdf> Accessed 17th Sept 2019
- UN-Habitat (n.d). Participatory Slum upgradeprogramme factsheet. Available at <https://unhabitat.org/urban-initiatives/initiatives-programmes/participatory-slum-upgrading/>. Accessed 20th Sept 20