

Final Pre-Consultation Report

ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND USE OF THE EVIDENCE MAP DEVELOPED BY THE DPME

Prepared by: *Enterprises University of Pretoria (Pty) Ltd – Research Solutions*

Prepared for: *Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation*

Date: *22 March 2017*



planning, monitoring
and evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BNG	Breaking New Ground
CRUP	Community Residential Units Programme
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DBSA	Development bank of Southern Africa
DHS	Department of Human Settlements
DPME	Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
EM	Evidence Map
EMHSS	Evidence Map for the Human Settlements Sector
EMP	Evidence Mapping
EPHP	Enhanced People's Housing Process
EUP	Enterprises University of Pretoria
FLISP	Finance Linked Individual Subsidy Programme
HAD	Housing Development Agency
HSS	Human Settlements Sector
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
IHSP	Institutional Housing Subsidy Programme
IRDP	Integrated Residential Development programme
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NDPG	Neighbourhood Development Partnership Grant
OM&E	Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation
PHP	People's Housing Process
PICO	Problem, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome
SEIAS	Socio-Economic Impact Assessment System
SERI	Socio-Economic Rights Institute of South Africa
SHP	Social Housing Programme
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
TOC	Theory of Change
UISP	Upgrading Informal Settlements Programme

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND	5
1.1 THE PROJECT	5
1.2 THIS REPORT	5
2. INTRODUCTION.....	7
2.1 A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF EVIDENCE MAPPING	7
2.2 METHODOLOGY.....	8
3. FINDINGS.....	9
3.1 INTRODUCTION	9
3.2 A HIGH-LEVEL OVERVIEW OF THE EMHSS	9
3.2.1 Unevenness, concentrations and gaps	9
3.2.2 Statism	14
3.2.3 Housing-focus	15
3.2.4 Limited evidence on intergovernmental collaboration and integration as intervention or outcome	15
3.3 PEAKS AND TROUGHS IN EVIDENCE IN THE EMHSS.....	15
3.3.1 Research method.....	15
3.3.2 Geographical Place/Region	16
3.3.3 Housing versus Human Settlements research	16
3.3.4 Sources of Research	16
3.3.5 Researchers	17
3.4 SUMMARIES OF THE 'EVIDENCE CELLS' ON THE PRIORITY OUTCOMES OF GOVERNMENT IN RELATION TO THE INTERVENTIONS IN THE HSS.....	17
3.5 A CRITICAL ENGAGEMENT WITH THE DATA IN THE EMHSS AND ITS USEFULNESS IN POLICY FORMULATION AND DECISION-MAKING	19
3.6 FILLING THE CONTENT AND EVIDENCE GAPS IN THE MAP.....	20
3.6.1 Filling the evidence gaps	20
3.6.2 Enhancing the specificity and usefulness of the map	21
3.6.3 Maintaining the map	21
4. THE EVOLVING THEORY OF CHANGE & RELATED PATHWAYS IN THE HSS ...	22
4.1 INTRODUCTION	22
4.2 A DRAFT NARRATIVE ON THE EVOLVING THEORY OF CHANGE IN THE HSS	22
4.3 AN EXPLORATION OF PATHWAYS IN THE THEORY OF CHANGE	27
5. ALIGNING THE EM WITH THE SEIAS AND THE OM&E FUNCTIONS	31
6. CONCLUSIONS.....	36
REFERENCES.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The ten interventions with the highest number of related sources in the EM	10
Table 2: The fifteen Interventions with the lowest number of related sources in the EM	10
Table 3: Sources in the EMHSS related to the eight primary sub-outcomes.....	11
Table 4: The ten sub-outcomes with the highest number of related sources in the EMHSS.....	11
Table 5: The ten sub-outcomes with the lowest number of related sources in the EM	12
Table 6: Highest number of sources in ‘intervention-outcome intersect’	12
Table 7: Interventions-Outcomes intersects with the lowest number of sources in the EMHSS.....	13
Table 8: Research methods.....	15
Table 9: Research type and region.....	16
Table 10: Type of research and focus of the research.....	16
Table 11: Source of research	17
Table 12: Type of research by main intervention type.....	18
Table 13: Type of research by main outcomes	18
Table 14: Type of research by sub-type outcomes.....	18
Table 15: Interventions by main outcomes	18
Table 16: Summary of the Draft Evolving Theory of Change in the HSS.....	25
Table 17: Subsidies.....	27
Table 18: Policy and Legislation	28
Table 19: Spatial Planning.....	28
Table 20: Transactional Support	29
Table 21: Bulk Infrastructure	30
Table 22: Employment.....	30
Table 23: A Draft Proposal for aligning the SEIAS, EM and OM&E functions in the DPME	31

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The Project

During the second half of 2015, the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) initiated an Evidence Mapping exercise in the Human Settlements Sector with the dual intention of:

- Assisting the process of policy formulation in the sector;
- Using the experience as a pilot to test the usefulness of, and challenges associated with such a process for policy formulation in government.

As such, the focus was on ‘populating the evidence map’, and not on a comprehensive analysis and sense-making of the evidence gathered and mapped in the process. The data gathered in the process and the evidence map did, however, raise numerous questions regarding the Human Settlements Sector (HSS), amongst others:

- The relatively high volumes of research/evidence in some thematic areas and the relatively small volumes of research/evidence, and even voids, in others;
- The reasons for, and implications of the abundances, low volumes and voids in the map;
- The usefulness and relevance of the topics, themes and outcomes, as used in the construction of the evidence map (based on the findings regarding abundances and voids);
- The agenda, culture, practices and fetishes of researchers in the sector in the South African space and ways in which these could be transformed towards more collaborative learning and sharing ‘research communities’ that span (1) the public sector, (2) those involved in research in the sector, and (3) the wider community;
- Constructive, sustainable and effective low-cost ways in which research endeavours could be sparked in or directed at addressing gaps in the map; and
- The limited use of evidence such as that gathered in the process in the specific sector, and ways of attending to this.

At the same time, the project initiated a set of embryonic thoughts and discussions amongst those involved with the Evidence Map for the Human Settlements Sector (EMHSS) on ways in which (1) evidence mapping, (2) the DPME’s Socio-Economic Impact Assessment System (SEIAS), and (3) the department’s processes of monitoring and review, could be aligned.

To provide answers to the above questions, the DPME initiated a follow-up project in mid-2016, to bring on board a service provider to undertake these tasks, in close collaboration with the department. After a bidding process, Enterprises University of Pretoria (EUP) was appointed.

1.2 This Report

This is the third output of the project, with (1) the *Inception Report* and (2) the *Draft Report on High-Level Findings from the Evidence Map* preceding it. This report seeks to provide a platform from which to engage sector specialists in the Housing and Human Settlements Sector on the map, in consultations set to take place in the very near future. As such, the report consists of five parts:

- A brief introduction to Evidence Mapping and the methodology followed in analysing the map;

- An overall summary of the findings from the EMHSS, including both a description and critical interpretation of the evidence as documented in the map;
- An exploratory engagement with the evidence in the EMHSS in relation to the evolving theory of change and related pathways in the HSS;
- A draft proposal for integrating the EMHSS with the SEIAS and the Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation (OME) functions in the DPME; and
- A conclusion.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 A Brief Overview of Evidence Mapping

Over the last decade, Evidence Mapping has become an increasingly popular instrument in the toolbox of evidence analysts to provide visual snapshots of often high volumes and disparate types of data, ranging from highly specific primary studies and focused impact studies to wide-ranging systematic reviews (McKinnon et al, 2015: 185; Miake-Lye et al, 2016: 2)¹. These snapshots, with (1) researchers and (2) policy analysts and decision-makers as their primary users, “... can show at a glance which areas or relationships have been studied most – whether it be the impact of ecotourism on local economies or of education on reducing harmful fishing practices. They can also highlight key gaps in the evidence base, and so guide the prioritization of research” (McKinnon et al, 2015: 185). In a time of austerity and shrinking research budgets, EMs have become important guides in facilitating (1) the greater use of the existing body of research and (2) the systematic targeting of research funding (McKinnon et al, 2015: 185-6, Miake-Lye et al, 2016: 2).

Notwithstanding their versatility for use across a variety of disciplines and fields, EMs have a specific place in evidence analysis where they are ideally suited for systematically unearthing, understanding and visualizing causality, i.e. documenting, characterizing, assessing/evaluating and mapping research findings on the relationship/s or link/s between (1) an intervention or set of interventions and (2) its/their outcome/s in a specific field of research interest or endeavour. As such, they are very useful in:

- Providing a high-level picture/visual depiction of where and on what there is more and less evidence and ‘certainty’ as to the impacts, outcomes and/or effectiveness of an intervention or set of interventions;
- Systematically identifying knowledge gaps and hence (future) research questions and/or considering the needs for new or further research in a field;
- Gaining a quick, executive overview of where, why, how and by whom research on a specific intervention or set of interventions (and its/their impacts) has been undertaken;
- Informing, identifying, considering, evaluating and prioritizing (policy) interventions in terms of impact/s and costs; and
- Predicting policy effectiveness based on the quality, spread and findings of the evidence captured in an/the EM (McKinnon et al, 2015: 185-7; Hempel et al, 2014: 1; Miake-Lye et al, 2016: 1-9).

Given this specific use, EMs work best when the work that is captured in the EM is drawn from (1) systematic reviews, (2) tailor-made impact evaluations, and (3) primary research in which casual relationships between interventions and outcomes is explored (McKinnon et al, 2015: 187). Crucial to the preparation of useful EMs is:

- Careful crafting of the interventions/actions and impact to be included in the map;
- The setting of unambiguous study-inclusion criteria;
- Meticulously and systematically populating the map in accordance with the inclusion criteria; and

¹ Miake-Lye et al (2016: 2) point out that as recently as 2002, there were no published evidence maps, and that in 2010, only ten publications covering such maps could be found.

- Limiting links between interventions/actions in the studies to the primary/key effects/outcomes (Miake-Lye et al, 2016; Hempel et al, 2014: 1-4).

Without such care and attention to detail, the EM risks not being presented or treated with the high level of confidence that policy analysis and preparation requires (Hempel et al, 2014: 4). Involvement of domain/topic experts in the preparation of the EM, and in the review of the EM and in the conclusions drawn from it, is also crucial (Miake-Lye et al, 2016: 1; Hempel et al, 2014: 6-7). Stakeholder engagement is generally regarded as of importance if the EM is to be used in a policy preparation or review process (Miake-Lye et al, 2016). Given its newness and notwithstanding the value it has already added, Miake-Lye et al (2016: 1; and see 18) in a summary of a systematic literature review of “evidence mapping”, point out, that, due to its newness and heterogeneity in definition, approach and methods used, *“Foundational work is needed to better standardize the methods and products of an evidence map so that researchers and policymakers will know what to expect of this new type of evidence review”*. At the same time, the authors argue that it is important to establish what is new about evidence mapping and in which ways it differs from previous and other new and emerging meta-research and research mapping methods (Miake-Lye, 2016: 2).

2.2 Methodology

The EUP team was assisted by the project manager in the DPME to gain access to the EMHSS on the DPME’s website. In addition to this, Excel summaries of elements of the data in the map were provided to the EUP team. From its side, the EUP team worked through the EMHSS and the summary templates for each of the sources in the map. To provide a quantum to the high-level analyses that the team sought to make of (1) the EMHSS and (2) specific components of the map, the attributes of all 317 records in the map (as captured in a PICO-template) were in turn captured in a SPSS-dataset² (N = 317). Frequencies, summaries and strengths of links were drawn from the dataset. The outcome of these exercises was captured in this report.

² SPSS is the abbreviation of ‘Statistical Package for the Social Sciences’. The dataset was created by one of the team members and populated with the assistance of a research Masters’ degree student in the Department of Town and Regional Planning. Queries regarding frequencies, components and links were generated in the team and run by the team member who created the database.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction

As noted in the introductory segment of this report, Evidence Mapping is a recent addition to the family of research methods in the field of evidence analysis. As such, there is not yet a well-established body of work on how such maps are to be constructed, what they should include and how they could and should be analysed, or used. In addition to this, the three EUP team members did not have the same level of involvement with the EMHSS, and this meant that it was both a bumpy and steep co-learning curve. The use of the SPSS-database was also not something that was planned at the time of submitting the bid for the project, but only came after internal concerns about the validity and credibility of a summary of the EMHSS based on observation and qualitative analyses only. As much as was a novel intervention, it also proved to be a hugely beneficial addition, providing both a quantitative angle, and in several cases, a quantum to the qualitative analyses.

What is presented below is the outcome of a gradual process of ‘beginning to make sense of the map’. It rests on the content of the map, as filtered through and deliberated by the three team members. As such, it must be interrogated by other researchers, policy analysts and decision-makers in the field.

The findings that follow are presented in the following sequence under the following headings:

- A high-level overview of the EMHSS;
- Peaks and troughs in the map;
- Summaries of the ‘evidence cells’ on the priority outcomes of government in relation to the interventions in the HSS;
- A critical engagement with the data in the EMHSS and the usefulness of the map and its contents in policy formulation and decision-making in the HSS; and
- Gaps in the map, and ways in which these could be filled.

3.2 A high-level overview of the EMHSS

There are four phrases that are regarded as capturing the essence of the EMHSS: (1) unevenness, concentrations and gaps, (2) statism, (3) housing-focus, and (4) limited evidence on intergovernmental collaboration and integration as intervention or outcome. Each of these is discussed in more detail below.

3.2.1 *Unevenness, concentrations and gaps*

One of the key objectives of an EM is to provide a high-level snapshot of where (1) the bulk of the evidence, and (2) the gaps in the evidence in a domain are located. At the same time, the first cut of an EM also enables a reflection on the interventions and outcomes that were originally selected, as the spread of evidence may not necessarily be reflective of (1) the research interests or (2) the perceptions of researchers in the domain regarding omissions or gaps in their field. It may also be that the interventions and outcomes in the EM are not perceived by researchers in the field as causally connected, related, or linked to each other. Once these aspects are considered, the EM may need tweaking.

In the case of the EMHSS, a small number of cells dominate the map. Of the 31 *intervention-rows*³, ten of these are home to 70.3% of all the ‘counts’ in the map. The next six have 15.5% of the counts, meaning that slightly more than half of the interventions are home to more than 75% of the counts in the map. **Table 1** below provides a summary of the ten interventions with the highest number of related sources in the EMHSS, while **Table 2** below provides a summary of the fifteen interventions with the lowest number of related sources in the EMHSS.

TABLE 1: THE TEN INTERVENTIONS WITH THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF RELATED SOURCES IN THE EM

Intervention	Type of Intervention						Sources in EM related to intervention (N=316)	Percentage of total # of sources in EM related to intervention
	Housing				Settlements			
	S		N-S		S	N-S		
	F	N-F	F	N-F				
1	Policy and legislation		X				190	60.1
2	Plans, programmes & projects		X				126	39.9
3	Regulation		X				119	37.7
4	Spatial planning					X	114	36.1
5	Subsidies	X					99	31.3
6	Land use management					X	86	27.2
7	Urban management					X	76	24.1
8	Participation in self-help housing				X		75	23.7
9	Mortgage finance			X			70	22.2
10	Savings (household)			X			60	19.0

Intervention Type Abbreviations: S = State; N-S = Non-State; F= Financial; N-F = Non-Financial

TABLE 2: THE FIFTEEN INTERVENTIONS WITH THE LOWEST NUMBER OF RELATED SOURCES IN THE EM

Intervention	Type of Intervention						Sources in EM related to intervention (N=316)	Percentage of total # of sources in EM related to intervention
	Housing				Settlements			
	S		N-S		S	N-S		
	F	N-F	F	N-F				
1	Private Transport					X	1	0.3
2	Unsecured lending			X			1	0.3
3	Property Valuation					X	2	0.6
4	Rates and Taxes					X	2	0.6
5	Debt Financing			X			2	0.6
6	Donor Funding			X			5	1.6
7	Pension Guarantees			X			7	2.2
8	Supply-Side Subsidies	X					8	2.5
9	Capital Subsidies	X					9	2.8
10	Public Transport					X	10	3.2
11	Intergovernmental Transfers	X					18	5.7
12	Development Finance	X					21	6.6
13	Housing Grants	X					28	8.9
14	Employment					X	29	9.2
15	Construction			X			30	9.5

Intervention Type Abbreviations: S = State; N-S = Non-State; F= Financial; N-F = Non-Financial

On the *outcomes*-side, ten of the 33 primary and sub-columns are home to 62.2% of all the counts on the map, and the following seven to 24.5% of the counts, meaning that slightly more than half of the outcomes are home to nearly 87% of all the counts in the map. **Table 3** below provides a

³ This number includes two clustered “Other” categories. The same applies in the case of the outcomes where there are eight “Other” categories.

summary of the total number of sources in the EMHSS related to the eight Primary Outcomes. **Table 4** below provides a summary of the ten sub-outcomes with the highest number of related sources in the EMHSS, while **Table 5** provides a summary of the ten sub-outcomes with the lowest number of related sources in the EMHSS.

TABLE 3: SOURCES IN THE EMHSS RELATED TO THE EIGHT PRIMARY SUB-OUTCOMES

Primary Outcome		Main Outcome			Sources in EM related to outcome (N = 316)	Percentage of total # of sources in EM related to outcome
		Constitutional Right to Housing	Functional Residential Property Market	Good Governance		
1	Improved/Quality living conditions	X			239	75.6
2	Participation by low and middle income households		X		150	47.5
3	Town and land-use planning			X	134	42.4
4	Poverty reduction		X		120	38.0
5	Growth and distribution of value in the property market		X		76	24.1
6	Procedural justice			X	72	22.8
7	Intergovernmental relationships			X	53	16.8
8	Fiscal sustainability			X	42	13.3

TABLE 4: THE TEN SUB-OUTCOMES WITH THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF RELATED SOURCES IN THE EMHSS

Sub-Outcome	Main Outcome	Constitutional Right to Housing	Functional Residential Property Market			Good Governance				Sources in EM related to outcome (N=316)	% of total number of sources in EM related to outcome
	Primary Outcome		I/QLC	GDV	PLM	PR	PJ	FS	TLUP		
1	Shelter/Houses	X								230	72.8
2	Sustainable Development	X								129	40.8
3	Affordability of Housing		X							125	39.6
4	Housing Assets			X						111	35.1
5	Municipal/Basic Services	X								107	33.9
6	Town/Urban Planning							X		92	29.1
7	Integrated Settlements					X				89	28.2
8	Land Tenure							X		85	26.9
9	Community Participation					X				76	24.1
10	Access to the Property Market		X							72	22.8

Outcome-Type Abbreviations: IQLC = Improved/Quality living conditions; GDV = Growth and distribution of value in the property market; PLM = Participation by low and middle income households; PR = Poverty reduction; PJ = Procedural justice; FS = Fiscal sustainability; TLUP = Town and land-use planning; IGR = Intergovernmental relationships

TABLE 5: THE TEN SUB-OUTCOMES WITH THE LOWEST NUMBER OF RELATED SOURCES IN THE EM

Sub-Outcome	Main Outcome	Constitutional Right to Housing	Functional Residential Property Market			Good Governance				Sources in EM related to outcome (N=316)	% of total number of sources in EM related to outcome
	Primary Outcome		I/QLC	GDV	PLM	PR	PJ	FS	TLUP		
1	Other		X							3	0.9
2	Other							X		3	0.9
3	Other			X						5	1.6
4	By-laws							X		5	1.6
5	Other					X				6	1.9
6	Building Regulations							X		7	2.2
7	Other								X	7	2.2
8	Legal							X		9	2.8
9	Other						X			19	6.0
10	Other	X								23	7.3

Outcome-Type Abbreviations: IQLC = Improved/Quality living conditions; GDV = Growth and distribution of value in the property market; PLM = Participation by low and middle income households; PR = Poverty reduction; PJ = Procedural justice; FS = Fiscal sustainability; TLUP = Town and land-use planning; IGR = Intergovernmental relationships

Should (1) the aspects captured in the map reflect those that are of importance to government, (2) the data/evidence have been accurately recorded and mapped, and (3) the map not require tweaking, the implication of this is that there are *huge evidence gaps in those aspects of the field/domain that are of importance to government.*

An analysis of the *intersects between interventions and outcomes* also provide an indication of evidence concentrations and desserts. (This is irrespective of what the evidence is on, or what it ‘says’ about the interventions and outcomes in an evidence-intersect.) **Table 6** below provides a summary of the intersects of interventions and outcomes with the highest number of sources in the EMHSS.

TABLE 6: HIGHEST NUMBER OF SOURCES IN ‘INTERVENTION-OUTCOME INTERSECT’

No	Intervention		Outcome		No of sources in intersect
	Type	Name	Type	Name	
1	H.S.N-F.	Policy and Legislation	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	157
2	H.S.N-F.	Plans/Programmes/Projects	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	104
3	H.S.N-F.	Regulation	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	97
4	H.S.N-F.	Policy and Legislation	CRH.	Sustainable Development	93
5	SET.S.	Spatial Planning	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	93
6	H.S.N-F.	Policy and Legislation	FRPM.	Affordability of Housing	81
7	H.S.N-F.	Policy and Legislation	CRH.	Municipal/Basic Services	79
8	SET.S.	Spatial Planning	GG.	Town/Urban Planning	77
9	SET.S.	Land-Use Management	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	76
10	SET.S.	Spatial Planning	CRH.	Sustainable Development	76
11	H.N-S.N-F.	Participation in Self-Help Housing	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	75
12	H.S.F	Subsidies	CRH.	Shelter/Houses	74
13	H.S.N-F.	Policy and Legislation	GG.	Land Tenure	70
14	H.S.N-F.	Plans/Programmes/Projects	CRH.	Sustainable Development	69
15	H.S.N-F.	Policy and Legislation	GG.	Town/Urban Planning	64

Intervention Type Abbreviations: H = Housing; S = State; N-S = Non-State; F = Financial; N-F = Non-Financial; SET = Settlement

Outcome Type Abbreviations: CRH = Constitutional Right to Housing; FRPM = Functional Residential Property Market; GG = Governance

At the other extreme, **Table 7** below provides an overview of those interventions-outcome intersects with the lowest number of sources in the map. The table also indicates that there are interventions where there is (1) an ‘evidence dessert’ in the case of all three the main outcomes, and (2) evidence in some intersects, but ‘evidence dips’ in the case of one or two of the others.

TABLE 7: INTERVENTIONS-OUTCOMES INTERSECTS WITH THE LOWEST NUMBER OF SOURCES IN THE EMHSS

Intervention		Outcome-Intersect Evidence Desserts	Notes
Name	Type		
Subsidies	S.H.F.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	There is a sizeable body of evidence on subsidies as intervention, but the evidence is unevenly distributed, and not differentiated with regards to the type of subsidy, i.e. demand-side, supply-side, capital, housing grants or development finance. The evidence on subsidies (as a group) is concentrated in the areas of CRH and FRPM, and far more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Donor Funding	N-S.H.F.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Debit Financing	N-S.H.F.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Mortgage Finance	N-S.H.F.	GG.	There is a sizeable body of evidence on mortgage finance as intervention, but the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and FRPM, and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Unsecured Lending	N-S.H.F.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Micro-Finance/ Lending	N-S.H.F.	GG.	There is some evidence on micro-finance/lending as intervention, but (1) this is relatively small in relation to the evidence in the total map, and (2) the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRO and FRPM, and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Savings (Household)	N-S.H.F.	GG.	There is a sizeable body of evidence on savings as intervention, but the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and FRPM, and far more limited with regards to GG. The only outcome in the GG-intervention-subset where there is some evidence, is ‘Land Tenure’.
Pension Guarantees	N-S.H.F.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Construction	N-S.H.N-F.	FRPM.GG.	There is some evidence on construction as intervention, but (1) this is relatively small in relation to the evidence in the total map, and (2) the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and to a smaller extent FRPM, and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Transactional support	N-S.H.N-F.	GG.	There is a sizeable body of evidence on transactional support as intervention, but the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and FRPM, and being more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Property Market Information	N-S.H.N-F.	GG.	There is a sizeable body of evidence on property market information as intervention, but the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and FRPM, and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Bulk Infrastructure	N-S.SET.	FRPM.	There is a sizeable body of evidence on bulk infrastructure as intervention, but the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and GG,

Intervention		Outcome-Intersect Evidence Desserts	Notes
Name	Type		
			and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with FRPM.
Property Valuation	N-S.SET.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Rates and Taxes	N-S.SET.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Built Environment Management	N-S.SET.	FRPM.	There is some evidence on built environment management as intervention, but (1) this is relatively small in relation to the evidence in the total map, and (2) the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and GG, and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with FRPM.
Public Transport	N-S.SET.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	There is a small body of evidence on public transport as intervention, and this is in the intersect with CRH. Relative to the total map, there is very little evidence on this intervention.
Private Transport	N-S.SET.	CRH.FRPM.GG.	The evidence dessert applies to all the outcome-intersects of this intervention in the map.
Employment	N-S.SET.	GG.	There is some evidence on employment as intervention, but (1) this is relatively small in relation to the evidence in the total map, and (2) the evidence is unevenly distributed, with the bulk of the evidence located in the intersects with CRH and FRPM, and being far more limited with regards to the intersect with GG.
Abbreviations: S = State; N-S = Non-State; H = Housing; SET = Settlement; F = Financial; N-F = Non-Financial; CRH = Constitutional Right to Housing; FRPM = Functional Residential and Property Market; GG = Good Governance			

The most significant desserts in the EMHSS are in the case of the following *interventions*:

- Donor funding;
- Debt financing;
- Unsecured lending;
- Pension guarantees;
- Property valuation;
- Rates and taxes;
- Public transport; and
- Private transport.

The bulk of the evidence desserts and dips relate to Non-State interventions, which has implications for policy proposals that propose, suggest or rely on Non-State actions. In addition to this, the largest desserts and dips are in relation to ‘Good Governance’ as *outcome*, which has implications for policy proposals with this outcome in mind, as it would suggest/require:

- Finding evidence that those preparing the EMHSS missed; and/or
- Undertaking or undertaking new research on the intervention/s and its/their outcome/s.

3.2.2 *Statism*

The evidence in the map is not only highly concentrated around a small number of interventions and outcomes, but in the case of the interventions, also focused on those aspects of the sector where the State is involved: The six rows that are home to the highest number of counts are all state functions, notably (1) Policy and Legislation, (2) Plan/Projects, (3) Regulation, (4) Spatial Planning, (5)

Land-Use Management, and (6) Subsidies. Together these six interventions account for 50% of all the counts in the map. While this may be a function of the role that the state has played in housing provision in South Africa, it does mean that there is far less evidence for policy makers on interventions in which the state takes a less commanding role, and in which the role of the private sector, households and communities is, or should be stronger.

3.2.3 Housing-focus

While the EMHSS is about ‘human settlements’ and not only ‘housing’, the evidence in the map is far more concentrated on the ‘housing’ than the ‘human settlements’-side. The interventions listed as falling under ‘housing-interventions’ account for 69.9% of all the counts, which is far more than double those that fall under ‘human settlements-interventions’, which account for 31.1% of the counts. In the case of the outcomes, the picture is equally staggered in the direction of housing-outcomes, with six of the top ten outcomes-columns being housing-focused and being home to 41.1% of all the counts in the EMHSS. At the same time, all the outcomes with a more ‘human settlements’ leaning, account for only 34.5% of the counts in the map. Based on these high-level assessments alone, the extent to which the map can provide evidence-led guidance with regards to the development, maintenance and upgrading of ‘human settlements’ can be questioned.

3.2.4 Limited evidence on intergovernmental collaboration and integration as intervention or outcome

The evidence on interventions captured in the EMHSS is largely about singular endeavours and not on interventions in which (1) different spheres and sectors of government, or (2) state and non-state actors join forces in the housing or human settlement development, upgrading and maintenance process, or in which cooperative government (as outcome) is advanced. The outcome listed as ‘intergovernmental relations’ in the map accounted for only 6.3% of the counts. In contrast, the ‘improved/quality living conditions-outcome’ received 30.4% of the counts in the map.

3.3 Peaks and troughs in evidence in the EMHSS

A number of aspects related to the EMHSS were explored in terms of concentrations and gaps were explored. The following paragraphs provide an overview of the findings of this exploration:

3.3.1 Research method

In contrast to the emphasis in evidence mapping on research synthesis, the bulk of the research captured in the map is not research synthesis (only 16.2% of the total), but primary research (81.9% of the total) (see **Table 8** below). In the case of the formal research, research synthesis accounted for 31.4% of the sources as opposed to only 11.9% of the sources in the case of the grey literature. The three DPME sources were all primary research.

TABLE 8: RESEARCH METHODS

Research Method	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Research synthesis	0	0	22	31.4	28	11.9	50	16.2
Primary research	3	100.0	42	60.0	208	88.1	253	81.9
Both	0	0	6	8.6	0	0	6	1.9
Total	3	100.0	70	100.0	236	100.0	309	100.0

3.3.2 Geographical Place/Region

The bulk of the sources (see **Table 9** below) had Africa as focus (74.9% of the total). In the case of the grey literature, this figure was 85%, which may be attributed to the strong emphasis in the gathering of the grey material on researchers in South Africa, or that write on the country. This high prevalence of African, especially South African sources, has the obvious value of providing ample evidence on the local situation and similar situations on the continent, but may – read together with the limited number of research synthesis-sources – limit the learning from other countries. This is especially pertinent given that South Africa has seen very limited experimentation in the housing and human settlements sectors, and only spans slightly more than two decades.

TABLE 9: RESEARCH TYPE AND REGION

Region	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Africa	5	100.0	24	36.4	204	85.0	233	74.9
Asia & Latin America	0	0	27	40.9	13	5.4	40	12.9
Europe & North America	0	0	9	13.6	0	0	9	2.9
Multiple	0	0	6	9.1	23	9.6	29	9.3
Total	5	100.0	66	100.0	240	100.0	311	100.0

3.3.3 Housing versus Human Settlements research

As highlighted in the high-level overview of the EMHSS, there is a far stronger prevalence of research devoted to housing than to human settlements in the map (see **Table 10** below). In terms of total figures, 42.7% of the sources are on housing, 7.3% on human settlements, and 50% on both. In the case of formal research, this housing-bias is even higher, with 53.6% of the sources being on housing, 7.2% on human settlements and 39.1% on both. The grey material has a lower percentage of sources devoted to housing (39.3%), but does not necessarily have a much stronger focus on human settlements (7.4%), and has a higher focus on both (53.3%). In the case of the DPME research, 60% of the sources are on housing, none on human settlements and 40% on both. Whether the map is an EM on housing rather than on human settlements is an issue.

TABLE 10: TYPE OF RESEARCH AND FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH

Research Focus	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Housing	3	60.0	37	53.6	95	39.3	135	42.7
Settlement	0	0	5	7.2	18	7.4	23	7.3
Both	2	40.0	27	39.1	129	53.3	158	50.0
Total	5	100.0	69	100.0	242	100.0	316	100.0

3.3.4 Sources of Research

While the bulk of the formal research is generated in academic institutions (92.9%), followed in a distant second place by science councils (7.1%) there is far more of a spread in the case of the grey literature (see **Table 11** below). In this case, the primary source is 'Other', which primarily includes

local and international NGOs (55.2% of the total)⁴, followed by science councils (16.3%)⁵, Consultancies (11.3%), government departments (8.8%) and academic institutions (8.4%). In terms of the total picture, 'Other' is the largest source (42%), with academic institutions in second place (27.1%), followed by science councils (14%), consultancies (8.6%) and government departments (8.3%).

TABLE 11: SOURCE OF RESEARCH

Research Entity	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Academic	0	0	65	92.9	20	8.4	85	27.1
Government Department	5	100.0	0	0	21	8.8	26	8.3
Science Council	0	0	5	7.1	39	16.3	44	14.0
Consultancy	0	0	0	0	27	11.3	27	8.6
Other (HRC, SACN, UN-Habitat, etc.)	0	0	0	0	132	55.2	132	42.0
Total	5	100.0	70	100.0	239	100.0	314	100.0

3.3.5 Researchers

While there is a spread of researchers in the case of the formal literature, there is a greater tendency towards concentration in the grey literature, especially so where 'South African grey literature' is concerned, with a sizeable body of the local research being undertaken by a small body of researchers in consultancies, science councils and NGOs⁶. While this does not mean that the research outputs generated by this body of researchers is not credible, biased or tainted, the areas of research focus are to some extent determined by these bodies, and this has a bearing on the type and nature of the evidence produced. At the same time, the fact that (1) many of those responsible for the South African grey literature are based in metropolitan settings, and (2) their research is focused in these areas, has a bearing on the evidence captured in the EMHSS.

3.4 Summaries of the 'evidence cells' on the priority outcomes of government in relation to the interventions in the HSS

As argued in the introduction, the clearer and more clinical the process of capturing the link between an intervention and an outcome, the more useful an EM is for policy analysts and decision-makers. In the case of the EMHSS, there is a serious challenge with making use of the data in this way. Very few of the sources captured in the map have a single link or an *indication of the most significant link* between an intervention and an outcome. Grading of the link/relationship was also not done, and so, while the map may show a big bubble at an intersect, it says very little else about the relationship between the two variables that meet at the intersect.

The bulk of the studies in the EMHSS have 'multiple points of equal intersect', as is demonstrated in **Tables 12 to 15** below. (In all four tables, 'Multiple' as category ranges from 75.6% to 85.8% in terms of the total for the whole evidence set, but in some sub-sets, such as for instance the grey literature,

⁴ Primarily the Cities Alliance, UN Habitat, The World Bank (international NGOs); and Urban Landmark, SERI, the Centre for Affordable Housing Finance in Africa, the African Center for Cities, the South African Cities Network and the Isandla Institute (local NGOs and research institutes/centers).

⁵ The HSRC and the CSIR.

⁶ Key researchers and consultancies include Mark Napier, Kecia Rust, Ivan Turok, Kate Tissington, Stephen Berrisford, Gemey Abrahams, the Palmer Development Group, Shisaka Development Management Services, Sarah Charlton, Felicity Kitchin, Wendy Ovens, Lauren Royston, Marie Huchzermeyer, Kecia Rust, Joris Hoekstra, Lochner Marais and Eighty20 Consulting.

this figure is as high as 91.7%.) While this means that themes may have been conflated, it also limits (1) statistical analyses and graphical presentation of the findings beyond the main EM, and (2) extraction of guidance on policy interventions and their anticipated impacts from the map.

TABLE 12: TYPE OF RESEARCH BY MAIN INTERVENTION TYPE

Research Type	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Housing: State: Financial	1	20.0	1	1.4	5	2.1	7	2.2
Housing: State: Non-Financial	1	20.0	11	15.9	6	2.5	18	5.7
Housing: Non-State: Financial	0	0	0	0	5	2.1	5	1.6
Housing: Non-State: Non-Financial	0	0	3	4.3	4	1.7	7	2.2
Settlement: State	0	0	4	5.8	13	5.4	17	5.4
Settlement: Non-State	0	0	0	0	2	0.8	2	0.6
Multiple	3	60.0	50	72.5	207	85.5	260	82.3
Total (N=316)	5	100.0	69	100.0	242	100.0	316	100.0

TABLE 13: TYPE OF RESEARCH BY MAIN OUTCOMES

Outcomes	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Constitutional right to housing	0	0	13	18.6	12	5.0	25	7.9
Functional residential property market	0	0	14	20.0	23	9.5	37	11.7
Good Governance	0	0	6	8.6	9	3.7	15	4.7
Multiple	5	100.0	37	52.9	198	81.8	240	75.7
Total (N=316)	5	100.0	70	100.0	242	100.0	317	100.0

TABLE 14: TYPE OF RESEARCH BY SUB-TYPE OUTCOMES

Primary Outcome	DPME		Formal research		Grey literature		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Improved/quality living conditions	0	0	13	18.6	12	5.0	25	7.9
Growth and distribution of value in property market	0	0	7	10.0	0	0	7	2.2
Participation by low and middle income households	0	0	0	0	4	1.7	4	1.3
Poverty reduction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Procedural justice	0	0	2	2.9	0	0	2	0.6
Fiscal sustainability	0	0	2	2.9	1	0.4	3	0.9
Town and land-use planning	0	0	1	1.4	3	1.2	4	1.3
Inter-governmental relationships	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multiple	5	100	45	64.3	222	91.7	272	85.8
Total (N=317)	5	100	70	100	242	100	317	100

TABLE 15: INTERVENTIONS BY MAIN OUTCOMES

Main Outcome	Housing		Settlement		Both		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Constitutional right to housing	14	10.4	4	17.4	7	4.4	25	7.9
Functional residential property market	31	23.0	2	8.7	4	2.5	37	11.7
Good Governance	5	3.7	6	26.1	4	2.5	15	4.7
Multiple	85	63.0	11	47.8	143	90.5	239	75.6
Total (N=316)	135	100.0	23	100.0	158	100.0	316	100.0

This dilemma is not a reflection on the coding that was done in the compilation of the EMHSS or on the method of evidence mapping, but rather a reflection on the nature of research in the field of

housing and human settlements. Research in the fields of housing and human settlements is generally and necessarily not focused on finding or establishing direct links between an intervention and an outcome. There is a far greater trend for studies in these fields to be descriptive than explanatory, i.e. the study of relationships between variables, in this case interventions and impacts. One-on-one causality is also not a popular area of focus in these fields. The research captured in the EMHSS was generally not done with the testing of a link or a relationship between variables (the base of theory-creation) in mind.

It is also not a tradition in the field to build and test theory. Research in the field does not as a rule ask questions about for instance an intervention or action like high-rise residential development with the aim of coming to a shared understanding, based on evidence, on the outcomes of the action/intervention. This may be due to a fear of being perceived as deterministic or of missing a variable, and hence, maybe of not doing enough work to get to a point of making bold statements about causality. Buzzwords and areas of interest and research funding and focus and flavour-of-the-month-interventions come and go, and policies change without or before enough work has been done about an intervention or set of interventions and its/their impacts and outcomes.

3.5 A critical engagement with the data in the EMHSS and its usefulness in policy formulation and decision-making

While the EMHSS presents a novel departure, and heralds the prospect of a new era in which evidence will be brought to bear on policy-analysis and review in a far greater way, there are two key concerns with the data in the EMHSS, viz. (1) how the data was captured, and (2) what data was captured.

With regards to *how the data was captured*, working with the templates and trying to synthesize the findings, was difficult. The main reason for this was most probably the template itself, which was not clinical enough, and as such, most probably did not force those completing the templates to make clear calls as to what the key findings of each of the sources was. It may also have been the overarching framework of the map, which was not attuned to the kind of research that is done in the housing and human settlements fields. Adjusting the framework and/or the templates after some analytical work had been done and the literature had 'spoken', may have assisted in this regard. The simple question here being: Was the map adjusted in accordance with the kind of research that is done in the housing and human settlements field, or was it driven by what the crafters of the EM would want research in the field to be on? It may also have been a too strong a recognition of complexity and the multi-variant nature of cause and effect in the housing and human settlements fields, coupled with the lack of research that seeks to establish and test links between interventions and outcomes, i.e. the pursuit of causality, which made, and will make the use of the EMs in the housing and human settlements fields difficult.

As for *the data that was captured*, questions were asked by the EUP team as to the grounds on which studies were included and excluded in the map. Some of these questions related to the exclusion of studies that did not have distinct empirical bases, and at the same time, to the inclusion of studies that did not make clear statements regarding interventions and outcomes/impacts. One of the EUP team members also asked specific questions about the absence of sources by distinguished local researchers. This again raised the question as to the process of compiling the/an EM, and the resources involved. Is it for instance possible for one person to make the call as to which studies to

include and exclude? Can someone who is not trained in a specific technical domain complete the templates used to populate an EM? Is a trained researcher required to prepare an EM, or is domain knowledge and experience adequate for this?

3.6 Filling the content and evidence gaps in the map

There are three aspects that need attention in the EMHSS, which are dealt with in separation sections below:

- How to fill the evidence gaps in the map;
- How to enhance the specificity and usefulness of the map; and
- How to maintain the map;

3.6.1 Filling the evidence gaps

While the EMHSS provides an overview of evidence in the field, it does not provide clear guidance as to what the results/impacts/outcomes of state and non-state financial and non-financial interventions in the housing and human settlements domains are. As noted in **section 3.4** above, this is not necessarily due to research gaps in specific geographical areas or on specific kinds of interventions or outcomes, but rather the nature of research in the housing and human settlements fields, i.e. the preference for descriptive studies and the much lower level of enthusiasm for explanatory studies and the pursuit of causality in research in these fields.

ON of the members of the EUP team, Jacques du Toit (2010) conducted a methodological content analysis on all full-length peer-reviewed research articles between 1996 and 2005 in the Journal of Architectural and Planning Research, Journal of Urban Design, and Journal of Planning Education and Research (N = 381). The methodological 'profile' of planning research, as such, includes some of the following features:

- Only 42% of all articles included a stand-alone 'methods' section – the bulk of articles made anecdotal reference to methods or not at all;
- Only 20.2% included at least one reference to a methodological source – the remainder of the studies included did not at all;
- 48.6% of all studies involved 'basic' (i.e., theory-driven) research, while the other 51.4% involved 'applied' (i.e., 'practice'-driven) research;
- Most importantly, only 13% of all studies focused on pure 'explanation' (i.e. 'cause-and-effect' research), while most of the studies focused on mere 'description' of phenomena, or 'exploration' of uncharted areas of planning;
- Similarly, only 15.4% of all studies can be said to have been conducted in a post-positivist paradigm aiming to establish generalizable or 'universal' patterns or relationships. The bulk opted for a pragmatic approach (maybe also for lack of any identifiable paradigm), while few studies followed an interpretative or critical theory approach; and
- Lastly only 4.6% of studies included an experimental research design, while another 4.6% of studies included modelling/simulation – these two types of designs being the core method to establish or predict cause-and-effect patterns and relationships.

The figures above suggest that planning research is fairly hybrid, leaning quite strongly towards 'softer' and more descriptive social studies, and that it certainly does not have a strong tradition of hard cause-and-effect studies that would typically employ quantitative correlational and

experimental designs - at least to the same extent as certain natural and physical sciences. There are arguably many reasons for this profile, and it may well be debated whether this profile is conducive for planning and human settlements as fields of enquiry, and EM exercises. What it does suggest is that EM in planning should be very carefully designed and executed to differentiate properly between the wide range of different studies, and that the net should be cast wider than planning to include other relevant 'causal-type' studies from associated fields such as Sociology, Economics, Geography, etc.

Whether it is in fact possible to compile the stark and unambiguous kind of EMs with their interventions and outcomes-axes in the housing and human settlement fields is something that would need to be deliberated with (1) research experts in the field of evidence mapping, and (2) domain experts in the housing and human settlements fields.

3.6.2 Enhancing the specificity and usefulness of the map

Following on from the engagements with experts, and granted that the verdict is that there is room for a map such as the EMHSS, there are several things which can be done, such as:

- Cut the map into smaller sub-maps to allow the links between single variables and outcomes to be studied and captured;
- Engage experts in the field to identify gaps (overall, as well as no or little research), explore links/relationships between variables in which research can be done, and explore ways of getting the research done; and
- Involve more domain experts in compiling EMs and ensure more collaborative populating of EMs to further increase the credibility of the map.

3.6.3 Maintaining the map

It must be ensured that the EMHSS is 'curated', maintained and updated. Discussions on how this can be done, needs to take place with experts in the field. In such deliberations, the roles of government, as well as outside research organisations/entities need to be established. Making available 'sensitive' government research synthesis and review reports to such entity, including all reports prepared by service providers to government, would also need to be done.

4. THE EVOLVING THEORY OF CHANGE & RELATED PATHWAYS IN THE HSS⁷

4.1 Introduction

This part of the report consists of two parts: (1) a draft summary of the Theory of Change (TOC), as it has evolved over the last two decades in the HSS, and (2) a series of templates that draw on information from the EMHSS and the SPSS-dataset and that seek to explore what the evidence in the map suggests in relation to a selection of pathways in the map.

4.2 A Draft Narrative on the Evolving Theory of Change in the HSS

This section seeks to narrate the theory of change as related to the provision and delivery of houses in South Africa since 1994 and argues that although there are defining moments of change, the theory of change is continuously evolving to accommodate existing and emerging challenges (see **Table 16** below). Consequently, the significant moments of change tend to signify a series of cycles that characterise the evolving theory of change.

Prior to 1994, the housing landscape was characterised by racial segregation in cities and towns, poor quality housing for many, high levels of informality and poor services, infrastructure and amenities. The lived reality in cities was complex and furthermore complicated by dysfunctional and fragmented local governments in many areas. Often, local governments lacked political legitimacy and financial capacity to fulfil their mandates. This also impacted on the housing programme which was to be delivered by national and provincial government. Consequently, the dawn of democracy brought about a need for a theory of change to enable transformation from the existing situation to a new envisaged future.

The first cycle of change focused on housing the nation and the creation of better functioning settlements in the light of growing migration, urbanisation and increasing levels of poverty and at the same time to respond to the social and spatial injustices of the past through redistribution. Some of the most pressing needs were for adequate housing, affordable rents, security of tenure and the right to own land and a house anywhere in the country. This was formalised through the adoption of the Botshabelo Accord in 1994 by different sectors involved in housing delivery, committed to *“...take reasonable legislative and other measures to achieve the progressive realisation to this right [to housing]”*. This accord bound parties, both morally and politically towards the achievement of seven objectives, focussing on the improvement of the housing environment and institutions, encouraging savings, providing houses through the subsidy scheme along with housing support, as well as mobilising credit and making land available for housing. The Constitution of South Africa, Act

⁷ Unless specifically indicated otherwise, this discussion draws on the following sources: Co-producing Human Settlements: Re-tooling the social contract for Sustainable Human Settlements, 2010. Framework for Discussion. DHS; Framework for Engagement and guidelines towards the retooled Social Contract for Human Settlements, 2010, DHS; Misselhorn, M., Napier, M, Charlton, S. Godehart, S. Mkhabela, I. and Carey, S. 2012. Rethinking the Housing Programme: Finding a sustainable and responsive solution to the Need for Adequate Shelter, Synthesis Report; From housing to sustainable Human Settlements, 2014. Cities Network Poster. Towards a policy foundation for the development of Human Settlements Legislation, 2015, Developed by DHS.

108 of 1996, further entrenched that everyone has the right to access adequate housing, and that the state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of this right. However, despite the large number of houses delivered, the massive scope and the required scale of delivery was overlooked.

The second cycle was initiated by the Comprehensive Plan for the development of Sustainable Human Settlements, commonly referred to as Breaking New Ground (BNG) and the Social Contracts. The Social Contracts committed all stakeholders to fast tracking sustainable human settlements through a focus on five areas: (1) product and delivery; (2) development planning; (3) finance; (4) capacity building; and (5) communication. Each of these were addressed through a series of MoUs and partnerships. To address issues of finance, the Minister of Housing signed an MoU with the major four banks to make finance more affordable and accessible through loans and backed loans. Secondly, to make more land available, a partnership was established with Intersite Property Management Services to identify surplus land for housing. In addition to this, the Housing Development Agency (HDA) was established to acquire, manage and disperse land suitable for human settlements. Thirdly, to address issues of capacity around planning and development, partnerships were established with DBSA to integrate their sustainable communities approach with the subsidy housing delivery system. Increasing the delivery of houses were also tackled through partnership with willing stakeholders in the field of construction. Finally, the issue of communication was addressed through a new TV programme on BNG and the various housing programmes linked to it. In spite of some great achievements, challenges emerged around the implementation of BNG across the three spheres of government and building social capital in poorer communities.

The third cycle was characterised by a re-commitment to the social contract and the development of clear outcomes to guide the implementation processes. This, however, took place in a very constrained post-2007 Global Recession-financial environment with job losses and high unemployment levels, coupled with an increasing number of informal settlements and overcrowded housing conditions. The vision for housing and settlements, therefore echoed the goals of the Medium-Term-Strategic-Framework to focus on settlements that are decent and appropriate settlements (with a range of socio-economic opportunities), sustainable (in terms of the toleration of diversity and democratic governance) and enable vibrant communities to develop. Given this, there was a need to not only reconsider the product of delivery, but also the way in which delivery had to take place, i.e. the mechanisms of delivery. Furthermore, although BNG emphasised the creation of sustainable human settlement, it is only in this third cycle that the focus significantly broadened from a focus on only shelter to the entire settlement, as defined the Vancouver declaration, where a settlement is *“the totality of human community – whether a city, town or a village – with all social, material, organisational, spiritual and cultural elements that sustain it”*. The then, newly established Department of Human Settlements also reflected this shift in practice and responded by drafting a strategic human settlements plan, centred on 6 pillars to achieve the revised political vision and approach towards human settlements. These six pillars included: (1) functioning and empowering human settlements; (2) a developmental approach to housing delivery; (3) efficient response to urbanisation through integration, mixed housing, a variety of tenure options and a range of socio-economic amenities; (4) diversification of delivery models through four programmes, i.e. affordable, medium density rental housing, upgrading informal settlements, rural shelter and basic services, and the People’s Housing Process (PHP); (5) changing the delivering process to allow for community engagement; and (6) institutional re-alignment. Furthermore, DHS

considered three priority focus areas to contribute to their broader agenda of building a democratic, non-racial, non-sexist and prosperous society, i.e. (1) planning and development, (2) social cohesion, and (3) finance.

A number of Programmes were also established during cycle two and three to facilitate the envisaged change in practice. These included the Integrated Residential Development programme (IRDP), the Enhanced People's Housing Process (EPHP), the Social Housing Programme, the Upgrading Informal Settlements Programme (UISP), the Finance Linked Individual Subsidy Programme (FLISP), the Institutional Housing Subsidy Programme (IHSP) and the Community Residential Units Programme (CRU). Another key Initiative included the Neighbourhood Development Partnership Grant (NDPG). The purpose of this grant is to fund, support and facilitate the planning and development of neighbourhood development programmes that provide catalytic infrastructure to leverage further public and private sector investment towards greater sustainability. However, despite the high ambitions and considerable effort, achievements have been uneven and a number of challenges have emerged. These broadly relates to issues of sustainability and efficiency, including cost inefficiency, insufficient socio-economic and spatial leverage, ineffectiveness in reducing the backlog and a lack of environmental sustainability. Other challenges related to low levels of affordability leading to increasing informality, an increasing mismatch between the delivered product and what is needed due to state allocation of houses, the gradual erosion of meaningful community engagement and participation, and insufficient contextualisation of housing in relation to the broader settlement through inadequate spatial planning, poor public realm investment and weak urban management.

The fourth and current cycle is aimed at building urban communities and creating more sustainable settlements through a focus on integration, efficiency and balance. This cycle is strongly influenced by the National Development Plan that emphasize the transformation of human settlements and entrenched spatial patterns that exacerbate social inequality and economic inefficiency. This cycle is also mindful of the addressing the current context that is characterised by a growing population, the rapid rate of urbanisation, low levels of economic growth, high levels of unemployment and an increasing housing backlog with more than 14 million people living in informal settlements. In addition, the new policy also has to address current concerns that the existing welfare approach adopted in human settlements programmes is unsustainable and has escalated government expenditure. However, it has also been indicated that market base strategies cannot respond to the housing needs of the poor and that state intervention is critical to address this need. The intention with the new policy and legislation is to, *“establish a foundation for the establishment of a viable, socially and economically integrated communities that are located in areas allowing convenient access to economic opportunities as well as health, educational and social amenities”* (Towards a policy foundation for the development of Human Settlements Legislation, 2015:16). This should be achieved through a focus on the following: (1) improving the planning, design and development of settlements, (2) facilitating access to adequate housing and quality living environments, (3) improving access to the residential property market for poor households, (4) fiscal sustainability and financial affordability, (5) improving performance measurement, and (6) improving policy implementation. A major focus of the new pathway will be the development of spatially and socio-economically integrated settlements, communities and neighbourhoods and residential areas with mixed use, while land access for suitable development will be improved. In addition to this, there will also be a focus on the development of public space. Various types of subsidies will continue to

play an important role, while a range of rental options will also be facilitated. In addition, self-help housing will also be promoted. In this way, the intention is to reach more beneficiaries, while also taking into consideration the quality of the living environment.

TABLE 16: SUMMARY OF THE DRAFT EVOLVING THEORY OF CHANGE IN THE HSS

<i>Time</i>	<i>Moments of change</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Instruments /delivery models</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Challenges</i>
1994-2004	Reconstruction and Development Plan, 1994 Botshabelo Accord, 1994 Housing White Paper Housing Act, 1997	Realisation of the right to housing – ownership of houses	Stabilising housing environment Consolidating and unifying housing institutions Encouraging savings for housing Establishing a subsidy scheme Providing housing support to communities Mobilising credit Making land available for housing	Individual Housing Subsidy Programme (capital grant to households earning < R3500/m) The People’s Housing Process (PHP) Enhanced Discount Benefit Scheme (subsidy mechanism to transfer house to qualifying occupants)	1 129 692 houses in 10 years	Size and quality of houses often poor Location of new houses on urban periphery far from socio-economic opportunities – fragmented spatial environments – impact on service delivery Little success in mobilising credit / re savings
2004-2009	Breaking New Ground, 2004 Social Contract for Rapid Housing Delivery, 2006 Rural housing Social Contract Housing Act, 2009 (Amended)	To address urban poverty through state housing – house as asset	Improve housing finance option Increase access to well-located land Address development planning capacity towards more sustainable settlements Increasing the delivery of houses Addressing communication with communities	Financial Services Charter (FSC) % partnerships with banks Housing Development Agency (HDA) Partnership with DBSA Partnership with key stakeholders e.g. Anglo Platinum Breaking New Ground TV programme	Almost 1 million loans for low-income housing Better located human settlements Mixed income & Integrated developments, e.g. Cosmo City Alternative technologies & mixed methods and improved quality houses Diversification of product delivery	Lack of shared understanding of BNG across provinces Lack of alignment of functions and funds Disconnect between people and state – not building communities – social capital of poor not developed Lack of data on performance of banks re FSC

<i>Time</i>	<i>Moments of change</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Instruments /delivery models</i>	<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Challenges</i>
2009-2014	Re-tooled Social Contract, 2010 Strategic Human Settlements Plan Medium-term-strategic Framework (MTSF) 2009-2014	To expand social and economic infrastructure & build, cohesive, caring sustainable communities – key role of human settlements	Functioning and empowering human settlements Developmental approach to housing delivery Efficient response to urbanisation through integration, mixed housing, variety of tenure options and range of socio-economic amenities Diversification of delivery models through 4 programmes. Changing the delivering process to allow for community engagement. Institutional re-alignment	Developmental government Range of programmes (IRDP, EPHP, SHP, UISP, FLISP, IHSP, CRU) Neighbourhood Development Programme Grant (NDPG)	Funded 3 million houses since 1994 24% of registered housing stock in township areas Housing Programme contributed 7.1% to the employment in the construction industry Municipal tax base expanded through those paying for services in subsidy houses Home-based businesses increased	National housing programme is not sustainable and efficient (cost-inefficiency, insufficient social and spatial leverage, growing housing backlog, environmentally unsustainable) Low levels of affordability No meaningful participation Mismatch between what is delivered and needed Not sufficient focus on public realm development Insufficient socio-spatial transformation
2014 onwards	Towards a policy foundation for the development of Human Settlements Legislation, 2015 Development Plan (NDP), 2012 Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF) SPLUMA (2013) Medium-term-strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014-2019	Building Urban Communities – to focus on spatial integration, sustainability, efficacy and balance, and integrated urban settlements	Improving the planning, design and development of settlements. Facilitating access to adequate housing and quality living environments. Improving access to the residential property market for poor households. Fiscal sustainability and financial affordability. Improving performance measurement. Improving policy implementation.	Accreditation for municipalities to deliver houses Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG) Integrated City Development Grant (ICDG) Community Residential Programme (CRU) and social housing. Freehold & communal ownership (subsidies) Self-help housing		

4.3 An Exploration of Pathways in the Theory of Change

The next six tables (Tables 17 to 22) below represent the first tentative stabs at testing the usefulness of the EM at ‘testing’ support for the pathways as included in the TOC in the HSS. It is by no means an exhaustive list of interventions included in the TOC.

TABLE 17: SUBSIDIES

Intervention	Subsidies					
Intention	To provide financial support to low-income households to access housing through a range of programmes.					
Type	Housing	Settlement	State	Non-State	Financial	Non-Financial
	X		X		X	
Outcome	Sources in Intersect					
	Number	Intersect-Density				
		Low	Medium	High		
Improved Quality living conditions	72				X	
Participation by low and middle income groups	70				X	
Poverty reduction	47				X	
Procedural justice	12	X				
Town and land-use planning	37			X		
Intergovernmental relationships	17	X				
Summary of Evidence						
<p>Grey material constitutes by far the bulk of the sources. Most of the sources focus on the African region and particularly South Africa. Although there are a few academic articles, the key contributions come from research reports and several book chapters. Although the evidence varies, the literature tends to indicate that subsidies contribute to stabilize communities and promote the dignity of the beneficiaries. There is also evidence to support the fact that subsidy houses offer (1) much better living conditions compare to informal dwellings in informal settlements and (2) improved access to services such as on-site or in-house toilets, in-house taps and better quality roads in the settlement. Although these houses have been linked with better access to socio-economic conditions in some case, there is a body of evidence pointing out that residents in subsidy houses are often trapped in areas without socio-economic opportunities, necessitating long traveling distances, which in turn has a financial and time cost and indirectly lead to the need for large transport subsidies as well. Some of the evidence also articulated the need to use state investment to create better living environments. The evidence suggests that there is minimal participation of beneficiaries in projects, with high levels of dissatisfaction in some cases. There seems to also be a need for post-occupation beneficiary support. Although the literature recognizes the positive impact of subsidy housing on people’s quality of life, it appears that subsidy housing did not always assist residents to get out of poverty. In several cases, home-based enterprises and home-rentals of rooms of backyard shacks can assist with poverty reduction to some extent. Yet, in many case subsidy homes are not working as financial assets. In addition, a significant part of the evidence seems to indicate that subsidy houses alone do not contribute to sustainable settlements and that they have not significantly changed the landscape. In many cases, communities are trapped in areas without socio-economic opportunities. In many cases, the focus remains on the mass delivery of standardised housing delivery through capital subsidies characterized by a lack of alignment and inter-governmental relations that constrain the delivery process. It seems that subsidies can facilitate a transformative result, but that it is limited in its ability to effect widespread change.</p>						

TABLE 18: POLICY AND LEGISLATION

Intervention	Policy and Legislation					
Intention	To address the imbalances and socio-spatial inequalities of the apartheid era through the provision of a new direction and the framing of a set of actions and instruments to move towards this new direction.					
Type	Housing	Settlement	State	Non-State	Financial	Non-Financial
	X		X			X
Outcome	Sources in Intersect					
	Number	Intersect-Density				
		Low	Medium	High		
Improved quality living conditions	152					X
Participation by low and middle income groups	99					X
Poverty reduction	86					X
Procedural justice	54			X		
Town and land-use planning	96					X
Intergovernmental relationships	45				X	
Summary of Evidence						
<p>This is one of the most highly populated set of intersects in the EM, and reflects the significant policy and legislative shifts that occurred since 1994, i.e. (1) creating the foundation for a new approach to housing in the first ten years (RDP, Housing Act 1997), (2) improving the quality of the houses and settlements in the next ten years (Breaking New Ground, 1994, Housing Act Amended, 2009), and (3) consolidating and building on this foundation (Policy foundation for the development of Human Settlement Legislation, Intended new Housing Act). Most of the sources are grey literature and research reports by science councils, NGOs and academics, as well as book chapters, constitute the main contributions. The evidence suggests that policy intentions have not always been able to result in the intended outcomes such as improved quality living conditions, greater participation in the housing delivery process and poverty reduction. There appears to be a gap between the contribution of housing to policies to alleviate poverty and the ability of housing to do so in practice. In many case beneficiaries remain severely dependent on social grants for survival, while finding it difficult to pay for services and taxes. Therefore, while in some cases, the house has provided the household with an asset as intended by BNG, it has rarely resulted in significant tax income for municipalities. Given this, the ability of subsidy housing to significantly contribute to the residential housing market, has not realized its intended objective.</p>						

TABLE 19: SPATIAL PLANNING

Intervention	Spatial Planning					
Intention	Using planning to incorporate lower income households in urban areas and transform South Africa's apartheid cities into settlements that are just, accessible for all, well integrated and efficient.					
Type	Housing	Settlement	State	Non-State	Financial	Non-Financial
		X	X		Not Differentiated in the EMHSS	
Outcome	Sources in Intersect					
	Number	Intersect-Density				
		Low	Medium	High		
Improved quality living conditions	103					X
Participation by low and middle income groups	55					X
Poverty reduction	56					X
Procedural justice	40			X		
Town and Land-use planning	91					X
Intergovernmental relationships	33				X	
Summary of Evidence						
<p>Grey/Informal material constitutes by far the bulk of the sources. There is, however, also a sizeable body of formal research on the intervention in the map. While many of the sources have South Africa as area of study, a significant number of sources are focused on African, Latin American and Asian countries. Reports prepared for NGOs constitute by far the largest body of work on this intervention, and the number of these reports is roughly equal to the sum of the journal articles, book chapters, research reports and government reports on the intervention. Strong themes in the body of work are: (1) the importance of involving all stakeholders and role-players in planning through meaningful and sustained</p>						

consultation/engagement; (2) the need to ensure that the training of planners is conducive to the roles that they must play in the transformation and development of sustainable human settlements; (3) the importance of transforming planning into a pro-poor instrument with regulations that are adjusted to perform this role; (4) the need to ensure integration between transport and land use planning; (5) the necessity of integrated and coordinated intergovernmental development planning in which all actors understand their roles and responsibilities; (6) the overarching need to identify well-located land for housing for the poor; (7) the need to secure political buy-in and support for all plans; (8) the successes and difficulties with ensuring integration between different land uses, racial groups, and income groups through planning; (9) the crucial role that rental housing can play in filling gaps in the housing market in South Africa; (10) the need for an approach that involves phased regularization of informal housing; (11) the slow pace of transformation of the apartheid space economy of South African cities; (12) the need for a differentiated and not a one-size-fits-all approach to in situ upgrading; (13) the need for planners to better understand backyard rental accommodation; (14) the need to plan for people with disabilities; (15) the contribution that transport planning can play to bringing about greater equity in urban spaces; (16) the trajectory of housing policy in South Africa over the last two decades; (17) the sustainability, outcomes and value for money of South Africa's housing subsidy programme; (18) the need for metros to integrate their planning and investment actions, and not just integrate their work with provincial and national government departments; and (19) the importance of government partnerships with the private sector in planning and settlement upgrading.

TABLE 20: TRANSACTIONAL SUPPORT

Intervention	Transactional Support					
Intention	The provision of support, including relevant/useful information, with accessing, purchasing and transferring land and shelter/housing.					
Type	Housing	Settlement	State	Non-State	Financial	Non-Financial
	X			X		X
Outcome	Sources in Intersect					
	Number	Intersect-Density				
		Low	Medium	High		
Improved quality living conditions	34		X			
Participation by low and middle income groups	35		X			
Poverty reduction	19		X			
Procedural justice	17	X				
Town and Land-use planning	19		X			
Intergovernmental relationships	3	X				
Summary of Evidence						
<p>Grey/Informal material constitutes by far the bulk of the sources in the map. While many of the sources have South Africa as area of study, a significant number of sources are focused on African, Latin American and Asian countries. The key contributors to the map are researchers conducting commissioned work for NGOs and intergovernmental agencies, such as UN-Habitat, the Cities Alliance and the World Bank. Strong themes in the body of work are: (1) the importance of involving all stakeholders and role-players in planning, housing provision and settlement upgrading; (2) the benefit to be gained by recognizing the different drivers of the various actors and role-players in the housing and human settlements sector; (3) the need for an integrated approach on the side of the State (spheres/tiers and sectors) to human settlement development and the provision of shelter/housing; (4) the need to recognize informal settlements (as 'places of hope') and to upgrade and formalize, and not demolish these settlements; (5) the important role of NGOs and micro-lending agencies in enabling housing and settlement upgrading; (6) litigation as a tool that is increasingly being used by communities to claim their right to the city, partially as a result of the State and State planning not planning for, or allowing this; (7) the importance of social capital and a concern for detail and local nuances in the planning for and implementation of in situ upgrading projects; (8) the need to share information on the housing and land acquisition, release and development plans by government with all stakeholders; (9) challenges encountered with the registration of RDP houses; (10) the need for <i>not</i> a one-size-fits all, but rather a continuum of housing policies/responses by the State; (11) the need for a range of financing options/models to address the many and deep-seated housing challenges in lower-income countries; and (12) the need for caution in expecting quick gains with 'opening land and houses markets for the poor', including the tool of titling.</p>						

TABLE 21: BULK INFRASTRUCTURE

Intervention	Bulk Infrastructure					
Intention	The provision, maintenance and upgrading of bulk infrastructure as key component of sustainable human settlement development.					
Type	Housing	Settlement	State	Non-State	Financial	Non-Financial
			X	X		Not Differentiated in the EMHSS
Outcome	Sources in Intersect					
	Number	Intersect-Density				
		Low	Medium	High		
Improved quality living conditions	33			X		
Participation by low and middle income groups	12	X				
Poverty reduction	15	X				
Procedural justice	8	X				
Town and Land-use planning	28			X		
Intergovernmental relationships	14	X				
Summary of Evidence						
<p>Grey/Informal material in the form of (1) NGO and consultancy reports and (2) government reports are the main sources on this intervention in the map. Most of the sources have South Africa as area of study, with a small number of sources focused on Latin American, African and Asian countries. Strong themes in the body of work are: (1) the need to coordinate infrastructure planning with spatial planning and planning for housing and incremental settlement upgrading; (2) the importance of definitional clarity on incremental settlement upgrading for engineering services planning, budgeting, investment, maintenance and upgrading; (3) the importance of planning for infrastructure investment, maintenance and upgrading in the provision of free basic services; (4) the crucial role of bulk infrastructure in attracting and retaining private sector investment; (5) the reality that the maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure are serious challenges in most middle-income countries like SA, and that this necessitates private sector and community involvement; (6) the high cost of infrastructure necessitates its inclusion as key factor in deciding on land acquisition and allocation for affordable housing; (7) the need to recognize the vulnerability of the poor when it comes to infrastructure breakdowns or repairs; (8) the high value that households place on tarred roads and access to basic municipal services in their overall assessments of the quality of their settlements and lives; and (9) the importance (for planners in particular) of becoming more knowledgeable on backyard rental accommodation and its impacts on the provision of basic municipal services.</p>						

TABLE 22: EMPLOYMENT

Intervention	Employment					
Intention	Allowing and supporting informal economic activities to ensure a livelihood for residents of informal and low-cost housing. Recognizing the job creation and economic growth potentials in human settlements. Valuing the house as a key component of, and important contributor to entrepreneurial activities in informal areas and townships.					
Type	Housing	Settlement	State	Non-State	Financial	Non-Financial
			X		X	Not Differentiated in the EMHSS
Outcome	Sources in Intersect					
	Number	Intersect-Density in EMHSS as a whole				
		Low	Medium	High		
Improved/Quality Living Conditions	25			X		
Poverty Reduction	21			X		
Summary of Evidence						
<p>Grey/Informal material constitutes the bulk of the sources in the map. Most of these sources have South Africa as focus. The key contributors to the map are researchers conducting commissioned work for NGOs. Strong themes in the body of work are: (1) the need to recognize informal housing/shelter and economic activities, including informal economic activities related to housing, such as rental and home-based enterprises, as key job creators and important survival mechanisms; (2) the role of the house in making a living and in permitting and enhancing entrepreneurship in urban South Africa; (3) the importance of access to finance, and challenges in this regard, for small-scale business operators/home-based enterprises; (4) profiles of landlords and small-scale business operators/home-based enterprises; (5) the need for an integrated approach (all three spheres and all relevant sectors of the State, private sector and communities) to housing provision, infrastructure provision, upgrading and maintenance, settlement upgrading and job creation; (6) the importance of well-located land for low-income housing, and the role of the State in identifying and releasing such land; and (7) in-situ upgrading as desired practice/model, instead of 'slum removal' and the demolition of informal housing.</p>						

5. ALIGNING THE EM WITH THE SEIAS AND THE OM&E FUNCTIONS

There table (**Table 23**) below provides an exploratory proposal for aligning the SEIAS, EM and OM&E functions and teams in the DPME. The table is based on the following understanding regarding the functions and teams in the DPME:

- The *SEIAS function* is performed by a team of DPME officials in collaboration with officials in affected national sector departments (i.e. departments reviewing or preparing a policy or bill);
- The *Evidence Mapping function* is performed by a team of DPME officials in collaboration with academics, researchers and possibly a service provider;
- The *Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation function* is performed by a team of DPME officials who may do so in collaboration with officials from national sector departments; and
- The *national sector department* responsible for the preparation of the policy or bill will ensure that meaningful stakeholder consultation takes place throughout the policy/law review or preparation process.

TABLE 23: A DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR ALIGNING THE SEIAS, EM AND OM&E FUNCTIONS IN THE DPME

Policy Phase		DPME Functions and Teams		
No	Name	SEIAS	Evidence Mapping (EMP)	Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation (OM&E)
1	'Everyday Scanning': Service provided to all National Sector Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuously engaging with national sector departments and the OM&E team on the outcomes and impacts of existing policy and legislation. • Continuously engaging with the EMP and OM&E teams, to identify emerging policy issues and new evidence on key policy issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuously creating, populating, maintaining and updating EMs in relevant sectors/fields. • Continuously providing information, based on the EMs, to the relevant national sector departments and the SEIAS and OM&E teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuously monitoring the outcomes and impacts of existing policy and legislation in their specific sectors/fields. • Continuously monitoring the media, society, political discourse, trends, etc. to identify emerging policy issues that may have an impact on the realization of key national objectives/outcomes in that sector/field. • Continuously monitoring, in collaboration with the EMP team, what research is revealing or suggesting on key policy issues or questions in relevant sectors/fields, and ensuring that EMs are accordingly updated.
2	Policy Diagnosis: Specific engagement with a national sector department on a policy or law to be revised or a new policy or law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information to the relevant sector department based on engagement with the EMP and OM&E teams on (1) the outcomes and impacts of an existing policy or law, or (2) the need for a new policy or law in the field/sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an overview of (1) what evidence is available in the EM, and (2) what the evidence in the EM 'says' in relation to the sector/field in which the existing or proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the risks of <i>not</i> reviewing an existing or preparing a new policy or law vis-à-vis reviewing an existing, or preparing a new policy or bill. • Establish whether there is a need for (1) the review of an existing policy or law, or (2) the preparation of a new policy or law.

Policy Phase		DPME Functions and Teams		
No	Name	SEIAS	Evidence Mapping (EMP)	Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation (OM&E)
			policy or law is located.	
3	Policy Mandate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receive the instruction from the sector department that an existing policy or law is to be revised or a new policy or law is to be prepared. In collaboration with the relevant sector department, draft the terms of reference for the SEIAS to be followed in the policy/law review/preparation process. Establish (1) the structures for, and (2) the rules of engagement with the sector department and the EMP and OM&E teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish what evidence the EM offers is in relation to the evidence that the SEIAS will require. Undertake or commission dedicated work to populate and/or review the EM in areas that the SEIAS will require guidance/evidence on. Should it be required, update the EM in relation to the list of interventions and outcomes in the map. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the EM to assist the sector department with framing the issue/s that the new or reviewed policy or law will engage in accordance with key national objectives/outcomes. Provide inputs to the EMP team on amendments to the EM based on the framing process.
4	Draft Policy Preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the sector department with the preparation of a draft policy or bill in accordance with the terms of reference, as agreed upon in Phase 2. Engage with the EMP and OM&E teams in accordance with the rules of engagement, as agreed upon in Phase 2. Feed (new) evidence generated in the policy research, preparation and/or consultation process to the EMP team for inclusion in, or for updating the EM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the EM, provide evidence to the SEIAS team on specific policy issues and policy questions that may be asked. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the EM, monitor the policy or bill preparation process, to establish whether there is evidence for what the policy or bill is postulating, proposing or putting forward. Provide continuous feedback to the SEIAS team on the findings of the monitoring exercise.
5	Draft Policy Evaluation: SEIAS Phase One	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the sector department with the evaluation of the policy or bill in accordance with the terms of reference, as agreed upon in Phase 2. Reach an agreement with the sector department on revisions to be made to the draft policy or bill, based on the inputs received from the EMP and OM&E teams. Assist the sector department with (1) the completion and preparation of the SEIAS Phase One template, and (2) the compilation of the accompanying SEIAS documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the contents of the EM, (1) provide information to the SEIAS team with regards to evidence on key policy issues and questions in the field, (2) propose areas for further research in cases where there are evidence gaps, and (3) suggest amendments to the draft policy or bill to the SEIAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide feedback to the SEIAS team on the draft policy or bill, based on (1) the EM, and (2) an assessment of the policy or bill in terms of its fit with, and contribution to the realization of key national objectives/outcomes.

Policy Phase		DPME Functions and Teams		
No	Name	SEIAS	Evidence Mapping (EMP)	Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation (OM&E)
			team.	
6	Draft Policy Revision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the sector department with the revision of the draft policy or bill in accordance with the agreements reached in Phase 5. Ensure that revisions are made in accordance with the agreements reached in Phase 5. Feed (new) evidence generated in the policy research, preparation and/or consultation process to the EMP team for inclusion in, or updating of the EM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the EM, provide input or feedback to the SEIAS team on the draft policy or bill, to assist the revision process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the revision process and provide feedback to the SEIAS team on the revised policy or bill, based on (1) the EM and (2) an assessment of the policy or bill in terms of its fit with, and contribution to the realization of key national objectives/outcomes.
7	Revised Draft Policy Evaluation and Finalization: SEIAS Phase Two	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the sector department with the draft policy/bill evaluation and finalization process in accordance with (1) the terms of reference (Phase 2) and (2) the agreements reached on revisions to be made to the first draft policy or bill in SEIAS phase One (Phase 5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the EM, provide feedback to the SEIAS team on the revised draft policy or bill to assist the draft policy or bill evaluation and finalization process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide feedback to the SEIAS team on the draft policy or bill, based on (1) the EM, and (2) an assessment of the policy or bill in terms of its fit with, and contribution to the realization of key national objectives/outcomes.
8	Revised Draft Policy Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the policy/bill (1) has been prepared in accordance with the terms of reference (Phase 2) on the preparation of the policy/bill, and (2) that all inputs from the EMP and OM&E teams (Phase 5 to 7) have been duly considered in the policy/bill preparation process. Provide the sector department with feedback on the draft policy/bill as provided by the EMP and OM&E teams. Engage the sector department and request explanations on aspects where it did not follow the guidance as included in the inputs made by the EMP and OM&E teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the SEIAS and OM&E teams with information from the EM that (1) they may request, or (2) the EMP team may regard as important in undertaking the review of the revised draft policy/bill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request the EMP team to provide it with information from the EM, to assist it with a review of the draft policy/bill. Assess the draft policy/bill based on the extent to which (1) it contributes to the realization of national objectives, and (1) the sector department followed the guidance, based on the EM, as provided by the EMP team, and responded to inputs made by the OM&E team, based on the contribution of the draft policy/bill to the realization of national objectives. Provide the SEIAS team with feedback and inputs for revision of the policy/bill, based on its review.
9	Formal Policy Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request the EMP team to provide it with information from the EM in response to issues raised, submissions made and questions asked in the consultation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the EM, provide interested and involved parties with information that they may 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide feedback to the SEIAS team on inputs and submissions made and questions raised in the consultation process, based on (1) the EM, and

Policy Phase		DPME Functions and Teams		
No	Name	SEIAS	Evidence Mapping (EMP)	Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation (OM&E)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the sector department with inputs from the EMP and OM&E teams. • Ensure that inputs made, and evidence provided by the EMP and OM&E teams is considered by the sector department in the preparation of the policy/bill. • Assist the sector department with the completion and preparation of the draft SEIAS Phase Two template and the compilation of the accompanying documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • request, or questions that they may have. • Update the EM based on inputs made and evidence presented by interested and involved parties in the consultation process. • Provide the SEIAS team with information from the EM in response to inputs made and questions raised in the formal submissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (2) an assessment of the implications of the inputs, questions and submissions for the policy/bill and its ability to meaningfully contribute to the realization of key national objectives/outcomes.
10	Final Draft Policy Revision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach an agreement with the sector department on those aspects of the policy/bill to be amended, based on (1) the formal consultation process (Phase 9), and (2) the inputs made by the EMP and OM&E teams. • Assist the sector department with the amendment of the draft policy/bill in accordance with the agreements reached. • Ensure that the policy/bill is amended in accordance with the agreements reached. • Assist the sector department with the revision, amendment and completion of the final SEIAS Phase Two template and the compilation of the accompanying documentation in accordance with the agreements reached. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide final inputs to the SEIAS team on policy issues and questions it may request, to assist the policy/bill revision and amendment process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the final draft policy/bill revision and amendment process, and provide feedback to the SEIAS team on the final revised policy or bill, based on (1) the EMP and (2) the OM&E teams' assessment of the policy bill's fit with, and contribution to the realization of key national objectives/outcomes.
11	Policy Submission to Cabinet or Minister	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include any DPME information as annexures to the draft policy/bill and Cabinet or Minister's memorandum, which may include information as provided by the EMP team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the SEIAS team with information from the EM that it may have requested, or that the EMP team may regard as of importance for the submission of the draft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the SEIAS team with information that it may have requested, or that the OM&E team may regard as of importance for the submission of the draft policy/bill to Cabinet or the Minister. • Request the EMP team to provide the SEIAS team with information that it

Policy Phase		DPME Functions and Teams		
No	Name	SEIAS	Evidence Mapping (EMP)	Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation (OM&E)
			policy/bill to Cabinet or the Minister.	may regard as of importance for the submission of the draft policy/bill to Cabinet or the Minister.
12	Implementation of the Policy or Law and incorporating it in the DPME's Phase 1-'Everyday Scanning' Functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuously engage with the relevant sector department and the OM&E team on the outcome of the new policy or law. Continuously engage with the EMP and OM&E teams, to identify emerging policy issues and new evidence on key policy issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuously populate, maintain and update the EM in the respective sector/field. Continuously provide information based on the EM to the sector department and the SEIAS and OM&E teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuously monitor the outcomes and impacts of the new policy or law. Continuously monitor the media, society, political discourse, trends, etc. to identify emerging policy issues that may have an impact on the realization of key national objectives/outcomes in the sector/field. Continuously monitor, in collaboration with the EMP team, what research is revealing or suggesting on key policy issues or questions in the sector/field, and ensuring that the EM is the field is accordingly updated.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this final pre-consultation report, an analysis of the content and usefulness of the recently completed EMHSS was undertaken. A high-level peek of the map, challenges in using it and proposals for improvement were made. Of key concern now is to move towards the consultation stage, during which (1) the contents of the report can be engaged with experts in the HSS domain, and (2) the alignment of Evidence Maps with the work of the SEIAS team can be deliberated.

REFERENCES

DHS. 2010. *Co-producing Human Settlements: Re-tooling the social contract for Sustainable Human Settlements. Framework for Discussion.*

DHS. 2010. *Framework of Engagement and guidelines towards the retooled Social Contract for Human Settlements.*

DHS. 2015. *Towards a policy foundation for the development of Human Settlements Legislation.*

Du Toit JL. (2010). *A typology of designs for social research in the built environment.* Doctoral thesis submitted at Stellenbosch University.

Hempel, Susanne; Shekelle, Paul G, Taylor, Stephanie L; Solloway, Michelle R; Miake-Lye, Isomi M; Beroes, Jessica M; Shnamna, Roberta; Booth, Marika J; and Siroka, Andrew M. (2014). *Evidence Map of Acupuncture.* Evidence-based Synthesis Program Center, West Los Angeles VA Medical Center, Los Angeles, California. Accessed on 6 March 2017. Available at <https://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/publications/esp/acupuncture.pdf>

McKinnon, Madeleine C., Cheng, Samantha H, Garside, Ruth, Masuda, Yuta J and Miller, Daniel C. (2015) Map the evidence. *Nature*, Volume 528, 10 December, pp. 185-187.

Miake-Lye, Isome M; Hempel, Suzanne; Shanman, Roberta and Shekelle, Paul G. (2016). What is an evidence map? A systematic review of published evidence maps and their definitions, methods, and products. *Systematic Reviews*, Vol 5: 28, pp. 1-21.

Misselhorn, M., Napier, M, Charlton, S. Godehart, S. Mkhabela, I. and Carey, S. 2012. *Rethinking the Housing Programme: Finding a sustainable and responsive solution to the Need for Adequate Shelter, Synthesis Report.*

SACN. 2014. Poster: *From housing to sustainable Human Settlements, 2014.*