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Abstract

It has been over twelve years since the 1974 Ethiopian Revolution took place. Having inherited a housing system which did not serve the majority of Ethiopians, the new government adopted five approaches to alleviate the housing crises: namely, Government Sponsored Low-Cost Housing, Cooperative Housing, Self-Help Housing, Resettlement, and Upgrading of Housing. For the purpose of comprehensive planning and implementation, the central government created new institutions, restructured existing ones and established a structure of urban units on the neighborhood level, hierarchically organized on the basis of size and type.

The government took these steps more than ten years ago. However, housing needs of urban poor are still not being met or, even, adequately addressed. Today, there is a severe housing shortage in urban areas with a large and growing population living in sub-standard housing.

To what extent these steps, taken to alleviate the housing shortage, represent a radical change in governmental attitude or just a token response, are examined. The impact that they had on the housing circumstances of the poor, are evaluated. Finally, an analysis is made of the specific objectives and means of implementation that had been adopted in the housing programs.

While there was a clear understanding of the dynamics involved in the housing programs, what emerged was that the principal 'actors' (the central
government, the various enabling institutions, and people at the level of the neighborhoods) had not succeeded in establishing a working system of management and inter-communication. This has resulted in the mis-match of intentions and results. Furthermore, while the objectives of the programs and the responsibilities of the institutions are clearly stated, the resources and management needed for reaching those objectives and for the efficient function of the institutions, are inadequate.

The findings question the decision-making style of the central government and, particularly, of the institutions which see the housing programs with narrow and specifically defined objectives and with rational application of ideal means required to reach those objectives. This decision-making style is inappropriate for situations constrained by limited resources in material and technology. This is because the availability of the resources were not considered as a factor of the implementation process when the objectives were established.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In Ethiopia, the housing problem has been, and is, an important concern of the nation. Since the 1974 Revolution, almost all urban centers of the country have been unable to provide more and better housing for their population because of an interplay of complex social, economic and political forces.

Before the 1974 Revolution, like other socio-economic and political problems of the nation, housing was not a burning issue among the majority of the population. Even though the housing problem existed, it was an issue which received the least attention among government bodies, policy makers and, most of all, in the academic world. However, when a somewhat disorganized, both popular and Populist Revolution took place in 1974, its central aim was to dismantle the half-century long, feudalistic government of the Haile Selassie Regime. The Populist Revolution also brought to the surface all the problems associated with the urban system. Housing was one of the critical issues with which the revolution was associated. The revolution was marked by a spontaneous and immediate action-seeking movement.

Within a relatively short period of time, from 1974 to 1979, the revolution succeeded in totally dismantling the Haile Selassie socio-economic order. Meanwhile, the government also established the basis for a new socio-economic and political order in the country. It was the poverty, unemployment, hunger, high costs of living, and tyranny of the old Regime which made the masses of people stand behind the Revolution. Success was
achieved. The motivating ideas were an expectation of better employment, better housing and services, better health and education facilities. In short, there was an expectation of a better way of life than had existed during the Haile Selassie Government. Regardless of the type of political system, a government is perceived to be better by the people when there is an improvement in all aspects of living conditions and prospects for the future are bright.

It has been almost twelve years since the 1974 Revolution took place. The years from 1974 to 1979 were a period where little attention was paid to any sort of development programs. It was a period which could be characterized by the existence of uncertainty in the political structure of the country. Most of the national resources were allocated to bringing peace and order in the nation. The war between Somalia and Ethiopia, the war between the central government and the secessionists in the North, South and West, and the clandestine wars between counter factions operating within major urban centers, were among the major events which consumed the scarce resources of the nation.

It has been two years, since the Ethiopian Workers Party (E.W.P.) was established, after preparation and organization, from 1979 to 1984. It has been almost seven years since socio-economic development programs were begun with major emphasis in the rural areas. Needless to say, it has been only few years since the government came to a position of being able to develop programs or to bring real changes to the socio-economic spheres of the country. Different socio-economic changes have been taking place over the last seven years. These changes, however, cannot be expected to deal with the complex set of social and economic problems of each individual citizen. Nor are the changes expected to automatically transform poor living conditions of
the population to vastly improved ones within such short periods of time. Moreover, change does not necessarily solve all nature of problems in a satisfactory manner. It may result in the exchange of one set of problems for another. Change does not bring progress to all sectors of the population. It may result in improvement of living conditions for that part of the population which has access to mechanisms by which change occurs. But, change can also result in deterioration, especially if the basis on which it is formulated is not sound. A major objective of the change should be to address the underlying issues of problems which affect the bulk of the population. Therefore, changes should be valued differently among different groups, depending on the types of adjustments made to the welfare of that group. Some people value the change highly; others view it with suspicion and even with fear.

In any case, the Revolution’s changes do exist. Today, several examples exist which indicate how changes have occurred. Some of the changes have been assessed, evaluated, and criticized with respect to deeds of the Revolution and future prospects. This study attempts, as a central objective, to inquire and to make it more understandable as to whether or not the socio-economic change has been felt by a majority of urban people who, from the beginning, have stood behind the revolution and made it happen.

Taking the subject of housing and related services as a vehicle of investigation, this study analyzes, evaluates, and assesses changes brought in housing. It attempts to determine whether changes that have been brought in the living conditions of urban poor would be reflected in the physical environments where they live and work. The study assumes that the house and its environment is the core upon which aspirations for change in family status will rest.

Are changes formulated on the basis of a rational understanding of the true
needs of the urban masses? If not, to which sector of the population did the Revolution bring changes in living conditions? If changes have indeed brought adjustments to a specific sector of the population, are the premises governing the changes rational? With these general questions in mind, Chapter One presents the housing environment and socio-economic characteristics of residents in a typical urban neighborhood administration unit, namely, the Kebele unit.

Although much is known about housing conditions of urban areas, the first chapter attempts to deal with the complex set of problems which exist within a contemporary urban system. It addresses an area where the diverse issues of housing, economics, infrastructure services, crimes, and policing co-exist and are experienced, and are thus readily understood. Although, government agencies tend to view the new Kebele neighborhoods as a single, collective unit capable of dealing with its own situations, this section presents the nature and magnitude of circumstances with which these urban neighborhoods are expected to deal.

This view is presented with the hope that, first, results of such studies will gain more attention to aid the formulation of policies and programs tailored to fit neighborhood needs. Second, it is hoped that by understanding circumstances within the neighborhood, this background knowledge can be utilized in analyzing and evaluating different government-initiated housing programs.

Based on decrees in force, the government now has greater control over the planning and implementation of development programs. Theoretically, this control offers the government several benefits. It allows the government an opportunity to initiate development programs where they are most needed. The government has indicated its commitment to upgrade the living standards
of the urban masses and has also created institutions through which its wishes can materialize. The institutions are entrusted with powers enabling them to formulate comprehensive, integrated development programs in housing and related services. The government expects the programs to be propitious for the greatest possible number of people, especially for those who exist in lower socio-economic stratum.

Different housing programs have been developed and promises have been formulated that govern the accessibility of programs. However, efforts to provide sufficient housing units through these programs have been unequal to the task needed to accommodate the bulk of the urban population in proper housing environments.

Chapter III attempts, first, to make an in-depth inquiry of the inherent problems surrounding and within housing institutions which are responsible for formulating and implementing policies. These institutions are also responsible for the proper allocation and utilization of resources. Second, it examines whether or not the institutions have become instruments for redressing the appalling housing conditions that exist in urban areas. Third, it examines whether the housing environment constructed using these programs was built in accordance with the needs of the residents. These three fields of inquiry are the issues that are clarified in Chapter III.

The establishment of housing institutions and the development of housing programs alone will do little to solve the housing problems. Construction authorities, research institutions, and building material industries must be made ready to meet the set of demands created in implementation of the housing programs. Chapter IV, therefore, is devoted to understanding and evaluating the magnitude of problems which exist in these institutions. Finally, in Chapter V, conclusion and the prospects of the newly issued housing
policy is discussed.

Research Methodology

To maximize the validity of the research result, five separate research instruments were used. Person-to-person interviews were primarily used to collect data concerning the Resettlement, Low-Cost, Self-Help, and Cooperative Housing Programs. After several site visits, interviews were conducted with randomly selected prominent residents in each housing project.

The interview schedule had no time limit. In most cases, two to three visits were needed to complete one interview. Informants were asked questions concerning their satisfaction or dissatisfaction about the development. Specific questions were focused on the housing and its environment, on residents' social activity, on suitability of the housing design, and their reactions regarding management of the housing. Questions were also included concerning government handling of housing problems, and how residents perceived the institutions responsible for providing housings.

The interview schedule allowed residents to have flexibility in answering the questions and allowed for the possibility of expanding and detailing particular concerns that they had. This was particularly important, considering the fact that current political circumstances made it difficult to discuss issues which had direct political implication. However, it was found that by formulating open-ended questions, some discussion of housing matters of a political nature was achieved. Although posing open-ended questions was more time-consuming and difficult to document, a recording device was found to be helpful in later analyzing responses. In short, interviews constituted the primary data collection method. It allowed the greatest amount of personal contact with residents and provided a better opportunity of understanding
what was important to the residents.

Questionnaires had two specific purposes. First, they contained questions designed to deal with specific and detailed aspects of residents' satisfaction with the neighborhood and satisfaction with the housing unit. Questions were directed to residents' social and economic life, anticipated satisfaction or dissatisfaction with housing units and related service. Questionnaires included queries about the Kebele neighborhood system, about its methods of giving community service, and about the role it plays in promoting the social well-being of residents. Most questions were an open-ended type, with the exception of a few close-ended questions, which were included for statistical purposes. Second, the questionnaire was designed to cover a larger number of residents than could be reached using personal interviews. It yielded good quantitative data with respect to socio-economic and housing of the neighborhood.

The questionnaire method was used on a 12 percent sampling of households. There were six university students involved in conducting the survey. The questionnaire and documentation took from 45 to 60 minutes for each house. The sample size selection had two primary goals. One was to include a large enough random sample of residents for interview so that one could analyze the data according to such considerations as family composition, income, housing types, size, types of available facilities and activities. The second goal was to assure that questionnaires were distributed throughout the Kebele neighborhood. This was to guard against bias from sampling a particular location, and to increase the possibility of gathering data from different locations of the neighborhood.

The systematic method observation was used to actually observe what was going on in a particular place and at a specific time in the case-study area. To
accomplish this, a room was leased adjacent to the neighborhood. Systematic Observation was used by the groups who conducted the questionnaire as well as by the author. Observation was made of social and economic activities in areas where they took place. Attendance at Kebele meetings and watching the Kebele service giving system in operation, was part of the procedure. Moreover, the observation process took advantage of engaging in casual conversations about subjects relevant to the research. For example, talking to residents conducting informal economic activities and visiting the local beer houses were a part of the observation process through which valuable information was gathered. These conversations followed an unstructured format, in which both the observer and the resident could interact freely on sensitive topics in regard to economic and political circumstances. The information was used in the final analysis to make the quantitative data more meaningful than that which was collected through structured interview and questionnaires.

Examining available literature was the other major source of information for the study. There were few institutions which had sufficient literature on the circumstances of housing in urban areas. But the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing (M.U.D.H.) was a major source. The City Council of Addis Ababa (C.C.A.A.), Central Statistics Office (C.S.O.), and Ethiopian Building Construction Authority (E.B.C.A.) were secondary sources. Some of the available literature concerning housing and institutions were written in the Ethiopian language, Amharic. Most of it was in filed documents and articles, rather than in published books.

For the purpose of collecting needed data to study houses constructed under the housing programs, a total of fourteen sites were selected. Two Self-Help, three Cooperatives, two Resettlement, and seven Low-Cost housing sites were
included. The sites selected for evaluation were determined by a number of criteria, which together effectively limited the sites to a manageable number but which assured a fair representation of the housing programs.

Among the major criteria for the selection of the sites was that the project had to have been occupied for at least two years. It was decided that recently completed projects would provide different information than those which had been occupied for longer periods of time. Key informants needed to be prominent residents of the complex; the length of their residency would put them in a position to give reliable information about the subject. Among randomly selected informants, the minimum length of residency was three years and the maximum was nine years.

The other criterion was the location of the sites in the urban areas. In order to present the variety of issues arising from residents located in urban areas, it was determined that selected sites had to be located in different urban areas where varying socio-economic sectors of the urban population live as well as in urban areas having different levels of infrastructure services.

The last criterion for selection of projects was that it allow opportunities for investigation of the housing process. For example, there are housing projects constructed under certain programs where residents are familiar with detailed information concerning the process of construction such as Self-Help, Resettlement, Cooperative Housing projects. For Low-Cost houses, many sites were researched. This was to collect as much useful information as possible in order to make a more meaningful assessment about the housing environment and about the institutions. Although consideration was taken into account of projects that offered different design features which could be compared, it was discovered that almost all designs were similar, with the exception of unit size.
Selection of the case-study area was made through information gathered from the M.U.D.H. on Kebele neighborhood units in the urban system. The information gave further insight into demographic and service distribution patterns in the urban system. Based on this information, the major criterion considered was the location of the site. It was decided that the site must be located in an urban area which most reflected the characteristics of urban housing. The existence of sectors of the population in the lower-income brackets was considered as to be the second criterion. Since the majority of the population lives in central urban areas, it was apparent that in order to collect inclusive information concerning the residents activities and neighborhood environment, the case-study site should be centrally located. This, therefore, was considered as the third major criterion.

As one examines the entire Addis Ababa urban areas, one finds various environmental problems which hinder the development of a neighborhood. These include natural hazards which result from flooding and topographic setting. Based on this, it was felt that the case-study should represent an urban neighborhood with physical environmental problems. This, therefore, became the fourth criterion.

As the last criterion, the size of the population was taken into consideration. This was necessary because some neighborhoods have a small population, while others have a large population size. For this reason, the case-study site needed to have a population size above the average, but not so large as to create problems for the conducting of the questionnaire and observation. Furthermore, it was felt that the population of the case-study site should be composed of residents of a multi-ethnic background, as is the case in most centrally located neighborhoods. This, therefore, was the sixth criterion considered in the selection of the site of the case-study.
Given the range of criteria considered, it was believed that their combination would result in the selection of a case-study area with the best opportunity for recording, describing and analyzing from eighty to eighty-five percent of the socio-economic and housing characteristics of urban Addis Ababa.
CHAPTER II

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND HOUSING CIRCUMSTANCES OF A TYPICAL URBAN
NEIGHBORHOOD: A CASE STUDY.

A. Physical Environment of Kebele 25 and its Evolution

From the outside Addis Ketema is a typical congested poor urban
residential area which dominates the central section of the city of Addis
Ababa.¹ There are six Kefetegnas, or Higher Urban Dwellers Associations²,
within the Addis Ketema area with a total population of 362,916. This
population accounts for 27 percent of the total population of Addis Ababa.

Addis Ketema is an area of 35.3 square kilometers, making a population
density of 10,281 habitants per square kilometer. Within Kefetenga 6, there
are 12 Kebeles. Kebele 25 is one of them, with a population of 5,966 in an
area of 0.10 square kilometers.

The jurisdiction of Kebele 25 is marked by two major rivers which pose
continuous major environmental hazards, more than to any other Kebele
through which these same rivers pass. During the heavy rainy seasons,
especially in June, July, August and September, the two rivers flood causing
damage to the area. At other times of the year, they are used as open-sewer
and garbage dumping areas. The two rivers pass through the most crowded and
densely populated areas of Addis Ababa and join one another at the end of the
southern boundary of the Kebele 25. The river which borders the southern part
of Kebele is called little Akaki. It is one of the three major rivers in Addis
Ababa which runs all year.³

The Mercato River, which borders the east part of Kebele 25, runs only
during the rainy season. In the summer, it becomes a slowly moving stream.
On close inspection, one quickly realizes that the stream is actually an open sewer collecting all the sewerage of the highly populated neighborhood of Keletagna 5, 6 and 7 of Mercato region. This slow, polluted stream loses its downstream power and begins to deposit its contents along the length of Kebele 25. On sunny days, the area around the river bank has a stench which remains until heavy rain comes to flush the garbage away.

Along Mercato river, there is a series of wooden bridges which has been constructed by neighboring residents. The bridges connect Kebele 25 to Kebele 26 and 36 of Keletagna 4. These bridges are also common sites for dumping garbage of any type generated from the three Kebeles residents, (see Appendix A, No. 11). During the rainy seasons, however, the river becomes destructive due to flooding. Each year, therefore, residents are forced to reconstruct the bridges. There are two concrete bridges on this river, one on the northern and the other one on the southern section of the Kebele. The concrete bridge, located in the northern section, is always flooded. As a result, people and loaded donkeys must refrain from crossing the bridge for at least two hours after the rain stops. The site under this bridge is also a common place where nearby neighbors dump their garbage, (see Appendix A, No. 6 and 10). There is, supposedly, a municipal service which comes to collect garbage once a week. The garbage truck covers only a few sections of the houses located on the sides of the main asphalt street. For this reason, during the evening or even the daytime, most people carry their garbage to the area under the bridge which is used as a dumping point.

Likewise, the Akaki River, which makes the southern border of the Kebele, poses equal danger to the residents who live on either side of the river bank. However, the continuous running water of this river adds a quaint pastoral aspect to this section of the city. Historically, the Akaki River has been the
most useful of the three rivers and the one which has been exploited for many years by the surroundings residents for irrigating their backyard vegetable gardens. One prominent resident of Kebelle 25, who is now in his sixties, recollects it was during the Italian Occupation of Addis Ababa (1935-40) that the Akaki River began to be used for irrigation. At several points along its course, the Italians constructed conventional dams and had the river channelled to privately-owned small farms. Although this was years ago, when most of the surrounding area had not been populated and land was owned by few people, a concrete wall that was used to dam the river remains to remind every one of the usefulness of the river to the area. Today, the remains of the dam wall serve as a bridge that residents use to cross from one side of the river to the other. Few people appreciate the river’s usefulness. Rather, they talk about the danger it causes year after year to the houses which once had masonry walls and were 10 to 15 meters from the river bank. Today, some of the houses have been destroyed while others are in critical condition. The destruction is a result of years of erosion of the river banks, widening the floodway. The next three to four rainy seasons will mean that most of the houses, which have already lost some of their foundations, will fall completely unless some type of flood protection measures are taken. Aside from the problem that the river causes to the houses, to the trees, and to erosion of the soil, what people fear most is the danger the Akaki poses when there is flash flooding.

At the junction point of Kebelles 24 and 25, of Ketetegea 6 and Kebelle 12 of Ketetegea 24 administrative borders, homeless people use the river for washing clothes, many young children play in the water, while other children play football on an adjoining open space next to the river^4 (see Appendix A, No. 6). Each time there has been a flash flood, it has caused danger to the
children and animals which happened to be in the vicinity.5

Despite the danger the Akaki River poses to residents along its course, its use as an irrigation source for urban farming has been appreciated by the Urban Farmers Union. Along the course of the river, there are several urban farmlands which have operated since the Italian Occupation. When the Italians left, native landlords continued to farm the land using the irrigation channel constructed by the Italians. Today, all the farmlands are nationalized, and one of these farms is located on the far side of the river of the southern section of Kebele 25, (see Appendix A, No. 7). The land is cooperatively farmed by members who are residents of neighboring Kebeles. The major criterion for participation in Urban Cooperative Farming is that one must be unemployed, should have no source of income, and must be a resident of the bordering Kebeles. In this specific Cooperative Farm, there are twenty members who have no other source of income except that which is shared from the selling of cooperatively-produced farm products to government-owned corporations. Here, prices are determined by the corporation. The products consist of onions, cabbage, carrots, peppers and potatoes. The farmers make extensive use of the Akaki River and produce crops twice a year, despite the fact that there is no farming during the rainy season. The river floods and destroys crops at this time.

Where the farmland ends to the south, the Mercato River runs on the east border of Kebele 25 and joins the Akaki River. These two rivers, therefore, make two of the three jurisdiction lines of Kebele 25, which has a steep topography. The steepness of the land runs southeast to northwest with 10 to 15 percent slopes. Access to Kebele 25 is provided by two major roads. One is located on the northern jurisdiction line, the other is in the south section running east to west, (see Appendix A, No. 4 and 5). Historically all of
Kebele 25 was owned by three landlords. One landlord owned the southern part of the Kebele up to the principal thoroughfare which runs east and west, while the land north of the road was divided into approximately equal parts, owned by the other two landlords.

It is not altogether clear how early settlement began in the area. However, until 1961, the Kebele had groups of huts scattered along the major thoroughfares on the southern section. It is likely that the settlement pattern of all Kebeles in the Kefetegnas 4, 5 and 6, which includes Kebele 25, were influenced by Italian development efforts in Addis Ababa, especially the Mercato area. The land just west of the Mercato zone was divided into a grid of 50 x 175 meters by Italians, for business and residential areas. This area has one of the oldest sewer systems in the city which runs into the river as described earlier. During the Italian development of the Mercato area, the areas of Kebeles 24 and 25 of Kefetega 6 and Kebeles 38 and 36 of Kefetegna 4, were "squatting" areas for rural migrants who came to the city to sell their labor. The migrants were from the areas of Chebo and Gurage, Kembata regions.

The Mercato area and areas west of it, were among the first urbanized parts of the city, which experienced fast growth rates during the 1950's and early 1960's. The lots provided easy income for landlords as they were leased to individual businessmen. Some land owners became developers and began to construct cheap rental row-houses for small business and residential purposes. As the area became a center for business and thus opened opportunities for employment, it also increased the wealth of the squatter labor force and the new immigrants to the area. This important economic situation further encouraged squatters to look for ways to secure their existing settlement. One type of tenureship pattern by which squatters
secured their settlement pattern was the Lease-Hold Tenure System. Kebele 25 was an area which had inexpensive rented lots. That it is located in a flood-prone area made the price of the land cheap, and that it is within walking distance from the business center, made the area attractive to economically disadvantaged individuals who wanted to settle at that time.

A key feature of the Lease-Hold business was that houses were owned but not the land. This type of land development system was a dominant feature in urban development until 1974. Generally, most large properties of urban Addis Ababa were owned by few landlords. The practice was initiated by petty land owners, who began leasing their land to prospective house owners, usually squatters and the urban poor. This was so, according to the principle of tenancy-at-will, established by the landlords. Under this traditional system of land tenure, an agreement is struck between the landlord and the house builder whereby the latter agrees to pay yearly a premium of a certain amount as ground rent, depending on the size and location of the lot. No formal papers were exchanged, although the landlords issue receipts for payments. Despite the apparent insecurity of tenure inherent in such an arrangement, houses built on leased land were openly bought and sold. By tradition, the landlord cannot object to such transactions because he owns only the land, not the buildings on it. Although, there were laws, such as the Eviction of Tenants Act, which prohibited eviction except in cases where the tenants failed to pay ground rent. The landlords were always in a position to evict tenants if they needed to do so. However, in most cases, eviction was difficult requiring years of litigation. Because of this and other socio-cultural matters the development of those neighborhoods has taken a gradual step towards stable residency.
Conclusion

The major environmental problem the neighborhood faces is that of flooding. It is a problem faced by many poor urban residents whose neighborhoods are located along the major rivers of Addis Ababa. There were approximately 4,095 households with 3,426 houses sheltering 17,303 people who were subject to flooding in the past five years. During this time it was known that 12 people died and many were left homeless.6 Although a study was done by foreign experts regarding a flood-control program, the program has not been fully implemented.7 Steps which were to be taken to control flood hazards included planting trees, constructing a flood channel and flood walls, and resettling those households which are endangered. However, at this time, only the planting of trees has been done. No other steps have begun. Therefore, the flooding problem persists within the Kebele 25 and other neighborhoods located along the Kebena and Akaki rivers. After the 1974 Revolution, the status of Kebele 25 land and housing ownership changed. Today, the land and the extra houses are controlled by the government.
B. Demographic Characteristics of the Residents.

*Kebеле* 25, a population of 5,966 of which 47 percent (2,803) are male and 53 percent (3,163) are female, has 1,117 households representing demographic and economic characteristics of the lowest income bracket of urban Addis Ababa. It also accounts for 60 percent of the city's population.8

Twelve percent (134 households) of the total *Kebеле* population was selected for sample questionnaires about socio-economic and housing conditions. The demographic characteristics of the sampled household population is shown on table 1.1. However, if one examines age groups under 19 years for comparative purposes, with other available data, one finds many similarities in the demographic composition. From a total sample population of 839 people, 60.5 percent, (508) were under 19 years old. Of these age groups, 53.7 percent (273) were between the ages of 10 to 19 while the rest, 46.3 percent (235), were under 9 years old. The urban population of Ethiopia in 1982 was 4,719,600 9 Of these, 54 percent were under the age of 19 years. In this age group, 44.7 percent were between 10 to 19 years old, and 55.3 percent were under 9 years old. *Kebеле* 25 population demographic characteristics, therefore, reflects typical urban population characteristics in Ethiopia.

*Kebеле* 30 of *Kefetenga* 3 is located in the same neighborhood and the central part of the city with a population of 7,071.10 A socio-economic profile done on this *Kebеле* indicates that, 54 percent of its population was under the age of 19.11 Of that age group, 46.2 percent were between the ages of 10 and 19, and 53.8 were under that age. Moreover, it is interesting to note that in the same *Kebеле* population, 53 percent were female and 42 percent were male. The results of the sample household survey have shown few differences in the composition of female and male population, which was 52 and 48 percent, respectively, of the total household sample. Few differences
observed in the under 19 age groups. A similarity of population composition is also observed in those age group above 19 years old, when kebele 25 population is compared to the above two cases.

**Table 1.1. Distribution of Surveyed Household Population by Sex and Age.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cuml.</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cuml.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cuml.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>839</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the family size of the sampled households, one finds that 76 households (56.7%) have larger family sizes, (six persons and above), when compared to the households of the urban population. For instance, while the
The average household size of Addis Ababa is 4.4, in *kebele* 25, it was found that 20 households (15%) have eight persons and 13 households (9.7%) have nine persons. Furthermore, there were 9 households with 10 persons; 6 households with 11 persons; and one household with 13 persons in the family. The average household size of *kebele* 25 works out to be 6.3 persons.

Table 1.2. Family Size of the Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family size (No. of person Per Unit)</th>
<th>Household Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the number of children living in the households, there are a total of 523 children, of which 477 (91.1%) are under twenty years old, 34 (6.5%) are between the ages of 21 and 30, while the rest are over 30. While these children live with heads of the family, there are also a total of 78 children of relatives living with the family. On average, each household has 4 children.

By and large, the neighborhood reflects a relatively stable family life. For
instance, 77 percent of the sampled households were members of a regular family. Divorce is not common, thus only 6 percent of the households were headed by divorced parents ages thirty through fifty. Interestingly enough, families headed by widowed and single persons, were 12.7 and 3.7 percent respectively which, by any standard, is quite small for neighborhoods where the majority of residents are low-income people, with poor housing conditions and large families. One

Table 1.3 - Number of Children and Household Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Children in each h. hold</th>
<th>Household Frequency</th>
<th>Cuml. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - Children of relatives to the head of the households are not included. There are a total of 78 children of relatives supported by the head of the households. Total number of children = 523 21.7% are under 5 years old 32.6% are between 6 - 10 years old 37.4% are between 11 - 20 years old.

contributing factor is that existing socio-cultural trends tend to create
interdependency for survival among family members, and contentment and happiness exist, although material possessions are few.

Table 1.4 - Age Distribution Pattern of Head of the Households by Sex and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>H.H. heads</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Single M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Married M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Divorced M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Widowed M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total sample, 20.9 percent of households were headed by females while 79.1 percent were headed by males. It is also important to note that only 11.2 percent of heads of households were in between the ages of 20 and 34, while the majority ranged in age from 30 to 34. However, most of the heads of households were between 35 and 59, which amounted to 67.2 percent of the total. Likewise, a high percentage of the households were also headed by age groups over 60, which amounted to 21.6 percent. It is important to note that 84.3 percent of the households are headed by literate persons.

When this information is compared with the marital status of the heads of all Addis Ababa households, which amounts to 266,231, one finds quite a difference in the percentage composition. For example, of the total Addis Ababa households 28,028 (10.4%) are headed by single persons; 153,418 (57.2%) are headed by married persons; 23,255 (8.7%) by the widowed; 38,557 (14.4%) by the divorced,
and about 23,973 (9.3%) whose status was not stated. The significant point which could be made is that, kebele 25 has a greater number of married households and less broken families when compared to the overall population structure of Addis Ababa. On the other hand, significantly more households in kebele 25 are headed by widowed people than in the overall Addis Ababa households. Causes for this are several. For instance, health is a factor. Also, during the political unrest in the city, the urban poor were those who suffered much by the loss of a family member. Another important situation which seems to have contributed was that during the mobilization of people for war between Somalia and Ethiopia, most of the forces came from the lower income sector of the population. Several residents who were interviewed mentioned that they lost their husbands during the war in Asmara and Ogaden.

Conclusion

It is interesting to note that the percentage of single and divorced heads of households was very low despite stereotyped statements often made by research groups that most households in the low-income strata are headed by broken families. It is understood by most that the poor urban population, such as kebele 25 residents, have relatively stable family life, despite their life cycle of poverty, despair, and inability to plan for the future. For instance, ninety percent of those households interviewed were members of a nuclear family. Members of the family seem to agree to share the economic and social hardships of urban life. Divorce is not common to these social classes. This point is further supported by the fact that there are few married heads in the age group under 35 years old, while the majority of the population is headed by those over 35 years old. This statistic has two significant implications on the neighborhood. In general, in earlier times, people got married earlier. Today, most people do not marry unless the opportunity to form their own private life is feasible; that is, they want to be
away from parents, in their own house. Such opportunities are limited because it
is not easy to find a house. The second implication is that the Kebele 25 seems to
be settled by families who have lived there for many of years. For instance, of the
surveyed households, 71.9 percent have been living in the same Kebele
neighborhood 10 years or more, and 38.5 percent of the households own their own
houses. Non-owners compose 61.9 percent renting houses which have been
nationalized since the 1974 Revolution. In a way, those residents who rent have
secured housing status, since the houses have become government property.

Overall, the Kebele 25 residents seem to have a stable social structure within
the family. Residents appear to have settled in the Kebele having their own house
or having secured housing tenureship and having some sort of income. For
instance, most of Kebele 25 population is composed of three main ethnic groups;
Gourage, Shewa-Galla and Dorze. There are few Muslims, and Amhara. These
ethnic groups have culturally oriented, stable family structures and social lives,
which influences greatly the concepts of marriage and family. In fact, if one sees
the social life of Gourage and Dorze ethnic groups one sees their life built around
the nuclear family and their work. Almost all groups have a kin-based social and
occupational structure that passes from one generation to the next with regard to
cultural norms and work. In short, they are a family and a one-occupation oriented
people. Within these ethnic groups, housing is one of the basic means of ensuring
the continuation of the norms and values that guide their family life. There is no
question that the attainment of housing contributes to the family well-being and
stability. In fact, one can make a close correlation between stable family
structure and stable housing, and between traditional socio-cultural norms and
values of families.

It is apparent that the Kebele 25 neighborhood is composed of households with
a large family size. It had well above the average family size of the urban
population in Addis Ababa. Of course, there are several factors which contribute
to this phenomenon, too. One of the main ones is the inherent socio-cultural concept which prevails, especially among low-income and culturally attached families, that children are seen as assets for the parents. Among such families, problems which would be caused by having a large number of children, such as greater consumption of households resources, the increase in costs for child-rearing, and the adverse effects on the parent's work-force participation, are not taken into consideration. Second, there is no incentive to encourage a restriction in family size nor is there access to means whereby control measures could be achieved. For example, most of these residents are not professionally oriented, nor do they have the education or resources to take their future plans a step forward from the life they live today. Even if it were so, the existing opportunities are limited. For these reasons and others, there is no motivation for deliberate attempts by households to limit family size. For them, having children is what gives meaning to their lives, unlike the well-to-do societies who have incentives and motivation for limiting their family size. Well-to-do families, of course, consider factors which would impede the progress of achieving their goals before they decide to have many children.
C. Economic Characteristics of the Residents

It should not come as a surprise to find unemployment and
under-employment to be typical characteristics of Kebele 25 residents, or, for
that matter, of the poor urban population of Addis Ababa. This area, and all the
neighboring Kebeles are, perhaps, the most depressed areas of the city in
terms of the unemployment rate in the formal employment sector. Those who
are either self-employed, or employed by government or private enterprises,
are mostly in the sector of service employment.

An attempt was made to gather some information about the employment
status of the people in the Kebele 25. As the sample survey shows, it was
found that of the economically active population (i.e. 10 years and above\textsuperscript{14}),
only 173 people, (28.6 percent) were found to have some sort of employment,
while 431 (71.4 percent) claimed to be unemployed in the formal employment
sector at the time of the survey (see table 1.5). Furthermore, the survey
indicates that, most of those who responded to being employed were heads of
the family. It was also found that approximately 40 percent of those who are
employed work within walking distance from their neighborhood, so they go to
work on foot. While 19.1 percent who work far from their neighborhood use the
bus, 16.2 percent used a service car, and 8.2 percent went to work by taxi. Only
9.8 percent stated that they are employed within their own Kebele and needed
no transportation. Further, the survey results reveal that of the employed
population, 93 people (53\%) were heads of household and the rest were family
members. Of these, 5 were female household heads and 88 were male household
heads. A close examination of the sources of income of the heads of households
indicates that 45 (33.6\%) household heads receive their monthly income from
salary; 47 (35.1\%) from trade and labor, 15 (11.2\%) from compensation,
allowance and pension,\textsuperscript{15} and finally, 27 household heads (20.2\%) did not
specify their source of income.

Table 1.5 - No. of Employed Population and Their Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of employments</th>
<th>No. of people</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed by government</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed by private enterprises</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Although this table shows all those age ten and above, the age category of the employed has been observed to be over nineteen years old.

Somewhat similar data on classification of Addis Ababa households by Kebele and Kefetega according to source of income, reveals that (see table 1.6) there are fewer people in Kebele 25 who generate income through government or private employment than in all households in Addis Ababa. On the other hand, among residents of Kebele 25, Kefetega 6, there seem to be more people who have fixed monthly income than the rest of the jurisdiction area. Moreover, fewer residents in Kebele 25 seem to engage in trade and selling of labor by comparison to other residents in the same jurisdiction areas of Kefetega 6. This could be due to the geographic location of the Kebele 25 neighborhood, which is relatively far from the central business center, Mercato Market, while the other kebeles are located within close proximity. Generally speaking, therefore, Kebele 25 neighborhood is composed of residents who participate in mixed employment sectors.

When an attempt was made to get information about the household income, the attitude is that one's resources are too private to discuss, particularly with an outsider. Whenever a question was posed to the household head about income, it was observed that there was a much more widespread and
encompassing cultural pattern of reluctance to discuss the amount of the income. Reluctance to answer questions concerning family income or income generated by other informal economic activity is based on the concept that prestige, power and resources enjoyed by a family are viewed as interwoven matters. For this reason, exact knowledge of a person's resources and interpersonal networks could be used to undermine that person's prestige and power. In another sense, they fear that if one has inside information, through jealousy or desire for personal gain, one can destroy the happiness enjoyed by the family. Thus, most people made an attempt to avoid discussing personal wealth or income or, for that matter, any sort of prestige enjoyed by the family member.

Table 1.6 - Percentage Classification of Addis Ababa and Kefetegna 6 Households by Source of Income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.H. No.</th>
<th>compensation, allowance, and pension</th>
<th>salary</th>
<th>trade and labor</th>
<th>unspecified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa*</td>
<td>268,231</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefetegna 6*</td>
<td>10,117</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebele 25**</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** - Note that only household heads are considered not all employed population of sample residents.

However, after persistence and further explanation of the objectives of the question, most people (76.1%) cooperated to report income. Yet, during the course of interviews, household heads have occasionally indicated uncertainty when reporting the income figure. Therefore, for determining household
economic status, one has to keep in mind that reported income may not reflect a realistic picture of the amount of income that households enjoys. For instance, in the family structure of residents of Kebele 25, every economically active member of the family is expected to contribute as much as possible to the economic well-being of the family. There were several occasions, where a family member is reported as employed, either on a temporary or permanent basis, but the person interviewed was reluctant to report his exact income. In general, therefore, the reported income is usually under-reported to maintain secrecy or over-reported to maintain pride.

Table 1.7 - Size and Distribution Pattern of Monthly Household income (in Brt).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income Groups</th>
<th>H.H. No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>39.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 - 199</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>54.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 249</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>63.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 - 299</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>66.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 - 399</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>70.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>73.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 599</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>74.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>76.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The monthly income shown are the cumulative income of the household members.

($1=2.07 Brt in 1985).

Based on responses gathered, 27.6 percent of the interviewed households
have income less than 100 BIRR per month. Households whose monthly income lies between 100 to 200 BIRR represent 26.8 percent; those with 200 to 300 are 11.9 percent; with 300 to 500 are 6.7 percent; and those above 500 BIRR per month are 2.9 percent of the total. About 24 percent did not state income, (See table 1.7).

Under government definition and categorization of urban population according to income status, the low-income sector of the population are those who generate income under 200 BIRR per month. The middle and higher income sectors are categorized as those who generate income 201 to 500 BIRR per month, and greater than 501 BIRR per month respectively. In 1983, the Wages and Work Organization Board indicated that, the urban subsistence income of a household of 5 persons should be 123.85 BIRR per month.

Assuming that this subsistence income holds true for Addis Ababa 1978 data on income distribution, 80.5 percent of total households, (268,231), earn income under 200 BIRR per month. Of the total households, over 70 percent generate income below subsistence; they are below the poverty line of 123.85 BIRR per month. A sample survey done in June, 1981 of 710 houses in four high density areas of Addis Ababa, showed that, the poverty threshold had increased to an average of 165 BIRR per month per household. This figure meant that about 77 percent of the households in Addis Ababa lived under the poverty line.

When the income status of residents in kebele 25 is compared to the income circumstances of the Addis Ababa urban population, one finds that those who generate income below subsistence level account for less than 50 percent of the households. By comparison, therefore, well above 40 percent of the residents generate income which could put them in the middle income category. This is significant because, although kebele 25 and its surrounding areas are perceived by outsiders, the M.U.D.H. and the C.C.A.A. as residential areas of
low-income people, it could be said that this Kebelle is composed of mixed income classes. The condition is not, of course, manifested as clearly in the physical image of the neighborhood as it is in areas where middle and higher income live.20

1. Informal income-generating Activities

In Addis Ababa, some of the major employment activities are conducted in an informal manner. Such employment is usually within one's residential area. Observation of the types of economic activities undertaken within Kebelle 25, seems to confirm that informal economic activities are a major source of income for many households. This informal employment sector applies to very small businesses, often run by a family or individual, requiring little or no capital, mostly carried out at the home, just outside the home, or on a side street. Research of such economic activities revealed that the people were neither registered, nor did they have any sort of license.

In Kebelle 25 and in most neighboring kebeles, the informal economic activities involve major street trading or Gullet, the buying and selling of household items and foodstuffs at marginal profit, the selling of traditional Ethiopian beer (Tella), and local spirits (Areke), the selling of family rations obtained from cooperative shops, and the sale of casual labor are typical of the sorts of activities observed in this sector. The residents who make their living through such employment depend heavily on the areas' proximity to the major market center of Addis Ababa, which is the Mercato. The Mercato Market Center also serves as the central area for the supply of their trade and for their clientele too.

In Kebelle 25, residents whose houses face the two main roads, and residents whose houses have direct access to the small streets winding
through the neighborhood, have also been observed pursuing informal economic activities. This was confirmed by recording the types of informal economic activities undertaken within the neighborhood. There were eighteen different types of income-generating activities at the time of the survey, (See table 1.8).

Table 1.8 - Types of Informal Economic Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio repair shop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed makers shop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy product sellers (milk butter)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting donkey for labor work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo house</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatte betl (stimulant green leaves)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killo Hegede (roasted cereals)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engera (selling of local breads)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea room</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local restaurant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe repairmen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tella Betl (local beer)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal husbandry (cows, chicken, donkeys)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shemane (weavers)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweater knitting</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gullet (street trading)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                      | 262    |

a. Gullet - Street Trading

Of all, economic activities pursued by Kebele residents, most striking is what is called in Ethiopian Gullet, which is street trading. Those who are engaged in Gullet businesses are mostly women. Within this Kebele Gullet,
one finds most of the basic daily needs of a typical household in the neighborhood. In the jurisdiction area, there are 109 Gullet points. In the most commonly observed Gullet, items one can find seven days a week are: charcoal, firewood, local bread, pepper, tomatoes, onion, eggs, potatoes, spices, cereals, coffee, salt, sugar, and milk in plastic bags. Furthermore, there are other consumer goods such as, pasta, loaves of bread, wheat or maize that one sees from time to time, depending on how frequently the people who practice the Gullet are supplied.

There are several reasons why Gullet business has become a common and a practical income-generating activity among residents of Kebele 25. The major reason is that it is practiced within the neighborhood, on the street, and in most cases, right outside one’s home. This makes the Gullet operation simple, allowing the person to do other household work. Second, though the practice is time consuming, the profits are rewarding. As half of the residents have subsistence income, the profit generated from selling items in Gullet often covers expenses of other households needs. Third, as a result of a shortage of goods in the cooperative shops, the situation has necessitated and encouraged the practice of Gullet.

There are two types of Gullet pursued by the neighborhood residents. The mechanisms are different by which residents are supplied with goods. First, there are Gullet activities undertaken by families who sell a portion of items received from cooperative shops using their ration card. The Kebele-based Cooperative Shops distribute food and other household items to each family. The quantity of the items depends on the family size. The price of items is regulated by the government, are cheaply priced, thus affordable by the residents. For instance, most consumer goods distributed by cooperative shops have a Gullet value that is 200 to 300 percent more than the cost in the
Knowing this price difference, most residents sell portions of their rations for profit. They do so by setting up a *gullet*. Whenever monthly rations are distributed, one observes many small *gullet* points on the street, especially on the small narrow streets inside the neighborhood, and in front of the housing units. This type of *gullet* lasts for a few days. Once the residents sell what they have received, they wait for the next round of rations. For such *gullet*, the goods are part of family rations supplied by the *kebele*.

It is difficult, though, to determine whether residents who sell their rations are underfed or whether they sell surplus items. On the other hand, there are items the family could live without, though the family would be happy if it could keep them for self-consumption. But, when the family does not have enough income to cover expenses for basic needs, it would be forced to find alternative income-generating means. A reasonable strategy pursued by such a family is to sell part of a rationed item for profit as long as there is a demand for it.

The second type of *gullets* are those which are set up almost every day at a fixed point. Permanent *gullet* places are usually on a small area of raised ground, (see Appendix A, No. 16). The places are shaded with either plastic, sheet metal, or pieces of clothing. People who practice such *gullet* on a regular basis have a continuous supply of goods. So, for them, *gullet* is a regular business. Their goods are mostly coffee, sugar, cooking oil, butter, spices, eggs, wheat, maize, teff, and other staple crops, fresh fruits and vegetables. The way these people are supplied with goods is quite different from those people who practice *gullet* on a temporary basis. Primarily, they have well-established business connections with people who bring products from surrounding areas outside Addis Ababa. For instance, almost all firewood, charcoal and staple crops are brought to them cheaply and in large quantities.
Another supplier of goods for regular Gullet businesses are those residents who, either in the neighborhood or outside it, sell their rations due to an urgent need for money. Since those residents may not have time or patience to sit daily in the street, they have to make a quick sale to Gullet outlets for less profit than they would have gotten had they sold the product themselves.

Since the supply of goods for Gullet's business is partly from residents within the neighborhood and since the practice itself is undertaken within the Kebele, it is interesting to note what type of people consume the products. Generally speaking, there are two types of people in these Kebele: those who have the patience to cope with the system and make maximum use of it; and, those who do not. Perhaps, those who have no patience have problems with the Kebele officials. It may be that their ration card has been suspended, that they do not have ration cards, that they hate waiting for their turn in the line during rationing time, or that they are well-off economically and can afford to buy from outside. Whatever the reason might be, there are these groups in almost every Kebele neighborhood. These are the usual buyers of goods from the Gullet. Others who make purchases include those households who have many stomachs to feed and run short of rationed food before the next ration period.

b. Selling of Rationed Items

There are households who reported a large family size when the ration system was first introduced. In 1979, there was a modification of the quantity of rationed items per person, and the new family size for each household was registered. By law, the head of the household had to report to the Kebele officials if there is a change in the family size so that the quantity of the rationed items could be changed accordingly. In practice, however, the only time households report is when there is an increase in the family size, to get
more rationed items. There are, however, households who have fewer members, through death, marriages, schooling, employment or change of neighborhood. These are the ones who are reluctant to report to the officials. In this way, they keep their ration on the basis of the 1979 family size report. These people are seriously engaged in the business of selling their rations, mainly to traders and to shop owners.

Some residents arrange with traders in the Mercato Market Center so that they are paid in advance the amount of money needed to buy items. Then, they give the items to those traders who have financed them, including certain profits. There are also residents who are financed by owners of small private shops located within the kebele. For instance, some residents sell soap, sugar, matches, and cooking oils directly to the Gourege shops, making a profit. When there is a shortage of consumer goods in kebele Cooperatives Shops, the same products will be sold to the residents at three, sometimes four, times the price paid in the Cooperatives Shops.

Government officials, basically officials of Urban Dwellers Association, are aware of these illegal activities by the residents. They have made an attempt to stop practices by assigning people to watch a suspected market area where such transactions are made. In the past, they have been unsuccessful in catching people suspected. The punishment given to residents who are caught is suspension of family rations for a certain period of time. Those traders who buy the rationed goods from families are not punished, since by law they have a license to buy and sell. Therefore, the victims will always be the poor. However, the kebele officials understand the situation and it is something they cannot control. In fact, a man who guards the kebele office explained that officials know the dependency of many families on the income generated through such activities. Therefore, if an official sees a person selling his
rations to a shop or to a trader, he usually pretends nothing happened.

c. Making of Local Beer

The brewing and selling of local beer, which is called *tella*, is another self-employment activity practiced among households. Counting done in the field on three different weekends and on two regular weekdays indicated that there were 49 different points where the beer is sold. A sign, usually a Coca-Cola, Pepsi or any other can, stuck on a stick of wood in front of the house indicates that local beer can be bought. Most of the people who make *tella* depend on the grain availability and other brewing ingredients such as *gesho* - the green leaves which give flavor and make the fermentation process possible. Thus, this self-employment sector depends heavily on the cheap availability of the the two major components used, mainly, wheat and maize. However, those who brew *tella* for marketing today have found that the economic benefits are not as rewarding as they used to be. Grain has become much more expensive, even for basic staple foods. Besides, the process involved in the making of *tella* is very time-consuming. Furthermore, those who sell *tella* must have large spaces in their house to accommodate customers. Nevertheless, many people do make their living by selling *tella*, regardless of their room size or the cost involved in the brewing process.

d. Weaving of Traditional Clothes

Other popular, high-income generating activities are the weaving of traditional cloth using local homemade weaving machines, the knitting of sweaters, and the making of clothes using sewing machines. Of all the economic enterprises practiced in the kebele, the weaving of traditional cloth is one of the few ethnically-oriented occupations practiced in urban Addis
Ababa. For instance, the members of the Dorze ethnic group dominate in the occupation of weaver, and compose 95 percent of the weavers in urban Addis Ababa. Principally, they produce different types of the Shema of which most of the national dresses of Ethiopia are made. The Shema woven by a Dorze is considered to be the best obtainable, and is in great demand in Addis Ababa. In Kebele 25 all the weavers were of the Dorze ethnic group. The Dorze weavers receive a high income if compared to the majority of neighborhood residents. Weaving was once an occupation of the lowest social hierarchy of Addis Ababa because it was looked down upon by many as a lowly occupation.

One Dorze weaver in his late fifties, who was weaving with his son, explained that when he first migrated to Addis Ababa about fifteen to twenty years ago, he, and most of his Dorze weaver friends were denied participation in most social activities, especially during the holidays. They were given extremely low social positions in any social group activity. This low social position was not associated with the Dorze being a minority ethnic group, but was associated with the profession of weaving since it was regarded by many as a rural-oriented profession. Today, the weaving occupation is greatly appreciated because the money earned is much more than in any other economic enterprise practiced at home. For instance, a Dorze weaver can finish a Gabbi in two days if he has all the materials. A Gabbi is worn by Ethiopians at night as a supplement to a blanket, or while sitting in the house during the bad-cold weather. The cost differs according to the quality of the Gabbi. In most cases a Dorze man can make a clear profit of 20 to 40 Birr per Gabbi which means a Dorze weaver can have a minimum income of 300 Birr if he (weavers are usually male) works on a regular basis. Weavers also make other types of traditional dress.

The knitting of sweaters and the making of dresses, on the other hand, is not
an ethnically-oriented occupation. As skill is required to operate the sewing machine, in addition to some training concerning basic sewing techniques, most people who are engaged in this profession are young women in their early twenties who were born in the city and have access to training facilities. They make sweaters and dresses for retailers in the Mercato Market area. The amount of income generated by this occupation depends on the number of sweaters or type of dresses a person makes, since payment is per piece, according to the retailers contract. In any case, there is always a market for their services and the range of monthly income is usually 100 to 300 Birr.

e. Domestic Service

One very common occupation, especially for young unmarried girls or young divorced women who lack any specific skills, is work as domestic servants in well-to-do households. Often, their work place is quite a distance from kebele 25. Mostly, they work as live-in domestics with Sundays off, at which time they return to their neighborhood to stay with their parents. Domestic employment is characterized by long hours, very low pay, heavy work, and often, lack of respect. Payment ranges form 10 Birr to 30 Birr per month.

Before the 1974 changes, many domestic servants received harsh treatment. However, under the new government, although control over work hours and conditions have not improved, by law, domestic servants must be given time-off to attend school, or kebele meetings. To date, most domestic servants attend night school from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m. or attend literacy programs given by the kebele organization in the kebele office. However, the chances that a domestic servant would be given two to three hours off a day for schooling depends on the willingness of the family who hired her. This is because there are many people in the domestic labor market. There are also a
few elderly women, particularly widows, who work part-time doing domestic labor by picking up laundry, or by making Ethiopian bread, called Engera, going from house to house. These women usually work within a walking distance of the area in which they live.

f. Prostitution

Within the Kebele 25, prostitution is not a widely practiced occupation. Before 1974, and in the early years of the Revolution, there were as many as ten houses of prostitution on the side of the main street located on the southern section of the Kebele, (see Appendix A, No. 5). Today, women practice prostitution, as well as the selling of local spirits, Areke, at only two locations. Within the crowded residential areas north of the main road, there is no prostitution. The area is not conducive to the practice of prostitution as the main source of income, because many of the households in Kebele 25 are composed of families. Moreover, since the occupation is not respected and is considered immoral and unhealthy, a woman who tries to openly practice prostitution will automatically be discarded and socially ostracized by neighboring families. A woman practices prostitution if her house is located on a main road from where it is easy access by men outside of her neighborhood. For example, there are many houses of prostitution in the side of the road which is on the north part of Kebele 25, leading to the Mercato Market Center.

On this road, one finds any type of informal occupation. There are local bars, many Gullet points, and houses of prostitution. In short, one finds almost all occupations listed on table 1.8 along the road, on both sides. This section of the road is within the jurisdiction area of Kebele 20 and 26 of Keletegn 5 and 4, respectively (see Appendix A, No.1, 4,12).
2. Business Establishments

Within the Kebele neighborhood, beside the economic activity at home or on the street, there are a few business establishments. Grocers, shops selling manufactured consumer goods and, local bars such as Tetch Betti, (honey beer) are among the common ones. For instance, within Kebele 25, there are 8 shops having all types of consumer goods, 8 local bars, one privately owned butcher house, one photograph house and one liquor shop. These are business operated and owned by local residents who have government permits. Generally, these places are small and able to serve a correspondingly small number of people at one time. Mainly, these business are operated by two ethnic groups: these are Amhara ethnic group who operates bars, butcher shops, and Gurage ethnic group who operates grocery, shops and tea rooms. The survival and success of most of these businesses depend upon the level of personal connection to the customers, who are mostly residents in the immediate neighborhood. Moreover, business depends on favors, such as extending credit and catering to individual tastes.

In all cases, the businesses are located on major circulation roads and operate in one of the rooms where the owner reside. Business establishments and residences, are thus thoroughly interwoven and, in some cases, appear on the same street and occupy the same building. Most business establishments do not have names. Within the neighborhood they are simply referred to by the name of the owner or by the location. Apparently, the assumption is that since there are a few business establishments which are small in size, everyone who comes to shop is supposed to know where it is and who runs it. Furthermore, all businesses are old and owners have resided in the neighborhood for a long time.
Conclusion

As has been described in the preceding pages, Kebele 25 neighborhood is composed of residents having a heterogeneous socio-economic status. The income distribution of households seems to represent typical characteristics of urban population. Although data gathered through field research reveal few people engaged in the formal employment sectors, on close observation, the majority of residents seem to find employment opportunities in the informal sector of income-generating activities.

The neighborhood seems to serve residents, among other things, as a place of contacts and interaction for the production and exchange of goods. Homes within the neighborhood are used for producing, processing and marketing the goods, while providing shelter, loci for raising families and for social contact. Open spaces and public streets are often interaction areas where produced goods are marketed, where service-giving activities are undertaken, and where buyers and sellers can interact, (see Appendix A, No. 13).

As most economic activities are not labor intensive, material and labor needed for production of goods is usually provided from within the neighborhood. However, those economic activities which are pursued on a regular basis get their supplies both from inside and outside the neighborhood. Financing for the production of goods or services is available either through neighborhood-based, traditional Saving Association, through profits gained by selling household rations, and through pre-arrangement of payment with petty traders or shop owners. Much of the network for economic activities consists of exchange among residents within the neighborhood. Residents serve one another, one way or the other. Some of the exchanges of goods or services, however, involve people and supplies from outside the neighborhood. This business is usually conducted within the Central Business District where the
Mercato Market is located. The scale and level of exchange depends on the type of goods and services produced, its market demand outside the neighborhood, as well as location and economic status of the consumer for that specific product. By and large, the consumer is located within the same neighborhood.

In many ways, economic activities undertaken by the residents seem to be limited within the neighborhood. Almost all types of income-generating activities take place on a household basis. There are no large establishments where large scale commodities are manufactured. The informal economic activities are intended to meet the needs of the residents within the neighborhood. From the consumer's point of view, the products and services are allocated within close proximity. The products have lower or similar cost compared to prices outside the neighborhood. From the sellers' point of view, income is generated by the sell of needed services and basic commodities without going far. They avoid the cost involved in the transportation and the municipality tax. Moreover, because the marketing place is either within their house or on the street, it gives most people flexibility as to when and where they put their products on the market. Most people do other household work while, at the same time, they sell their products. They have a fixed clientele that supports their business, since most consumers are residents within the neighborhood.

It is important to note also that most economic activities are marginal, in that the production and marketing of commodities and services depends on their relative scarcity within the neighborhood. For some marketed products, it means that the profits are rewarding; in others, profits are marginal. In short, all types of economic activities taking place within the neighborhood are small in scale and are intended to fulfill the needs and standards of people whose socio-economic status are characterized as that of residents in kebele.
25 Kesetegna 6. Thus, the findings concerning the ways that informal economic activities are undertaken within Kebelle 25 give insight to how the urban people live.

In urban areas of Addis Ababa, informal economic activity is not confined to employment in certain urban residential areas, to particular occupation and ethnic groups, or to particular activity sectors; rather, informal activities are a way of life. They are typically characterized by easy entry to a type of activity. All activities rely on indigenous resources. Most are family-owned enterprises which have a small scale of operation. Activities are less labor intensive and are adapted to traditional ways of doing business. People who are engaged in these activities have acquired skills outside the formal school system.

The importance of informal activity for the bulk of the population is largely ignored when programs are formulated by government or by private organizations. For instance, the success of housing programs for the poor depends mainly on the economic status of the poor. The economic status of the poor has to be understood and associated problems have to be dealt with if success of the program is expected (for detail analysis of this matter, see Chapter III F). For instance, the government has developed a policy diverse enough to deal with the root of the problem through encouragement, economic assistance, and the creation of marketing centers. On the other hand, only the formal economic sectors, which are characterized by the obverse of the informal sector, have been taken into consideration when formulating policies of economic programs. The formal economic power, the work-force, and the state's economic policy raises many questions about the impact of policy on the part of the population who are engaged in informal sectors. This part of the population does not enjoy protection in terms of working conditions, job
security or social, and health benefits. On the other hand, the informal sector appears to offer a remedy for the urban employment problem while providing scope for the practice of local entrepreneurial talent. The important role the informal sector plays in the economic welfare of the neighborhoods is well-understood, even on the government level. Up to now, the government has not taken any steps to stop informal economic activity.

While the formal sectors typically enjoy access to credit, land for expansion, and access to services, the informal sectors have never had such privileges. In so far as they are not registered and are operating illegally, they escape taxation, social security levies, government regulation of wages, and regulation on the prices of their products.

However, the assumption that informal sectors are the main employment sphere for the poor does not always hold true. The poor are employed in the formal sectors, too. For instance, many economic establishments employ substantial numbers of casual workers at low wages, without fringe benefits and unprotected by social security and health insurance. These types of employment opportunities are to be largely observed in the central part of the city, the Mercato area, where market centers and small factories are located. Transportation of manufactured goods to the market outlets are done by casual laborers paid on a day-to-day basis or on the amount of work they do.
D. The Housing Environment.

Most settlements in Addis Ababa were developed without planning for balanced growth. To an outsider, the settlements look disorderly. Inside the neighborhood, the settlements have organized housing units, shops, local bars, small communal as well as private spaces. Most settlements seem to have been built within the constraints imposed by lack of capital, the need to maximize security and privacy, and the need to make efficient use of the lots. Furthermore, the settlements are characterized as having a densely populated, one story settlement environment with spatial organizations which make possible the complex ranges of residents' activities. Kebele 25 neighborhood is among many centrally located settlements with the characteristics mentioned above.

Although the neighborhood does not have an ideal housing environment, it is far from being an unplanned blight upon the city, especially if one considers the physical settlement as the functional expression of environmental needs of a large number of residents who have limited capital and material resources placed in an area of 0.10 square kilometers.\(^{24}\) In comparison to other Kebeles within Kefetega 6 jurisdiction area, Kebele 25 seem to be the most densely populated neighborhood. For instance, Kebele 24 has an area of 0.10 square meters with 616 households. This implies 162.3 square meters per household. Kebele 14 has an area of 0.20 square kilometers with 795 households, hence 241.5 square meter per household. On the other hand, Kebele 25 with 1,147 households, implies 87 square meters per household.

1. Circulation Network

Inside the neighborhood, the circulation network reflects a hierarchy of paths organized in an informal way, indicating the pattern by which the
settlement has grown over time. Speculation on the overall physical layout of the settlement shows that there are intimate relationships between the circulation areas and the housing groups. All houses have direct access to a space which serves as a linkage to the continuous circulation network existing in the neighborhood. Most of all, these spaces are used as an extension of the work place of a household, used for washing clothes, marketing, and for social matters among neighbors. Basically, there are four types of circulation. First, there are the two main service roads (5-6 m. width) located on the northern and the southern sections of the neighborhood, (see Appendix A, No. 4 and 5). These also serve as central social and commercial areas. Next, secondary spine paths (3-4 m. width) provide access from these two major roads to the various housing groups, (see Appendix A, No. 14 and 15). Third, very narrow lanes (1-3m. width) connect one housing group with another. Fourth, small cul-de-sacs provide access to self-contained groups of houses, (see Appendix A, No. 20 and 21). These four circulation networks provide services for a wide range of socio-economic activities of the residents.

The housing of the Kebele consists of a large number of small units grouped in a variety of ways along the circulation network, (see Appendix 2, 3, and 17). Houses vary a great deal in their standard of construction size, number of habitants and infrastructure facilities. All the houses have certain characteristics. They are, without exception, single story and small with one, two, or a maximum of three rooms. Some have a small, private, fenced area. The plots are usually defined with fences of scrap wood, or corrugated iron sheet, or by adjoining houses with a common space in the center.

The interrelationship between the house units and the group, together with the circulation system, provides the basic organizational framework of the neighborhood settlement. This creates a rich structure of activity patterns which does not normally exist in unplanned environment settings. Housing
units along the secondary spine paths are connected by the narrow lanes to
groups of houses and to houses not grouped in the compound but which usually
have some sort of fencing to provide a degree of visual privacy. In the small
cul-de-sacs, however, where there is less need for privacy, the paths
themselves are regarded and used as extensions of private open space, (see
Appendix A, No. 20 and 21).

Observation of Kabele 25 over a period of time suggests that throughout the
neighborhood, the function of the dwelling unit cannot be divorced from its
relationship to adjoining open space, both public and private. This functional
relationship exists both spatially and chronologically throughout the site,
enabling maximum use from the limited space, thus compensating for the
inadequacies of the space within the main dwelling unit. Families, whose
houses are located along the side of the spine paths have no private open space,
do their laundry and prepare their food stuff (except cooking), either in the
morning or late afternoon. During the rest of the day, the space is used by
children for playing, (see Appendix A, No.16 and17); by repairmen to repair
furniture, and, by women who are engaged in selling small vegetables and other
food items, while performing their duties inside the home. Further, the areas
are used by neighbors for gossiping or other social activities, such as mourning
when someone in the neighborhood dies, and for marriage or other ceremonies.
For mourning, marriage, and other celebrations, the public areas are used to
welcome guests. Benches are placed on the paths, and tents are used for
shelter, (see Appendix A, No. 23).

The relationship of one house to another is also based on "shouting"
distances. This is the distance at which it is naturally easy to converse with a
neighbor without moving from one's front door. The configuration of the front
doors of most houses faces the main pedestrian routes; or, if the houses are in
a compound, the front doors face the common area in the compound. Within the
Kebele 25 neighborhood, there are a great number of dilapidated houses huddled together in long rows of depressing sameness in their use of materials use and in their architectural forms, with narrow streets and no green spaces at all. Most houses are not rain-proof and they lack any sanitary provision. Most do not have proper ventilation except for a front door; they lack windows and are poorly constructed. There is no protection for climate or fire hazards. In short, one sees a poor quality of housing built over a period of time. This is characteristic of not only Kebele 25 housing, but it is true of most urban housing for the poor.

2. Structural Condition

Within the Kebele 25 area there are 1,193 registered housing units. About 35 percent are unoccupied due to dilapidated conditions. Of the occupied units, 1,151 (70%), are registered government property. The remaining houses (30%), are understood to be owner occupied. Most of the houses were constructed of cheap local materials which were available in the area. Walls are made of mud and straw, mixed with rubble. Roofing is constructed of corrugated iron sheet. With the exception of a few houses, most have earth floors, (see table 1.9).

The structural condition of Kebele 25 housing is reflective of typical urban housing conditions. For instance, of the total housing stock in Addis Ababa (236,412) almost 50 percent do not have foundations, and over 83 percent have walls material similar to that of Kebele housing. Only 4 percent of the housing stock has stone or concrete walls. The situation is not different regarding other components of the housing structures. 53 percent of the total housing stock in Addis Ababa has earth floors; 33 percent have floors covered with timber and only 6 percent have concrete floors. Concerning roofing material, 93 percent have roofs of corrugated iron sheet; 53 percent have no ceiling and
the rest of the housing stock has ceilings of soft board or other fabric material.

Table 1.9 - Dwellings Unit Structural Conditions and Housing Numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Conditions</th>
<th>No. of Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated iron sheet</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With ceiling</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without ceiling</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated iron sheet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud + mixed straw</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With foundation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without foundation</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the nationalization of 1974, Kebele25 housing units averaging 3 to 4 units were arranged in a compound with a fence around them, protecting and separating the private areas from the public. Usually, a compound was owned by one family. Houses in a compound share toilets (dry-pit type) and kitchens, too. Although the layout of most compound houses is usually attached, one also finds several one or two-room units detached. For instance, of the households surveyed, 50 percent have their houses in a compound which an average of 3 to 4 households share. About 29 percent of the households have fences on either one or two sides. A total of 21 percent of the dwelling units stand freely without a fence. (see table 1.10 and 1.11). Of Addis Ababa housing stock, over 45 percent are arranged in a compound.
Table 1.10  No. of Housing Units by Spatial Forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing unit in a shared compound</th>
<th>67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing units standing alone and a fence on one or two sides of the dwelling unit</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units standing alone without a fence</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.11  No. of Housing Units by Types of Fencing Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of fencing material</th>
<th>No. of housing units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated iron sheet</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (wood + iron sheet + carton)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close observation of the historical development of houses in a compound generally indicates a dwelling plan, configuration and construction techniques implemented on a Self-Help or owner-construction basis. They show a time-frame that corresponds to a family's financial resources with a spatial pattern that can adapt to the family's changing needs. Further, they have well-planned maximum utilization of the space within the lot. Compounds did, and some still do, have well-defined entrances of metallic or corrugated iron sheet door. Though the idea of a compound continues to exist, most of the fencing material has fallen apart. In some cases, fences made of wooden sticks are being consumed as firewood. Of those compounds which had fences of metallic sheets, some parts have been stolen.

The deterioration of the housing situation is visible in the nationalized housing stock left under Kebele responsibility and under the Rental Housing
Authority (R.H.A.). Before the nationalization, most houses in a compound were private property. They were well-maintained and had a well-fenced compound. After the Kebele took over they seemed to have been left without attention. As a result, houses in a compound have partial or no fencing left. Fencing had served to demarcate the private areas from the public streets. One of the maintenance problems reported concerned fencing. Problems associated with fencing are perceived by officials as minor and as luxury needs. For this reason, when a resident repeatedly reports the problem to Kebele officials, he is usually discouraged by being told, “the office will send people to your house to collect the remaining of the fencing material...” By law, the responsible agency, in this case the Kebele, should correct housing conditions whenever renting tenants report a maintenance problem.²⁷

However, there are still houses owned by a single-family in a compound. In comparison to Kebele-owned housing stock, these compounds have properly maintained fences and housing units. In general, however, the scarcity of construction material usually makes owners less attentive to their housing condition. For this reason, almost all the houses in the Kebele, regardless of ownership, need some sort of maintenance. Most need major maintenance improvements; very few have minor maintenance problems. For instance, when 134 households were asked what maintenance their houses need, 70 percent needed some sort of maintenance while only 30 percent did not need maintenance. However, of the 70 percent of household whose units needed maintenance, 24.5 percent were owners, and 75.5 percent were tenants who are renting Kebele-owned housing units.

Of the privately owned houses, the maintenance reported involved either the kitchen or the toilet. Very few of these households mentioned maintenance problems within their main habitable units, except roofing. Prior the nationalization, these households owned all the houses within the compound.
Except for the dwelling unit of the owners, the other units within the compound generated income for the owner. Whenever a maintenance problem occurred, the owner was responsible for maintenance, along with any problems associated with the toilet and kitchen facilities. However, after the nationalization of all extra housing except the unit inhabited by the owner, the kitchen and toilet facilities were also nationalized and were left to be shared. This action relieved the owner of responsibility for any problems connected with the extra houses or toilet-kitchen facilities. After the nationalization of the extra houses, the toilets are, in most cases, out-of-use because they are filled, and the Kebele was to have taken appropriate measures to empty them, since all are dry-pits. Since most kitchens have to be shared, they too have maintenance problems.

Of the total households surveyed, 87.3 percent use shared kitchens outside their habitable unit, while only 8.2 percent have separate private kitchens. Most kitchen roofs, doors, windows and walls needed maintenance. In these cases, the responsibility of maintaining the toilets and the kitchens rests on the Kebele. It was apparent from the survey that those who owned the dwellings but shared the toilets and kitchens do not have maintenance problems within their habitable space, but only with the toilet and the kitchen, where the Kebele is responsible for maintenance.

Overall results from the survey suggest that the most commonly reported maintenance problem involves the roof and the walls. Most of the roofs need replacement and most walls need reconstruction. That means, there is a need for a large maintenance program. Both processes require capital and skilled personnel to do the job. The situation is not different in the case of the housing stock in Addis Ababa. For instance, of the total housing stock managed by the Kebele office, 6 percent must be totally demolished whereas 75 percent require expensive maintenance.28
3. Services

The magnitude of residential service needs, such as piped drinking water, sanitation facilities, sewage systems, garbage collecting service and street lighting, is nowhere more apparent in urban Addis Ababa than it is in areas such as Kebele 25. Some of these urban residential areas surround Kebele 25 and the Mercato Market Center.

Piped Water

It was found from the survey that 41 percent of the households have piped water outside their main dwelling unit in a compound which they share with others; 15.7 percent have their own private piped water outside their dwelling unit; and 42.5 percent of the households had to carry their water supply home. Those who carry water do so in cans or jars, using the local Bonno, which is a government installed piped water supply located at two points in the neighborhood. The situation is the same in the overall urban areas of Addis Ababa. Available data indicates that while the majority of households have piped water inside a compound that is shared, quite a large number of households also bring their water from the public water tap, (see table 1.12).

The quantity of water consumed by the residents in Kebele 25 is not always the same from week to week. Women who fetch water for their home explained that there are times that the entire neighborhood gets its water supply once a week. As a matter of fact, they rarely get water from the Bonno every day, or at any particular time of the day. The Bonno operates early in the morning and only sometimes in the afternoon. The two Bonno points are located in the northern section of the neighborhood. Those households whose houses are located in the southern section of the Kebele 25 neighborhood, have piped water either privately owned or in a compound shared with other people.
Also, in this section of the *kebele* neighborhood, there are two households which make a business of water retailing. Therefore, those people who do not have a water supply, buy their water from these water retailers.

Table 1.12 Addis Ababa Water supply Types and Household Percentage (Total Households = 268,231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of water supply</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pipe inside unit</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipe in a compound</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public water tap</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well + river + spring</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sanitation Facilities

In *kebele* 25 and in almost all surrounding *kebeles*, the most commonly used form of toilet system is the dry-pit form. Those residents in *kebele* 25 who do not have a dry-pit dump their solid waste into the two rivers as explained earlier, (see Appendix A, No. 6, 10 and 11). Of the households surveyed, 20 percent have no type of toilet facility. Of the 80 percent of households who have toilet facilities, 63 percent share with other households within the same compound, while only 37 percent have private toilet facilities.

Here again the lack of proper sanitation facilities is apparent in the overall urban system. The available data for Addis Ababa concerning toilet facilities, reveals that while 20 percent of the households do not have any type of toilet facilities, over half of the urban household, have shared, dry-pit type toilet, (see table 1.13).

The *kebele* 25 officials attempted to provide two public toilets of dry-pit types (3x2x5 meters each), for residents to use. They were cooperatively built
by residents. One of the two is located in a congested area surrounded by residential houses and is in the northern section of the neighborhood, (see Appendix A No.17). The other is located at the extreme end of the southwest section of the neighborhood near the Akaki River.

Table 1.13. Toilet Facilities and Percentage of Households in Addis Ababa.
(Total Number of household = 268,231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of toilet</th>
<th>% of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flush private</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flush shared</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry-pit private</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry-pit shared</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no toilet</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


At the time of the survey neither public toilet was in operation. One of the residents, who lives in the congested area where the public toilet is located, indicated that it was not open to the public because the Kebele officials planned to widen and upgrade the narrow streets within the neighborhood. Then, the road could be used to gain access to the houses by ambulances and fire trucks, municipal garbage trucks, and municipal trucks, which clean out the toilets whenever they are clogged. Therefore, officials decided to wait until the road was widened before they opened the public toilets for use. If they had opened them sooner so many people would have used them, that the toilets would have been filled within two to three months after their opening, and the officials would have been forced to close the toilets. Today, most toilets within the neighborhood are inoperable because they need to be cleaned.

Other major problems are associated with liquid and solid waste generated by the residents. Any liquid waste generated by the residents, from washing
clothes, washing household utensils, from taking showers, is dumped in the open area right outside their door. Houses with direct access to the street, dump their liquid waste in the public street. Those in the compound dump waste in the open area inside the compound, directly in front of their door. However, there are a few houses located near or by the river side with an open drainage system which runs into the rivers. This was originally built to control surface water during the rainy seasons. Nevertheless, most residents dump their liquid waste into these open drainage systems. Data from the survey reveals that 39 percent of the residents dump their liquid waste in the open drainage systems while 61 percent dump waste in the open, either outside their house or in the street. At the same time, the street and the space just outside the house is used by children as a playground and for conducting Gullet activities. There are obvious health hazards posed by the dumping of liquid waste.

In Kebele 25, only the houses located near the two main streets can have access to the services of municipal garbage trucks which pass once a week. The remaining houses, located by the two river banks, dump any sort of garbage into the rivers. In addition to this, there is one commonly used garbage dump located at the extreme end of the southwest section of the Kebele, just at the open space on the side of the river. This place is used by all residents of Kebele 24 and most residents who reside in the southwestern section of the Kebele 25. In the rainy season, most garbage will be carried into the Akaki River by the run off, (see Appendix A, No. 6).

4. Overcrowding and Mode of Dwelling Space Utilization

In a survey of 138 housing units, 4 units were found to be uninhabitable. The remaining 134 housing units sheltered 839 people, or 14 percent of the total Kebele population. The sampled housing units had a total of 303 rooms,
which makes an average of 2.3 rooms in each housing unit. The area of each unit ranged from a minimum of 7.5 square meters to a maximum of 20 square meters. Of the total, 21.6 percent were one-room units; 47 percent were two-room units; and 20.9 percent were three-room housing units. There are many similarities to the overall housing stock in Addis Ababa. For instance, of a total of 168,372 houses, 27.8 percent are one-room units, 30.5 percent are two-room units, 15 percent are three room units, and 11.6 percent are four to six-room units. The rest are unspecified.29

Of the sampled houses in the one-room housing units, there are a total of 29 households, with a total of 154 persons, making an average of 5.3 persons per room. Of these households there were also 18 households having from five to eight persons per family in a one-room accommodation. Likewise, 42 percent of the total households have 384 persons, with an average household size of 6 to 7 persons accommodated in a two-room housing unit. This is an average of over 3 persons per room. On the other hand, in three-room housing units there were 189 persons, or 20.9 percent of the total households, with 6.8 persons, or an average of 2.3 persons per room. Therefore, based on the survey result, 89.5 percent of the total households sampled live in housing units which have three rooms and under, and an average of 3 persons to a room (for details see table 1.14).

Kebele 25 neighborhood is not unique in the just-mentioned accommodation arrangement. If one examines Kefetegna Administrative regions surrounding the Mercato Market Center, one finds similar household accommodation arrangements. According to Health and Social Service Department of C.C.A.A survey,30 Kefetegna 2 has 9.5 persons per housing unit, Kefetegna 4 has 7.7 persons, and Kefetegna 5 has 6.0 persons per housing unit. All of the above administration regions are located in the central part of the city, where housing and service conditions are in appallingly poor condition.
Table 1.14 - Number of Rooms, Number of Persons, Household Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Rooms</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total H.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total H. H.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pop.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visualize three to eight persons who live, sleep, eat, dress and, in some cases, cook in one room. The room is also used as a guest room. At night, occupants are compelled to sleep next to one another on the ground. From a hygienic standpoint, alone, such accommodations are objectionable, especially if someone has a communicable illness. Although the room is partitioned, usually with curtains, privacy for the elderly is unknown.

Due to such household accommodations an attempt was made to understand the utilization of the dwelling spaces of the households sampled. Results indicate that the common use of the spaces was as a living room, bedroom, cooking room, storage spaces and as work space. Of those 29 households who live in one-room housing unit, 25 of them use the room as a living room during day and as a bedroom during the night. They always have space in some corner of the room to store their valuables. They have a wooden or metallic box to
keep their clothes in and a cupboard to keep food, dishes, glasses, and cups. They have a corner space for a can of water, for *messob* which is used for storing *engera* (Ethiopian bread), as well as a *ocy* for other household things. There were two households who used the room for cooking too, in addition to the above.

Similarly, there were 63 households who were accommodated in two-room housing units with a total of 126 rooms. 40 percent of these rooms were used as a bedroom and storage area, and 37 percent were used as a living room and sleeping area. The rest of the rooms were used for multiple activities, such as for trade, for storage, or as cooking areas.

Only those households who have more than four rooms seem to have proper accommodations and are satisfied. In general, 33.6 percent of the households stated that the number of rooms in their housing unit are enough to accommodate their needs. The majority of these households have three rooms, and a few have four or five rooms. On the other hand, 66.4 percent of the total indicated their rooms were not enough to accommodate their household needs. Here again, almost all the households who gave this reply have a two-room and one-room housing unit (see table 1.15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of Households</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, they are enough</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, they are not enough</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in tables 1.14, 1.15 and the discussion in the preceding paragraph, suggest that while one and two-room housing units are unacceptable with a three-room housing unit less acceptable, it is clear that a family of six persons requires a house of at least three rooms as an acceptable minimum to
avoid overcrowding. There is insufficient space for proper standards of health and much less to permit the smallest amenities or to preserve elementary decencies.

The types of additional rooms that residents indicated that they need for their families' proper accommodation are shown according to stated priorities of types of housing components, (see table 1.16).

Table 1.16 - Types of Additional Housing Components Stated by the Households Listed in Order of Frequency of Mention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen outside the main dwelling unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen inside the main dwelling unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet, shower or bathroom outside the main dwelling unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A room to undertake some sort of business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

In the preceding pages, current circumstances of the housing environment of a typical urban neighborhood have been presented. The study reveals that neighborhoods such as Kebele 25 are characterized by a densely populated and dilapidated housing environment which is arranged in an unplanned manner indicating settlement growth over time, and having a continuous narrow circulation of networks developed so as each housing unit has access to one another and to major roads. Furthermore, most houses are built in a compound, having shared facilities such as kitchens, toilets and water taps.

Among the critical problems faced by such neighborhoods is the lack of proper infrastructure facilities. Services needed to minimize sanitation problems are perhaps the most critical problem of all urban neighborhoods. A majority of the residents use unsafe and improper toilet facilities resulting in the indiscriminate use of drains, open spaces and water courses where people
wash their clothes and children play. Although Addis Ababa’s first sanitary sewer system is now under construction for central commercial areas and perhaps for higher income residential areas, water-born sanitation will remain unaffordable to the vast majority of households who inhabit neighborhoods such as Kebele 25 for some time to come. In an attempt to find solutions for the sanitation problem, responsible institutions began constructing public toilets of dry-pits. Since the start of the program, 47 public toilets have been constructed in Addis Ababa. At present, none of them are operating because they are filled with refuse and no attempt has been made to empty the pits.

The poor environmental conditions are exacerbated by inadequate refuse collection due to sporadic municipality service. Garbage trucks often do not reach densely populated areas because roads are impassable as is the case in Kebele 25 or, because of reluctance of the municipality to extend services to these areas. As a result, most solid waste is dumped in the open posing great health hazards to the residents in general, and to children especially, who often play near such areas due to lack of other open spaces. Although daily solid waste collection is not feasible, it is possible to provide a space in appropriate locations where large containers could be used for residents to store waste which could be then collected by the responsible agency once every two or three days.

As Addis Ababa’s topography consists mainly of hills, valleys, rivers and streams, most low-income residential areas are located on sites where flooding is severe. When rainfall is significant, especially in June, July and August, most houses are flooded, causing major destruction to the families. Lack of a storm water drainage system, therefore, is another major problem prevailing in most urban residential neighborhoods. In residential sites where there is not much storm water, efficient earth ditches adjoining the circulation networks may be a possible and an appropriate way to deal with the
problem until a more effective project is developed. This approach is justified by the immediate impact it brings in reducing the level of flooding and by the resulting reductions in the initial construction cost and lower regular maintenance costs. Furthermore, it would allow full participation of the residents in the process.

The need for and benefits of appropriate standards for providing potable water for the urban area have been more effectively researched and debated many more times than almost any aspect of urban infrastructure services. To date, there are basically two common options which exist in densely populated and low-income residential neighborhoods: public stand-pipes (*bonno*) and single taps to multiple occupancy buildings within a compound. Although the provision of potable water using public stand-pipes is a forward step taken by the government, the study reveals that the service is usually inadequate to meet all in-house demands for water. In most cases, the public stand-pipes are small in number in relation to the number of users and, above all, they are not in operation more than two or three hours a day. In dry seasons, there are days that the neighborhood gets no water at all. This may be due to shortage or maintenance problems in the area. However, when the taps are in operation, most of the time they do not have adequate pressure. Because of this, one observes many people waiting their turn as a result of time needed to fill containers.

Although under the current economic circumstances, provision of potable taps in every dwelling is unreasonable and is beyond reach, it seems that a reasonable increase in the number of public stand-pipes with high mains pressure is achievable.

The extent of overcrowding and the use of a room for multi-services of the household is probably the most common accommodation pattern one can see in the neighborhood settlements in Addis Ababa. The study results seem to
suggest that two things are most needed if residents' needs are to be accommodated properly. These were additional bedrooms and a separate storage spaces.

In general, therefore, the problem of the housing environment of Kebele 25 and others of similar neighborhoods need to be treated as an integrated planning and programming exercise. In this respect, it is also necessary to emphasize that different institutions such as the M.U.D.H. and C.C.A.A. must have coordinated programs and actions directed at improving the conditions. An important matter which must be considered is the financial, technical and administrative capabilities of all groups that are involved. All deficiencies must be examined and development plans, having an impact on the proposed project, must be clearly defined. The legal and administrative framework under which the project would be provided must be clearly understood by all involved, especially by those who would benefit from the project.

The information from field findings and literature seems to reveal that the socio-economic profile of low-income urban households are in direct conflict with the policy pursued by institutions concerning how, where, and what types of services are provided. It seems apparent that the existing programs providing services contain cost recovery objectives. This means that only those residential areas inhabited by people on a higher socio-economic level and those areas with few or no site problems would be the neighborhoods where services could be provided. (See Chapter III Section F).

In such circumstances, therefore, the reluctance of concerned agencies to establish a set of development projects appropriate to the neighborhood has resulted in housing environments in which it is unhealthy and physically hazardous to live. It is the right time for government to take immediate action based on a thorough understanding of the implication of the issues with regard to political, social and economic matters. Neighborhood housing is a major
problem currently faced by the urban population. It is discussed in Chapter III Section F with respect to the drawbacks existing in kebele-sponsored Housing Programs.

E. Expressed Opinions of the Residents About the Kebele System

As a social, political and economic planning concept, the Kebele system fits as a whole into a three-tier, hierarchically arranged urban system. It serves as a base-unit of the entire urban structure. When the government first introduced the Kebele system, it was structured with short and long-term and goals of uniting the residents within each administrative unit. The task included self-government and organization of the social, economic, and political life of the neighborhood. This section attempts to give insight to issues with respect to the fundamental changes the Kebele system has brought to the life of the residents. Although it is difficult to get in-depth information about the residents' feelings because of the sensitivity of the subject, an attempt was made to collect information about the level of functionality of the departments of the Kebele system. These departments are believed to have direct impact in shaping the daily social, economic, and political affairs of the residents, as well as the physical setting in which they live.

When the Kebele unit was introduced, its jurisdictional area was and remains drawn by major thoroughfares and rivers. Within its area a complex of residential buildings combining a variety of services and retail outlets was to meet the residents' daily needs. Within a typical Kebele unit, there are diverse socio-economic services given to residents. Few of the Kebeles in Addis Ababa provide every necessary service within their jurisdictional area. Some, however, have only Kebele offices and one or two types of cooperative
services. Accordingly, the population residing in each Kebele differs in respect to size, socio-economic status, and demographic composition.33

Administration of Kebele day-to-day affairs depends on several factors. First, there are those Kebeles, where most of the residents are economically well-to-do, with better education and a liberal urban cultural background. They are open to innovation and changes. Such Kebeles, of course, have better administration systems which make use of existing potential resources among its residents. Not only that, they are also more powerful in dealing with the center by virtue of the political and the professional expertise that they can muster. They have better ideas and less conflict, with quick and easy resolution of problems. Moreover, whenever money, manpower, and legal matters which involve the consultation of higher officials or skilled people are needed, they are in a better position to achieve their objectives. On the other hand, Kebeles whose residents are members of the urban poor, usually lack the skill and resources needed to properly run the system in their favor. These residents often become victims of the malfunction of the system. Kebele 25 is one of the many Kebeles in Addis Ababa which fits the description. Such Kebeles lack most of the necessary services for their residents. Furthermore, in such neighborhoods, there is much abuse of power by elected officials. Misappropriation of resources is common in the system. Frustration, powerlessness, and hopelessness are also commonly expressed feelings among the residents.

The second major factor which affects the proper functioning of the Kebele system is population size. The more people residing in a Kebele jurisdictional area, the more services are needed to satisfy the needs of the people. Other characteristics of demographic composition, such as the sex and age of residents, also affect the proper functioning of the Kebele system. For
instance, some kebele units have more children than other kebeles and, thus, have a greater need for day-care centers and other educational facilities.

The third major factor is the location of the kebele in the urban system and the spatial distribution of houses within it. There are large kebele areas with small populations far from the centers of social and economic services in urban Addis Ababa. Residents experience difficulty in gaining access to water supply, electricity lines, regular transportation services, opportunities for employment, market centers, recreation and education facilities. Therefore, the further the kebele unit from the center, the more problems the system has in providing its residents with services.

Today, improper use of power by public-elected officials in administration, from top to bottom of the hierarchy, is a major problem faced by the Ethiopian government. Socio-economic and political development directives emanating from the top of government bodies are commonly distorted and unfaithfully carried out by the very people who claim to stand for goodwill in the revolutionary change. The most victimized section of the population is always the poor. The poor are not only poor economically, but also in the knowledge of techniques and tactics of how to use the governing system to serve their own interests. On the other hand, the economically well-to-do section of the population has always found means of dealing with the system so that it works for them. They find ways either to be elected, for their voices to be heard, to benefit themselves, and they do it in the name of the Revolution.

Presently, the ability of the state to supervise and inspect the people who mismanage the system and abuse their power is limited at the higher level of government offices. On the lower government administrative levels, such as the kebele system, the government seems to lack appropriate manpower and resources to cope with the problem. As a result, it is on the neighborhood
level where one finds the greatest abuse of power by elected officials. Some officials can even make life-and-death judgments on a person or a family. Since the Kebele officials are empowered by the government, any official action, legal or otherwise, can have direct impact upon a person or a family's social, economic or political affairs. While the work of government-appointed supervisors usually focus on problems at higher administrative levels, at the neighborhood level, power is left to the local officials. With this in mind, and despite the reluctance of anyone to discuss it openly, an attempt was made to gather information concerning residents' feelings about the Kebele system. Several open-ended questions were asked of the sample households of Kebele 25. The questions addressed issues such as the democratic nature of the election process, exercise of power by elected officials, and how services given by Kebele-owned institutions are administered and function to satisfy the needs of the resident.

1. The Election Process and Exercise of Power by Local Officials.

Kebele officials are elected according to procedures set forth by the government in proclamation No. 104 of 1976. Important positions in the Kebele system are the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, and the Secretary. The Chairman works voluntarily, on Tuesday and Thursday, without pay. Theoretically, he or she is supposed to work eight hours each day. The vice-chairman, the Secretary, and other elected officials (accountants and treasurers), work on a full-time basis being paid monthly salaries.

The election process was seen as a simple one with an obvious outcome. The Chairman is elected by Tekomo, that is, by raising hands, during the Kebele residents' general meeting. There are usually two candidates for a chairman's position. There is always an underground campaign intended to promote one of
the candidates. People who are engaged in the campaign are usually relatives and friends of the candidates who do not necessarily reside within the neighborhood. There are no debates or speeches made to the residents as to what candidate intends to do if elected. On election day, residents go to the assembly hall to elect their Chairman and other officials. The usual term of service for elected officials is two years. The last election held was in 1982, in which Kebele 25 had only one candidate for the post of Chairman. Most residents did not know the candidate’s background or who nominated him as a candidate. He is not a resident of Kebele 25, but resides in one of the neighborhoods in kefelegn 6. However, residents had to elect this one candidate as Chairman. At the time of the survey, most residents expressed a feeling that they had a Chairman elected by a fraudulent election process. Since 1982, there has not been other elections. However, based on information received, there is an election planned for all urban areas which will take place in mid-1986.

When sample households were asked their feelings about the exercise of power by Kebele authorities, the answers were stated in terms of good, bad and both, that is, sometimes the officials do well and sometimes they do poorly. (see table 1.17).

Table 1.17 Do Kebele Authorities Exercise Their Power as You Expect Them To?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>H.H %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The authorities are doing well</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorities are doing poorly</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorities are doing both</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although 36.5 percent of the residents thought the officials were doing...
their jobs well, they gave no reason for believing this. They simply answered by stating "They are doing well". On the other hand that, 32.8 percent did not answer the question. Information obtained from observation and discussion on the topic suggests that, generally, people prefer not to talk about politically sensitive issues. Also, the people believe that they have little at stake in the existing system's success or failure and prefer to keep quiet. In other words, they believe that answering the question will not change the situation. That belief reflects a strong feeling of hopelessness and powerlessness. Over eighteen percent of the households sampled think that the authorities sometimes exercise their power in good faith and, other times, in bad faith. The reasons given by these groups for believing that officials sometimes practice their power in bad faith are similar to those reasons given by those who think officials always practice it in bad faith. The latter group amounts, to 12 percent of the total households sampled. The range of reasons stated by these two groups were summarized as follows:

A. Whatever problem is forwarded by a resident of the Kebele to the officials, one sees different tactics used by officials who show unwillingness and intentional delays in solving the problem. This is done by giving different reasons and excuses for not taking responsibility, thus discouraging the resident from coming to the office to report problems. This behavior is generally practiced by the Chairman. For instance, reported maintenance problems of Kebele-owned houses do not get any type of solution. Always, officials give multiple reasons for not correcting the problem. They do it regardless of the type of problem. For this reason most households which have maintenance problems in their unit give up hope of getting any assistance from the Kebele

B. Kebele officials use their power to assist their own close friends and relatives. For their friends and relatives, problems are solved in a quick and efficient manner.

C. Most Kebele officials lack the knowledge necessary to handle
neighborhood matters. They lack the ability to weigh the importance of a problem forwarded by the residents. In some cases, the official intentionally ignores the issue. Some problems require urgent solutions, such as shortages of rationed food or other goods in the Cooperative Shops.

D. Whenever there is a general meeting of residents to discuss neighborhood problems, suggestions from the residents are not accepted by the officials. Whatever the decision, it will always be the one already decided among the officials. In short, resident meetings held for discussion of Kebele issues are more for symbolic and procedural reasons.

E. The attitude of the Chairman is characterized as being generally disrespectful and discourteous toward the resident.

The sampled households were asked their feelings on the democratic nature of the official election process in their neighborhood. The results were documented being good, bad and both, as shown on Table 1.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>H.H. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The election process was good</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The election process was bad</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The election process was both</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some 54 percent of the households surveyed stated that the election process was undertaken in a democratic way, but they gave no reasons for believing so. Further, the percentage of those who did not want to comment on the democratic nature of the election process was quite high, (21.6 percent). The most common reasons, given by those residents who believe that the election process was fraudulent, were lack of information about the candidate's education, work experience in public affairs, and what they would do for the community if elected. Concerning this matter, one resident stated as
follows:

... when the election day comes, all residents are called to the *Kebele* meeting hall, and they have to be there, it is a must. Anyone who failed to vote had to give convincing reasons for being unable to do so. In the meeting, some one from the "election committee" stands up and reads the list of candidates for the different posts. This process is then followed by some residents who stand up and give speeches to the assembly with the intention of influencing voters to vote for Mr. X. for the Chairman post. The speeches are mostly focused on the background and personal history of the person, about his loyalty to the Revolution, and include other reasons why Mr. X. is believed to be the appropriate person for the position.

... this is followed by other speeches delivered by different men among the residents on the same personality. After the election committee hears all the speeches, they ask the resident to raise their hands for Mr. X. or Mr. Y. for the position of the *Kebele* Chairman. People look at one another and raise their hands. Counting follows.

... in most cases, people who come to vote do not have any background knowledge of the person for whom they raise their hands. Furthermore, most want to get the election over with and go home. They do not seem to care about who is elected as a Chairman or as a Secretary. Since there is no discussion or debate among the candidates or the voters, the election process comes to an end very quickly.

This view of the election process is shared by many residents of the *Kebele* who were interviewed.

2. Policing the Neighborhood

Prior to 1974 and in the early years of the revolution until 1977-78, *Kebele* 25 and *Kebeles* surrounding the central market area were areas of crime and violence. Within the *Kebele* 25 jurisdictional area, there were two key-points where people committed crimes just after darkness. The road in the northern
section of the Kebele which leads to Mercato was one point, and the other one was the thoroughfare in the south. On both roads, the bridges were hiding places for looters and muggers, and points from which to attack passersby. The next morning one could see either blood stains on the street or a dead body thrown into the river.

During the revolution, Kebele 25 and neighboring Kebeles, became a hide-out for various political factions, especially those which opposed the central government. During these periods of political unrest, residents were faced with constant fights, robberies and, sometimes, murders. At times, the Kebele 25 was used as a battleground for "hide-and-seek" gun fights. In the evening, residents would hear gun-shots just outside their houses and nobody dared interfere for fear of getting killed. Today, as most have stated, these forms of terror have been stopped, and there is no one who does not say "thanks" to the Kebele peace-keeping system.

The Kebele peace-keeping system, normally called the Kebele Public Safety Committee, has three elected members who are responsible for mobilizing residents to keep the safety of the locality, the Revolution and the Country. If there is an aspect of the Kebele system which is appreciated by almost all residents of Addis Ababa, it is the introduction of the Kebele-based peace-keeping system. Since it began, the crime rate has fallen to almost to zero percent, especially from 1979 to 1983. One can walk without fear of being mugged at any time of the day from 5:00 a.m. until midnight, after which time a curfew is in effect. However, the Kebele peace-keeping system has not been without criticism by residents, and for good reason. Since 1983, crime rates have been going up. The nature of the crimes committed are not killing and mugging of passersby late at night, but are more like robbery without violence or injury to residents. Many residents report the robbery of their houses to
Kebele officials. The Kebele officials, so far, have not succeeded in catching the criminals.

To get some idea about criminal activity in the neighborhood, sample households were asked about the Kebele peace-keeping activities within their neighborhood. Approximately 69 percent said that the Kebele is "doing well", while 19 percent said "good and bad". Approximately 7.5 percent stated that Kebele peace-keeping in the neighborhood had weakened over the last three years and, therefore, it was doing badly. A few, 3.7 percent, did not comment on the matter. Most people who thought the Kebele peace-keeping unit was doing well based their conclusion on the fact that criminal activities in the neighborhood had been drastically reduced compared to earlier years. Within Kebele 25, at least, there had not been any murders for the last six years. Second, most of these residents liked the idea of residents' participation in the system.

When the Kebele neighborhood peace-keeping system was first introduced, every resident over 18 years of age was responsible for helping guard over the neighborhood the entire night, at least once-a-month. If the person worked weekdays, he would be assigned service on either Friday or Saturday night. The participation of every resident was required unless there were good reasons why the resident could not. Under the Kebele law, this reason had to be presented to the Kebele official in a written statement. As the years passed and the period of political unrest in Addis Ababa diminished, the activities of the neighborhood peace-keeping system also faded. As a result, crime rates grew sharply. In some Kebeles of Addis Ababa, murdered bodies have been found in the streets several times. The motives behind the killings are said to not always be robbery.35

Those households who stated that the neighborhood peace-keeping system is
poorly practiced, gave the reason that there are too many young people aimlessly roaming the neighborhood, with disrespectful behavior. In the evening, they get drunk, make noise, and fight. Second, vandalism and theft within the neighborhood has increased. The third, very important reason given was that guards who go around the neighborhood in shifts do not properly perform their duty. Most of the guards walk through the kebele only once or twice during the night. They go only to certain areas of the neighborhood. For instance, most of the time, guards are seen walking on the main roads, avoiding the narrow streets. Yet, they are supposed to go all over the neighborhood.

Another important matter believed to be jeopardizing the peace-keeping system was related to the age of the residents ordered to take part in program. Often, older people are ordered to be night guards. Requiring older people to take part in the system is seen by many as deplorable. Older people are not looked upon with respect and are not taken seriously; in most cases, they are laughed at. For example, one old man in his mid-seventies had been ordered to watch the neighborhood and, whenever he goes out, he carries a rifle. Some people laugh at him and make a joke, saying, “Is he out there to be guarded or to guard the neighborhood?” Actually, the remark is not far from reality. Ordering the elderly to take part damages their morale and integrity, since they do not get respect or appreciation for what they do. There is a high possibility that old men may be attacked rather than act as a protector.

Others believe the kebele peace-keeping system is poorly practiced because some young people, in their early twenties, have been ordered to take part once or twice every week for months and, even, years. They are properly trained by officials on how to keep peace in the area and they are mostly adults without regular employment. Had they been assigned on regular time schedules, their turn might have come once or twice every two or three months, depending on
the number of residents who were to participate. Some are bread winners for
their family, some go to school, but all are from economically depressed
families.

It has been observed that those families whose socio-economic status is
higher, and those whose relatives are associated with the Kebele
administrative system, do not take part on a regular schedule basis in the
peace-keeping program. On the other hand, members of families with low
socio-economic status have been assigned frequently.

Generally speaking, theft is the major crime practiced in the neighborhood.
Common targets of theft are household items left outside and clothes hung
outside to be dried. Sometimes, if the homeowner is away, people break in and
take furniture, radios, or other valuable items. Despite the shabbiness of the
housing environment, which might be thought of as a center of crime, only a
couple of drunks were seen between 7 and 8 p.m. Perhaps it is safer than
taking a walk on Churchill Road, in the business center, where streets are
lighted and one sees policemen on the street, (see Appendix B, No. 4).

3. People's Court

Before the Revolution, people wasted time going from court to court for all
sorts of trivial cases such as breaking into someone's house, stealing, or
disputes resulting from insulting somebody. In general, they were petty
criminal and civil cases. Sometimes, people spent up to five years appealing to
the Royal Court on minor cases, especially in litigation concerning land. In
some cases, litigation of this type drained the meager income of the people.

To avoid such practices, "The People's Court" was introduced. It is
empowered to resolve court cases by giving verdicts based on the information
of local witnesses and the evidence. The Judicial Committee has three elected
members from among senior citizens of the Kebele. Although the authority of
the Kebele People's Court Judicial Committee is limited, most minor court
cases have been handled by these Committees. Disputes include those between
family members or those between neighbors. Further, the People's Court can
handle civil cases involving up to 500 Birr and petty criminal offenses
involving up to three months imprisonment, or a fine of up to 300 Birr. A case
must be first reported to the Kebele office. It cannot be taken to a higher
court simply because the individual wishes to. The people present their cases
to the Executive Committee, which is composed of five publicly elected
members. These include the Kebele Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary,
Accountant and Treasurer. The Executive Committee identifies the cases which
are beyond the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee's power and directs
them to the appropriate agency. If the cause of conflict is slight, the Judicial
Committee merely warns the guilty person and dismisses the case.

The intention of the Judicial Committee is not simply to penalize, but to
reconcile and, as much as possible, create harmony. Most of the time, Kebele
25 People's Court handles cases which require reconciliation between family
members. These include disputes between husband and wife, divorce
settlement, and disputes between neighbors. Since the proceedings of the
Judicial Committee are open to the public, any resident of the Kebele who is in
attendance has the right to give suggestions or to criticize if they think the
committee has erred.

In any case, the Kebele-based People's Court has been seen to be generally
effective in resolving cases. However, the effectiveness of the court is highly
criticized in bringing justice when Kebele officials or their close associates
are found in questionable activities. Residents refrain from reporting criminal
acts committed by Kebele officials because they, or members of their family,
will be victims of official harassment. For instance, Kebele officials commonly take bribes, and there is sexual harassment of young girls in an exchange for legal services. While these criminal acts should be brought to the People's Court, none of the victims report the activity, even if he or she has witnesses, for fear of further harassment. Today, these two criminal acts are real problems facing the Kebele-based justice system.

4. Kebele Based Service Giving Institutions

Many types of socio-economic and political service institutions are administered directly by the Kebele system. Almost all Kebeles in Addis Ababa, have Cooperatives within their jurisdiction area. Cooperatives include shops for consumer goods, vegetables, fruits and grain stores, flour mills, butcher shops, and adult clubs. Moreover, all Kebele units have offices for the administration, youth associations, and assembly halls. Further, some Kebeles have bakeries, recreation health, and sport centers, and schooling facilities such as kindergarten, elementary and high schools within their jurisdictional area.

In Kebele 25, one finds Cooperative Shops for consumer goods, tea rooms, flour mills, butcher and grain stores. Of these, the Cooperative Shop which sells consumer goods and rations food to residents is the most important form of Kebele-run economic institution. It is the one which has most direct impact on day-to-day activities of a resident's life. Moreover, it is through this economic institution that the government controls the price of consumer products and provides them to the public at affordable prices. The use of these Cooperatives, therefore, is better understood in Kebeles where the population is composed of mostly low-income groups.

Unlike other Cooperative Shops located in well-to-do neighborhoods, the
shops in *Kebele 25* have a limited variety of goods. Items regularly displayed on the shelves are those which the government can easily supply without shortage problems. Such items consist of school materials, matches, toilet paper, cigarettes, soft drinks, and other items not always needed by most residents. On the other hand, vital foodstuffs like grain, sugar, cooking oil and pasta, received from government-run corporations, fail to reach *Kebele* Cooperatives in needed quantities on a regular basis. The Cooperative Shops are responsible for distributing the goods. These products arrive in the Cooperative Shop once a month. When they do, the residents are informed. Persons assigned to notifying the people move within the *Kebele* in the late evening or early morning using a microphone to announce the pick-up time and type of goods. Families who want to buy those items announced as being available send a family member to get in line to buy the product, showing the household monthly ration card.37

In *Kebele 25*, the most commonly rationed items are cooking oil, wheat maize, *teff*, sugar and pasta. Other consumer goods which are available in the *Kebele* shop on a regular basis can be bought without showing the ration card. Any changes in the family size must be reported to the *Kebele* office so that the quantity of the monthly allowance can be changed accordingly. However, decreases in family size are generally not reported, while increases are reported quickly. Reported increases, however, does not always mean the family will get immediate increases in the monthly ration. Changes often take six to eight months and, sometimes, never.

Accordingly, the amount of goods the *Kebele* receives through government distribution centers depends on the reported population size. Whenever there is a population decrease or increase, the quantity of the *Kebele*'s rationed products will be changed. Usually, this is not so for most food items. For
instance, the total rationed budget of kebele 25 has not been changed since 1962, although there have been population changes in the kebele. Shortage problems of rationed items are more acute in kebele areas where most of the residents are in low-income groups. These residents depend heavily on Cooperative Shops to buy items cheaply since the products sold in outside markets are expensive. As the results from the survey reveal, most residents use Cooperative Shops as their main shopping center, (see table 119).

Table 119 - Shopping Areas for Needs of the Households, in order of Frequency Mentioned.

Mercato.
Kebele Cooperative Shops.
Gullet in the Neighborhood and Surrounding.
Amanuel Berenda.
Others.

Families who come to settle in the neighborhood have the right to make use of Cooperative Shops and any other kebele facilities, provided they are registered as a resident of the kebele. However, they must get new ration cards if newly settled. They do so by receiving clearance from their former kebele, which involves a time-consuming bureaucratic procedure. That information is then taken to higher officials who administer the rations for the kebele to which the applicant moves. After completing time-consuming procedures, the family gets its ration card. However simple the procedures may seem, there are many residents of kebele 25 who waited more than a year or two to get their cards. Similarly, many do not have a ration card and other households, whose family number increased, did not receive increases in the amount of their monthly ration. Therefore, these residents shop outside the Cooperative for their needed items.
Table 1.20  Do Cooperative Shops Give Good Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Households %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Cooperatives give good service</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cooperatives give bad service</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cooperatives give both</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an effort to understand how residents feel about the Cooperative Shops, the sample households were asked whether or not they are served well and the reasons it was so (see table 1.20). Most stated that they receive good service. The most commonly stated reason was that the price of items is cheaper than prices in the outside market. For example, one kilo of sugar in the Cooperative Shop costs 1.50 Birr, while outside one pays 3.00 to 3.50 Birr per kilo. The same price difference exists in other consumer goods. Even those people who believe the service given by Cooperatives is bad, are satisfied by the low price of the items. Nevertheless, they have important reasons for not being satisfied. First, the Cooperative Shops are always experiencing a shortage of goods. Some products run out before every household gets its monthly share. When shortages occur, 20 to 30 percent of the residents are told to wait for the next shipment. Residents believe that kebele officials are reluctant to report the problem to the appropriate officials.

The second reason reflects the corruption level which exists within the management of the Cooperative Shops as well as with kebele officials. Cooperative Shops are used for the fulfillment of personal needs of relatives or close friends and associates of the officials. Officials also use their power to punish personal enemies through unethical, immoral and unjustifiable ways contrary to good of the whole. A common practice is the suspension of ration cards to punish a member of a family. This is done when, for example, a
member from a six-member family having been asked by Kebele officials to attend Kebele meetings, fails to attend two or three times. When a family member goes to collect rations from the Cooperative Shop, their ration card will be suspended until the conduct of that person is corrected. By law, the official should only deduct that person's ration from the family allowance. Punishment by suspension of rations should only be used in extreme cases of crime: say, illegal use of the ration card itself.

Another common case where the suspension of a ration card is used for punishment of a person is when a family member fails to participate in the Kebele peace-keeping system. Here, again, the victim is the whole family and not one person. In some cases, personal disputes between a family and an official will result in the suspension of ration card. If the victim takes the case to the People's Court, the official will find ways to justify his action. For this reason, residents are afraid to question the legality of the punishment.

The third reason stated by residents for being dissatisfied with Cooperative Shops was that the amount of the monthly food ration is too small. Most of the time, households which have larger families have to buy additional food to supplement to the amount received by ration. This implies that government standards regarding consumption of food by families need to be revised; the standards, which are expressed in volumes and weights per person, need to be increased.

Generally, the existence of Kebele-based Cooperatives, and the services they provide, are appreciated by the urban population. Most of all, they are important and beneficial to low-income groups of the urban population, when properly and justly operated.
Conclusion

Based on the survey result, the election process of Kebele officials was viewed by most residents as being democratic in nature. The last election the Kebele held was regarded by most as an election which took place in "peace-time". It gave the residents the opportunity to participate, a right which they had not had before the revolution or immediately after. However, whether or not their role or presence make a difference in the outcome of the election is a question which remains in everyone's mind. They are usually reluctant to discuss the subject and, up to now, the process does not seem to have been openly criticized. On the other hand, however, the mere existence of an election, coupled with resident participation, is viewed by many as a step forward. Of those who think the elections are conducted in a democratic way, the process is perceived as a gradual establishment of basic order and the principles needed for a "real" democratic election process where, one day, their votes will make a difference in the system.

The question of how democratic the election process is depends on many factors. For instance, one basic factor is that residents' knowledge about the concept of election in the political system seems to be very limited. To obtain better information about the issues, and to make changes in the election process, requires that the residents participate actively in the political arena. Due to past experience from political unrest, many people refrain from engaging in politically oriented matters, such as elections. However, as time passes, some are realizing that the system is available for their participation. Some have started to discuss and criticize the Kebele politics in the form of jokes among close friends.

By and large, residents are happy with the peace-keeping system and with Kebele-based People's Court. The importance of Cooperative Shops, in Kebele
neighborhoods composed of low-income people, is unquestionable. Goods sold in these shops are cheap, and most residents seem to appreciate the service given. Whereas, the service of Cooperative Shops located in well-to-do neighborhoods is little appreciated by the residents. Most residents can afford to pay the higher prices incurred by shopping outside of Cooperative Shops. While poor families make use of the Cooperative Shops, the well-to-do families shop for food stuffs from privately owned shops where they get better quality products at a higher cost with quicker and better service. Their dependency on their neighborhood Cooperative Shops for their daily or monthly needs is small when compared to the poor families. This does not mean that well-to-do families do not make use of their ration cards; on the contrary, they make effective use of their ration cards. Some use it for shopping for items for themselves or for close relatives. Some households give their ration card to neighbors who have more children and whose ration allowance is not enough to take them through the month. These families, however, must use it without being detected by officials.39
NOTES ON CHAPTER II

1. Prior to the establishment of U.D.A. and the division of urban areas into administrative units, the area south-west of Mercato was called Addis Ketema. Today, though the area of Addis Ketema is divided into smaller administrative zones and given names such as Kebele and Kefetegna, with number assigned, people of Addis Ababa orient themselves to the area by referring to its old name, Addis Ketema.

2. In Addis Ababa, there are 25 Kefetegnas or Higher Urban Dwellers Administrative regions, (H.U.D.A.). Each of them, in turn, is divided into smaller administrative neighborhoods, Kebeles.

3. The other two rivers are the Kebena River in the east section of the city, (see Appendix B, No.15, 16) and the Bantiyekeko River which is formed by two other rivers, Kurtume and Kechene. Both run in the central section of the city. All three rivers originate from Entoto Mountain in the northern section of the city. Every rainy season, flood water from the northern section of the city and the area from Entoto Mountain, which is stripped of vegetation, is collected and runs into the three rivers.

4. According to a 1978 housing survey, there were over 3,000 homeless people. They use the bus-stops, train terminals as well as parks and hotel areas as their home. Most of them were found to be over 18 years old. For detail see M.U.D.H., Report on Addis Ababa Housing Census 1978. (Addis Ababa: M.U.D.H., 1984).

5. Sometime in July of 1964 two old men and a donkey loaded with firewood crossing the river were caught by a sudden flood but were rescued. Such accidents happen many times whenever there is a heavy rain on the mountain or in the northern section of the city.


7. Ibid.

8. With regard to demographic characteristics of the urban population see C.S.O., Ethiopia: Statistical Abstract 1982. (Addis Ababa: Central Statistical
Office, 1982), p. 24. In the report, of the total urban population in Ethiopia, 47.4 percent (2,115,800) are male and 52.6 percent (2,350,900) are female. An almost similar population composition is seen in Kebele 25, Kefetegna 6.


14. It is typical in almost all low-income families that children start earning money at the age of 10. Of course, they will not be employed by a government organization or a private one. However, they work as messengers, for instance, carrying things from the market place to one's house. They are paid for their service. A typical example is children who shine shoes. They make an average of three to five Birr per day on a sunny day and eight to ten Birr on a rainy days. Depending how many days they work, they generate at least a monthly income of 50 to 60 Birr. All these children are between 10 and 15 years old. Another example is those children who are street venders, selling plastic household utilities door to door.


17. The subsistence household income was assumed to be 123.85 Birr per month based on estimation of the minimum wage of unskilled workers. Cited


20. The reasons that the neighborhood has an old settlement pattern with high population density is that every available open space is used carefully and efficiently. Houses are old with little or no service. Upgrading is needed. Government has to incorporate different programs, including resettlement of some of the residents to ease overcrowding.

21. One kilo of sugar is sold by Cooperative Shops for 1.25 Birr while it costs 3.50 Birr per kilo in either in the Gullet or in privately owned shops. Similarly, one loaf of bread is sold by Cooperative Shops for 10 cents, while people on the street, usually small children, sell two loaves for 25 to 30 cents. Another important item, pasta, is sold by Cooperatives shops for 1.10 Birr while on the street, it is sold for 2.50 to 3.00 Birr.

22. The making of Tella is practiced by most Christian households in Ethiopia for social purposes. It is usually brewed for holidays or for other celebrations by the family, such as religious celebrations, engagements, marriage, birthdays. For such purposes, for which it is brewed once in a while, the social implication of Tella is apparent.

23. A household which sells its monthly ration makes profits of three times the cost it paid to the Cooperative Shop. Such economic activity takes place once a month and probably lasts for a week. On the other hand, households who sell local beer on a regular basis make marginal profits due to expenses involved in the process of the making. For most, labor costs are not considered, as the household provides its labor.

24. For details of size of jurisdictional areas of each Kebele administration see Mamo Tsegaye, Beza Tesfaye, Economically Viable Hierarchy of Social Formation Planning and Servicing of Settlement at Ketema, Kefetege and Kebele. (Addis Ababa: M.U.D.H., 1984), Annex B.

26. Ibid., p.11.

27. For detail, P.M.A.C., "...Proclamation No. 104 of 1976." Ibid., P. 79.


30. C.C.A.A., Health and Social Service Department, "Houses and Population per Kefetegnas; Number of Inhabitants per Houses." cited in C.C.A.A., Low-Cost Housing. Ibid., p.2.


32. Ibid.

33. For a detailed critical analysis of the basis for the establishment of the Kebele Neighborhood, see Mamo Tsedale, Beza Tesfaye, Economically Viable ... Ibid., Annex B.

34. See P.M.A.C., "...Proclamation No. 104 of 1976." Ibid., p. 79.

35. Early one morning during working hours, two employees of Housing and Saving Bank (H.S.B.) came to see the manager. They told the secretary about the death of an employee who was found dead the day before. The news was shocking, and the secretary asked them where and how he was killed, and who found the body, etc... The two men were there to tell the manager about the matter and discuss how office employees would be able to participate in the burial event.

The victim lived in Kefetegnas 9, the neighborhood near the Yohanis Church on Gulilele road. That morning his body, found by a passerby was, lying on a narrow street leading to his house. When the police arrived at the scene they found his body was bruised from a heavy blow and that nothing was stolen from his pocket. In his wallet, there was a list of names whom the police later found to be on their list of wanted "criminals". They were members of Eritrean Liberation Movement organization, and the victim was from an Eritrean ethnic group. A further discussion with the secretary about crime in general disclosed that some murders are politically motivated, resulting in quarrels or disputes among friends. She suspected that this was the case in the
death of the bank employee, not robbery.

36. For detailed information about powers and duties of People’s Court see, P.M.A.C., "... Proclamation, No.104 of 1976." Ibid., pp. 81-82.

37. The household Monthly Ration Card is distributed to each household through the Kebele office. Each card lists each member of the household and their relation to the head of the household. Family size is shown, and areas are used where months and names of items and the amount are written. Whenever a family member goes to the Cooperative Shop to buy goods, that member has to carry the card. The supply the family is allowed to buy is determined by the size of the family based on government issued standards concerning a person’s consumption rate per month of critical items, especially food.

38. Most of the time, officials find ways to increase certain types of food items for those with increased family size. It is usually done at the expense of the household ration of others. For instance, a family of 4 persons who used to get four kilos of sugar (1 kilo of sugar per person per month), will be allowed to buy only 3.5 kilos of sugar or less. The same thing could happen to other items as well.

39. It is not always necessary that the owner of the ration card be in the shop to use the card, since a housekeeper can do the shopping. What officials do is see that the household listed on the card gets what is allowed. Therefore, although it is not allowed by law, in practice, anyone can use anybody’s ration card for shopping if he or she pays the amount charged.
CHAPTER III

HOUSING PROGRAMS AS THEY EXIST TODAY

A. Introduction: Historical Context of the Housing Programs and the Institutional Reform.

Of all the practical ideas for reducing urban housing problems in Ethiopia, four have emerged since 1974 revolution changes as the most widely adopted, with the fifth one being adopted only recently. These are: Construction of Low-Cost Housing; Cooperative Housing; Self-Help Housing, Kebele Sponsored Housing; Resettlement and Existing Settlement Upgrading Programs. Although they take a number of different forms and may be carried out separately or in conjunction with each other, these complementary approaches are being employed largely in Addis Ababa and, to lesser extent, in other major urban centers and regional towns. Considerable experience in providing housing has been gained in Addis Ababa, especially since early 1976. This, with the rate at which new housing is being constructed, however few they are in number, makes it desirable to assess the contributions and future potential of the programs. Before making this assessment it may be useful to place the four most common housing delivery mechanisms in their historical context. What were the problems to which these programs provided a solution? Whom were they intended to benefit and why? What made them so popular with the Ethiopian government?

The first factor to consider is the demand for housing by the urban population. Study of available literature and statistical data leads to the conclusion that the entire housing and urban system should either be replaced with new planning concepts or maintained and upgraded. It is clear, however,
that the problem of housing is so vast and because it will be with the nation for such a long time, it is likely to get worse. Although Ethiopia is one of the world's poorest and least urbanized countries, it has been experiencing a rapid rate of increase in urban population. According to the estimated data of 1965–1981, Ethiopian urban centers are assumed to have a growth rate of 5 percent per year. Of this growth, 2.5 percent is considered a natural growth rate while the remaining results from migration of people from rural to urban areas.¹

Figure 1. Existing Housing Program

In 1975 there were 185 urban centers with a total population of 3.2 million, (11.7% of the total population). In 1981 there were 318 urban centers with populations of 4.3 million (13.3% of total population).² According to available data, in 1984 Addis Ababa accommodated 31.5 percent of the total
urban population (4,685,618), Asmara, 5.6 percent; and 25 other urban centers, with population figures ranging from 20,000 to 100,000 each, accommodating 24.7 percent. The remaining 38.2 percent of the urban dwellers were scattered among 291 urban centers having population figures ranging from 2,000 to 20,000 each.³

In the absence of an intermediate town, Addis Ababa is by far the largest city in the country, having a population of 5.6 times that of Asmara, the next largest city (264,000). Assuming a 5 percent urban population growth rate per year, the population of Addis Ababa is expected to double in about fifteen years. This alarming population growth is much higher than the absorption capacity of major urban centers and towns in terms of job opportunities, educational, health and marketing facilities. Most of all, this growth presents serious implications for housing and basic infrastructure services. The intense pressure which this urban population growth puts upon the overall urban system is intensified still further when the nature of housing demands are taken into account.

For instance, a report by the City Council of Addis Ababa, (C.C.A.A.), regarding the housing situation in Addis Ababa, indicated that the cumulated housing needs from 1975 to 1984 amounted to 280,000 units. Of these, 140,000 units were needed to replace dilapidated housing, while the rest were needed to cover the city's population growth. In 1977, Addis Ababa's population was estimated at 1,100,000;⁴ in 1981, its population was estimated to be 1,450,000, resulting a 250,000 increase in population over four years. According to C.C.A.A. report, the number of registered people living in one house averaged 6.15.⁵ This figure was higher than the average family size of 5 persons per house, which means then that there was more than one family per house. During 1975 - 1984 it was assumed that the maximum
production of units was 20,000. Therefore, the cumulative backlog of housing needs during the period amounted to 260,000 units, or 26,000 units per year.

Furthermore, the report indicates that, between 1985 and 1994, the housing needs for Addis Ababa will be 41,000 units per year. Similar official estimates of housing needs in Addis Ababa have indicated these figures are reasonably accurate. Cautiously, it could be said that a total of 40,000 units should be constructed yearly in order to properly shelter the Addis Ababa population over coming decades.

The inevitable outcome of this mismatch in supply and demand was increased densities in existing low-income areas, overcrowding within the units, increase of dilapidated housing, deterioration of life-styles and living standards, spread of diseases, and growth of unplanned settlements by squatters.

The Ethiopian government, aware of the facts surrounding the urban housing conditions, pursued a policy of reforms with regard to urban land and housing. The first task expected from the government was to establish peace and order in both the city and countryside. In 1977, the government initiated action-oriented housing programs. Since then, these housing programs have become popular, and are perceived within the government hierarchy and among housing experts in the country, as a realistic approach to existing housing problems. The government’s attention to the housing programs is well-founded. It is worthwhile to sketch the circumstances of how the programs developed and, thus, became appropriate solutions to housing problems in a nation faced with the magnitude of housing shortage, as is Ethiopia.

In the seventies, in most developing nations, poor Settlements with high
population densities were growing at a much faster rate than the formally planned cities, and some nations undertook Slum Clearance and Squatter Resettlement Programs. However, these types of programs wasted scarce public resources on replacing existing dwellings, mostly, with high-rise buildings, but often without undertaking planned development. Because of this, the poor simply moved to other parts of the cities. Usually, people return to an area where they are familiar with the life-style and have easy access to jobs and other opportunities. However, throughout the housing history of Ethiopia, programs such as Slum Clearance and Squatter Resettlement did not take place. It had not taken place due either to neglect of the housing situation by the Haile Selassie government or due to existing financial constraints.

It is one thing to expose the limitations of earlier conventional wisdom, and, another, to find a more realistic alternative. Therefore, changes began to occur on the basis of individually tailored procedures, rather than coordinated programs. In some countries, individual low-income Settlements which had obtained political support or public attention were provided with basic services and a measure of security even when official policies may have required their removal. Occasionally, however, more positive attitudes have emerged. During the mid-sixties and seventies, the governments of Zambia, Colombia, and Kenya, and a number of other countries in Asia and Latin America, realized that a more appropriate course of action was to spread limited resources more widely, and provide plots on which Self-Help could be used to construct individual dwellings.

The conceptual foundation for such alternative housing was originally provided by a small number of committed professionals and scholars who questioned the official negative view of slums, shanty towns and squatter
settlements. Observers and scholars such as Turner, Mangin, Ross and Abrams,\textsuperscript{11} demonstrated convincingly that people were the best judge of what housing they needed and that, in most cases, they were perfectly capable of obtaining it. The role of government was to support this initiative by providing inexpensive land, security of tenure, basic services and a layout of accessible technical, and financial networks, to facilitate the housing process. So, the concepts of Self-Help, Cooperative, Resettlement and Upgrading Housing became appropriate methods to approach the appalling housing problems which existed in most urban areas of under-developed nations.

The above housing approaches were not, however, new. Serviced Land Subdivisions on which occupants constructed their own dwellings with some form of assistance and, thus, kept control, can be found throughout history. It is an approach that had been adopted in industrialized countries, such as Britain, as early as in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{12} Recently, these aspects have appealed to nations regardless of the type of government, whether Socialist or Capitalist, which have been faced with enormous demands for housing and urban services. For low-income households, these approaches provide the opportunity to determine how much is spent on housing and what form such expenditure takes. For professional observers, government consultants, housing experts and international agencies, these housing approaches provide the only realistic way of equating limited government and individual household resources to the extent and nature of the housing demand. This agreement as to the more beneficial approaches to the problem developed during the 1970s and, today, they are being adopted in different countries around the world.\textsuperscript{13}

The attraction of the Self-Help, Cooperative, Resettlement, and construction of Low-Cost Housing Programs for Ethiopia, is recent. The Ethiopian government sought these approaches to reduce the cost of the
housing unit, to stimulate the supply of housing for the poor and, in planned fashion, to somehow narrow the gap between housing supply and demand. In conjunction with these concepts, the housing approaches would also enable government to control the important elements of development, such as location, layout, cost and land use, which were lost with the growth of unplanned settlements.

Although these different housing approaches were introduced after the Revolution, the need to upgrade the large and increasing number of poor residential settlements was also being recognized as an alternative solution to the poor housing conditions of the urban population, especially in Addis Ababa. The conceptual objectives of the Settlement Upgrading, however, were introduced only recently and its objectives are far from being realized.

After 1979, which marked the end of political unrest in the country, the government recuperated from its socio-economic reform strategies by consolidating existing institutions and creating new ones. Major areas of government interest were housing and urban development. These new and improved institutions were directed to deal with matters in the overall sphere of urban housing and development. The most ostensible reform brought on by the revolutionary change, and the one expected to have significant impact on the processes for housing provision, was the creation of the Housing and Saving Bank, (H.S.B.). In conjunction with this, the reform brought changes to what was called, in the former regime, Ministry of Public Work and Housing (M.P.W.H.), though it continued to exist until the end of 1977. This institution was then expanded and reorganized into the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing (M.U.D.H.) which now embraces administrative jurisdiction of all activities of the Rental Housing Agency (R.H.A.) and the City Council of Addis Ababa (C.C.A.A). Furthermore, the C.C.A.A. has been reorganized to fit the new
urban system and embraces within itself the Addis Ababa Urban Dwellers Association (U.D.A.). In addition to these, a new Ministry was established, the Ethiopian Building Construction Authority (E.B.C.A.). The E.B.C.A. consolidated all nationalized construction industries. Today, the M.U.D.H., in cooperation with other government institutions, is one of the most responsible of the empowered institutions dealing with the implementation and policy setting of urban development programs.

Figure 2. Existing Housing Institutional Framework for Planning, Programming, and Implementation of Urban Housing.
At this point, it is worthwhile to state some of the major objectives, responsibilities and duties assigned to these housing institutions, especially the H.S.B. and the M.U.D.H., which are key institutions dealing with the housing and urban development affairs. The preambles of proclamation No. 60 of 1975 for the Establishment of Housing and Saving Bank state:16

WHEREAS, in accordance with the basic principles and goals of Hebrettesebawinet it has become necessary to further accelerate the rate of housing construction for the improvement of the living conditions of the broad masses, and

WHEREAS, in the past housing construction and finance have not been undertaken in a planned way and have therefore resulted in the diffusion and wastage of manpower and monetary resources; and

WHEREAS, in order to meet the growing housing demand of the broad masses the reorganization of the financial institutions catering for housing development construction becomes a necessity so that duplicative efforts can be reduced, and thereby services can be distributed geographically and demographically in such a manner that financial resources such as budgetary allocations, savings, internal and external loans, pension and insurance funds, rents from state owned buildings, and urban lands can be mobilized, coordinated and disbursed for housing development; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to coordinate and centralize and to plan ahead the financial needs for housing development as part of the overall financial needs in other sectors of the economy; and to further insure the application of a uniform policy of loan disbursement and to control the flow and proper use of funds with a view to merge the existing housing and savings institutions into one legal entity; and

WHEREAS, housing development requires the coordination of government institutions concerned, and therefore it has become necessary to define the relationship of these institutions;...

Negarite Gazeta, (1975)

The powers of H.S.B. extend to acquiring, owning, selling and exchanging
properties, in order to attain its objectives and to assure proper function of its operations. Other important directives issued by the 1975 proclamation focused on the duties and responsibilities of the bank: H.S.B. should...

- provide long-term loans for construction or acquisitions of dwellings, buildings, infrastructure, and community facilities;

- provide short-term loans for maintenance, repair or modifications of dwellings, buildings, infrastructure and community facilities;

- provide loans to construction industries approved by the Ministry of Public Works and Housing, (known today as the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing);

- control the proper use of loans granted by it;

- plan, in cooperation with the Supervisory Authority, the financial component needed for the construction, acquisition, repair and maintenance of dwellings, buildings, infrastructure and community facilities;

- demonstrate in economic terms the benefits that occur from cooperative housing programs to workers and peasants and make available to them credits on easy terms for housing and related construction programs;

- administer such special funds and guarantee schemes as may be placed at its disposal by the Government or by other institutions;

- mobilize local and external financial resources and publicize the economic benefits of time or term deposits;

- discount promissory notes received by construction industries; and

- borrow money and pledge or mortgage any of its assets to secure its debts.

Negarite Gazette, (1975)

The initial capital of the H.S.B. when established was 6,000,000 Birr. In
addition to this amount, there are other resources deposited in the Bank, the allocation of which are determined by the government. Such funds are derived from rental income from state-owned buildings or lands, grants and loans, as well as government budgetary appropriations and subsidies. Until the end of 1977, the performance of H.S.B. has been governed by the decisions made within the M.P.W.H. The extent of integration of these two institutions was to:-

- survey the different housing development needs of the country for the purpose of expediting the preparation of the financial resource needed therefore;

- set up cost accounting system for individual housing development financed by the bank and prepare certificates of payment in connection therewith;

- supervise the physical activities related to housing development financed by the bank and prepare certificates of payment in connection there with; and

- determine the need for the import of construction material for housing development.

Negarite Gazeta, (1975)

M.P.W.H. housing action must be in accordance with the government housing policy. Until 1986, there had not been an officially detailed housing policy, but mainly guidelines for how future housing programs should be implemented. The guidelines, formulated by the M.P.W.H., continued to be used with little or no rectification by the new ministry, M.U.D.H., which was established in August 1977. Today, the M.U.D.H. is an important institution through which state affairs relating to the development of the urban system are transacted. The duties and responsibilities of the M.U.D.H. remain intact as issued in
proclamation No 127 of 1977 and are to:

... carry out,... building construction, repairs and maintenance work...

... prepare the construction contracts to be entered into by any Ministry and Government office and supervise the implementation of the same in accordance with construction directives;

- prepare issue and implement building and urban roads construction directives and regulations of general application,...

- ensure that private buildings and urban-road-construction conform to established standards,...

- issue license to competent building construction contractors; suspend and cancel such licenses;

- establish standards to be complied with by building construction contractors and consultants;

- as regards to organizing and expanding the housing facilities of the people, study, propose, implement and cause to be implemented, when approved, programs aimed at solving, stage by stage, the housing problems of the broad masses; issue directives to private persons, cooperative societies, urban dwellers' association and organizations and encourage their implementation.

- conduct research and experimental development at all levels to enhance urban housing and development and ensure that fruitful results are put to use;

- be responsible for the overall protection and administration of Government buildings, houses, urban lands and roads ...

- in cooperation with the concerned institutions, conduct studies on social and economic questions of the urban centers of the country; prepare their topographic, master and detailed plans; delimit their boundaries; and issue and implement directives for the preparation of overall plans to enhance the development of urban centers in a systematic manner and conforming to the living requirements of the broad masses;
- be responsible for urban settlement projects; in accordance with the National Democratic Revolution Program, prepare directives for the establishment and establish at all levels urban dwellers' associations and municipalities and promote their development; issue directives for, encourage and supervise activities aimed at improving the living conditions of the broad masses of urban dwellers;

- in cooperation with training institutions, ensure that its employees engaged or to be engaged in construction works, urban planning, urban settlement and in other professions related to carrying out the activities of the Ministry are given training that help upgrade their professional standards and render better services to the broad masses.

Negarit Gazeta, (1977)

Moreover, on examining the power and function of the M.U.D.H., one sees that it has the right of eminent domain to acquire urban lands for housing, related service development, or resettlements, and power to develop housing through joint-venture with private or non-profit organizations. Parallel with the organization of the housing institutions, the government introduced different types of housing programs as explained in the preceding pages. These programs sought to ameliorate the housing problems existing in the nation, especially within the major urban areas.

Although there are many institutions involved in the planning of housing, ( see figure 2 ), the M.U.D.H., in cooperation with the H.S.B., is the principal agency through which urban development programs are formulated and housing policies are implemented. The M.U.D.H., as a principal agency, therefore, is given the task to develop and implement comprehensive, propitiously designed housing standards for the greatest number of people, particularly those in lower socio-economic strata. This implies, that the M.U.D.H. has great responsibilities in preparing the housing standards, in deciding the size of lots, and the way they are financed. It implies that the decisions
made by the M.U.D.H. determine which sectors of the population will benefit from the programs.

This is significant, because the indigent sector of the urban population ranges from 75 to 80 percent of the total. As seen in the proclamations for the establishment of H.S.B. and M.U.D.H., the responsibilities and duties given to these institutions indicate government commitment to comprehensive planning and social changes, especially in urban areas where poor housing conditions and ill-defined urban development patterns are apparent. Housing programs sought to enhance housing provisions for deprived masses and, hence, to promote social and economic well-being. The guidelines and housing standards and the financing and mechanisms by which facilities are provided, then, had to be tailored to the ability of that section of the population to participate financially.

Supported by the amplified images from the press, introduction of new housing programs fueled hopes that every family would be a recipient of decent housing. On the other hand, steps taken by the government concerning housing management are seen by housing experts to be consistent with solutions of problems associated with housing in under-developed countries, such as Ethiopia. However, after 11 years of revolutionary change, (1974 -1985), questions still remain as to the degree of success achieved by such housing programs, especially in assisting the poor urban households to obtain adequate housing. To what degree do the programs represent a token response or a radical change in government and public attitudes towards housing? What impact have they had upon the socio-economic life of the urban poor? Finally, how realistic and pragmatic is the housing delivery system in addressing the massive housing problems?

With such questions in mind, a detailed assessment of the different
programs and their institutional framework is the subject of Chapter III. The analyses are done in light of the efficiency, equity and justice of the institutions which are entrusted with the planning and implementation of the different housing programs, as well as in their management and allocation of the resources. Analyses were also done on the basis of the socio-economic status of the beneficiaries of the programs, on the basis of the requirements from the prospective participants in the programs, and the functional aspect of the housing units, and in the fulfillment of the wishes of the residents to achieve a benign urban environment. This chapter also makes an in-depth inquiry of the Kebele-sponsored housing programs. It does so by examining the contributing factors as to why Kebele neighborhoods are unable to undertake neighborhood-based projects and housings.

Literature which was made available from different housing institutions, and results from field research conducted in selected housing sites, are the basis for the analyses.
B. Cooperative Housing

1. Conceptual Basis for the Establishment of Cooperative Associations.

Cooperative Housing is often defined as any form of organization in which a group of people undertake housing cooperatively. Housing Cooperatives have been an effective tool for securing housing in many countries. Egypt, Tunisia, Tanzania and most of the socialist countries have encouraged, and to some extent sponsored, Cooperative Housing for some time. More recent trends in urban housing development have indicated that Cooperative Housing offers a viable solution to the ever-growing discrepancy between supply and demand for housing.

In Ethiopia, Cooperative Housing is a rather recent development. However, other forms of mutual aid, such as Edir, Eqilib and Mahber, have been important as traditional organizations catering to the welfare of its members, for a long time. These associations have been in operation for decades and their contribution to the socio-economic well-being of its members has been and, still is, of major importance. Because of this, it seems worthwhile to briefly describe their essence.

Edir is an institution primarily concerned with providing moral and economic support in time of death or marriage. Edir is practiced among residents of the same neighborhood, regardless of religious beliefs, ethnicity, or political orientation of its members. Though the organization sounds indiscriminatory, the truth is that, the practice of Edir is strong among homogeneous social groups having the same religious background. Here, economic status should not be a criterion for membership in the association. In practice though, members have more or less the same economic status. There is a fixed amount contributed by the members monthly to the
Association. Each association has its own rules and regulations by which members abide. Generally, the wealthier the members, the better the service and organization of the Edir system.

On the contrary, the Equib association is primarily based on economic motives, having its own "book of rules" by which it operates. The Equib functions outside the modern financial system. Its major objective is to provide both savings and loans. The principle of the Equib system is founded on what is, almost, a lottery arrangement among the members. Equib has its own chairman and treasurer, both elected in a democratic way by the members. The strength of the Equib association depends upon how well its members are economically endowed and the amount which each member contributes on a regular basis, whether once a week, every fifteen days, or, once a month. In practice, Equib is practiced among economically homogenous groups. It is the only association which does not discriminate membership on the basis of ethnic, religious or political affiliation. In the Equib association, the major concern is financial. Most frequently, Equib association members have the same economic background, and are often members of the same ethnic group. This is not to say that one cannot find an Equib association having members of a heterogeneous social class. On the contrary, most Equib is practiced among the educated and economically well-to-do and have members of different ethnic and religious backgrounds. Usually the membership of such Equib associations is small.

Though the Equib organization is oriented to deal with economic matters, it also has a social implication. It brings together a social class whose economic status is at the same level and whose objectives coincide with the way the money, once obtained, is used. The money obtained from Equib, depending how much, (which depends on the size of the group and frequency of
contribution) is invested in things that the family perceives to be important. For instance, it is often used in the improvement of housing conditions, for payment of loans, to make important household purchases, such as electrical appliances and furniture, and to invest in facilities aimed at improving the living standard.

The third traditionally oriented association is the *Meredaga*. It is basically a labor and economic sharing institution, organized among neighborhoods of close proximity, regardless of economic status, religious beliefs, or political affiliation. For instance, the most visible use of the *Meredaga* association is the case whereby a member becomes a victim of flooding or fire, and the house is destroyed. In these cases, each *Meredaga* member contributes to the victim financially or morally in the reconstruction of family life, and also contributes labor to rebuild the house. On a modern scale, a well-organized *Meredaga* association, through its economics and manpower, involves the construction of houses, clinics, schools, roads, and provides other types of infrastructures for its neighborhood.

The fourth traditional association is *Tsewa Mehaber*. It is, fundamentally, a religiously oriented institution and practiced within the Christian population. Besides strengthening the religious beliefs of its members, it has another implicit function, which is to keep social order among its members. For instance, members of the same *Tsewa Mehaber* organization are not allowed to gossip about other people or their affairs. *Tsewa Mehaber* members have reciprocal social and moral obligations which sometimes extend to economic ones as well.

The traditional institutions noted above are exercised outside the legal system and have their own social disciplines. Some of them, by their nature, function in a way that is similar to the *Kebelle* system. A case in point is,
Moreover, these institutions are self-initiated and incorporate self-interest motives, which are intended to fulfill the needs of each individual, or of the group. They all have democratic process in their operation and administration. In conjunction, all are traditionally oriented mutual-aid associations, focused mainly on social and economic matters, and are aimed at protecting and assisting the individual in times of happiness and adversity.

Historically, many of these mutual-aid associations developed from the form of social organization in which socio-economic relations and needs bind members of the extended family together. With the advent of urbanization and industrialization, the form and function of these traditional associations were transformed and extended.

Table 2.1 - Participation of Members of Households in Different Socio-Economic Organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Socio-Economic Organization</th>
<th>Households Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equir</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehaber</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edir</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebele Official Candidacy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebele Organized Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Campaign</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Most participants in the **Equir** association are found to be the **Gourge** ethnic group. While in other associations participants were of heterogeneous ethnic background.

The importance of these associations was not significantly known until the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1936. Although, there is not much literature indicating the level of practice in traditional associations by the bulk of the population, past social survey of Addis Ababa indicates that in 1960, out of 600 households surveyed, 21 percent were members of an **Idir** association.
while 27 percent had an *Equib* association.\textsuperscript{17} Other research done by Addis Ababa University attributed the spread of these mutual-aid associations to the pioneering work of the *Gourage Ethnic* groups.\textsuperscript{18} Today, the associations form an important part of the social organization of many urban dwellers. For instance, in 134 sampled households of *kebele* 25 residents, the level of participation by household heads in traditional associations is apparent (see table 2.1). In any case, despite the many socio-economic and political changes taking place in Ethiopia, the underlying principle upon which these associations work remains the same. It is the essential Ethiopian concept that the responsibility of the group is for that of the individual within the group.

The role of these traditional associations in the sphere of Cooperative Housing development is little known. Prior to 1974, the existing laws of land ownership prohibited most low and middle-income families from exploiting the association's potential for capital which would aid in the construction of their houses. Cost of land and construction materials were beyond the reach of most of the population. Thus, it could be justifiably argued that the Ethiopian Cooperative Housing Movements are the outcome of the 1974 Popular Revolution, which overthrew the feudo-capitalist tenureship system, thereby laying the foundation from which traditional associations could be encouraged to widen their scope of activities.

Thus, based on the conceptual organization and functional framework inherent in the traditional associations, on March 3, 1978, the government issued a proclamation to establish of four types of cooperatives, namely: Producers Cooperatives, Service Cooperatives, Thrift and Credit Cooperatives and Housing Cooperatives.\textsuperscript{19} The prospects and potential applications of the Proclamation are intended to be associated with the peasants and the urban
poor. These cooperative societies are formed and organized to fit the legal system of politics. That is, they are legal entities with judicial personalities, established rules and regulations, in accordance to the Ethiopian socialist philosophy. Moreover, members of the board are officials in the different ministries as indicated in the same proclamation.\(^\text{20}\)

The most visible application of the cooperative system in the urban areas is in the housing sectors. In the Housing Cooperatives, the Proclamation authorizes the M.U.D.H. to deal with all types of Housing Cooperatives.\(^\text{21}\) Today, the M.U.D.H. has established a Housing Development and Research Department to issue plans and to register and legalize all other forms of housing programs in the country.

2. Cooperative Housing Member Requirements

There is no official policy statement regarding how Cooperative Housing programs should operate. However, the Ministry has issued guidelines by which the Cooperatives and other housing projects could be undertaken.\(^\text{22}\) Concerning membership for Cooperative Housing, a group could be organized among those who dwell in the same neighborhood. All eligible members for a Cooperative Housing would be either tenants or dependents of tenants; would have a fixed source of income; and, would be older than 18, but younger than 55, which is the age by which the person could finish payment of the loans before retirement. In any cooperative organization, membership should not be less than two and not more than 50 households.

After a thorough examination of the applicant’s financial and other membership criterion, the M.U.D.H. provides a set of housing plans including their cost. Each member has the right to select whichever plan is appropriate to his or her preference and financial ability. In any Cooperative Housing
group, the total number of selected housing types should not be more than six. Varieties of plans are few with respect to architectural forms. However, most plans are designed to be expanded when needed. Furthermore, if members disapprove of the plans, they have the right to hire a private architect, provided they submit the detailed plans and cost involved.

After M.U.D.H. confirmation of the documents, they are sent for loan approval to H.S.B., the only institution which deals with financial aspects. The H.S.B. examines the housing types and cost associated with each, in relation to the financial background of the members. After the loan is secured and payment is arranged, the M.U.D.H. assigns, to each member, lots ranging in size from 200 to 500 square meters. The size of the lot is based upon the housing needs and amount of capital each member is able to allocate for the house.

In the implementation of the project, members select representatives among themselves to deal with all legal aspects involved in the housing, and to follow the entire process. The Cooperatives have rules by which each member has to abide. The organization has legal authorization to use the existing facilities needed for the housing process without undue difficulty. For instance, easy access to construction materials, quick service of electricity and water, and convenience in legal matters, is provided.

Members of Cooperative Housing projects are given any type of assistance upon request to the M.U.D.H. The technical assistance offered by the M.U.D.H. deals with basic education in resource management. If members need assistance in auditing the management of resources, the M.U.D.H. sends experts. If a problem arises among the members regarding deeds or titles and if assistance is requested, the M.U.D.H. sends a conveyancer to deal with the problem. Assistance for detailed designs and inspection of construction, if asked for, is also offered.
In any case, the availability of assistance depends on the relationship between a Cooperative unit and the M.U.D.H. A discussion with an official in the Housing Research and Service Department reveals that the major variable which determines the quality of a relationship between the M.U.D.H. and the Cooperative is the way in which a Cooperative Housing Project is managed and implemented. If a private firm is involved in the construction and management of the project (which has been so in most cases), then the role of M.U.D.H. is limited to the allocation of the lots and, in cooperation with H.S.B., the giving of permission for members to proceed with the project. On the other hand, if M.U.D.H., in addition to the above, also provides the design layout and detail construction documents, then the relationship between the Cooperative unit and M.U.D.H. is extended.

3. Assessment of the Circumstances and Institutional Framework of Cooperative Housing Programs

From the introduction of Cooperative Housing Programs until late 1980, the concept had been increasingly favored, both by the M.U.D.H. and other housing institutions, as a respectable means of encouraging the private population to invest in housing. It was installed with the hope that the program would ameliorate, in part, the urban housing problem. Since 1980, however, the movement has lost its momentum. Several factors have contributed to the decline of Cooperative Housing Programs. Briefly, these include the increase of construction costs and endless, time-consuming bureaucratic processes involving the organization and implementation of the Cooperative Housing Project. There are also problems associated in the securing of loans, high interest and high monthly payments, and, finally, with the government having taken steps to stop the development of new houses until new housing policy is issued. These and other factors, which will be dealt with in detail as the
subject is explored, are believed to have contributed to the decline of the Cooperative Housing movement. However, for the purposes of this study, the assessment of the institutional framework of the Cooperative Housing Program will be based on information made available by the Housing Research and Service Department of M.U.D.H., and on other information gathered during the field visit.

Table 2.2 Registered Housing Cooperative Associations as of March 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size and range of cooperative members (H.H.)</th>
<th>Number of cooperative units</th>
<th>Total Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Based on M.U.D.H. documents, 55 Cooperative Housing units have been registered and given legal entity as of April 1978. This number includes Cooperative Housing units registered from the beginning of November 1976 which had not secured loans and were not given permits until 1977. The approximate total number of members in Cooperative Housing is 1972 households. The breakdown of the size of members of the 51 registered cooperatives is shown in Table 2.2. There are two additional Cooperatives,
with a total of 92 households, for which information was not available.

The largest Cooperative unit is the Africa Wing Cooperative whose members are exclusively employees in the Ethiopian Airlines and Ethiopian Air Force. They have 181 registered households. The second largest is Eneredado Housing Cooperative, with 113 household members. The third and fourth are Yebrhanchora and Tatek with 95 and 56 household members, respectively.

a. Socio-Economic Sectors of the Urban Population which have Benefited from the Program.

Though there have been several socio-economic surveys conducted, there are very few, if any, that have provided a thorough understanding of the relationship between socio-economic characteristics of individuals or groups, their housing demands, preferences, or choices and the types of housing programs in which they participate. In the field of housing, the socio-economic status of individuals has been seen as a major determinant to type, location and quality of housing. These factors are in turn related to current and anticipated size and composition, as well as income of the family. Above all, the individual housing status is determined by the type of housing-delivery mechanisms existing in the country. With this in mind, this section reveals the types of members of the Addis Ababa population who sought the Cooperative Housing Program as a means of securing decent housing.

Under the current Cooperative Housing Programs, a major criterion for member eligibility for available housing options is the age of the applicants. It affects not only the chances of one's acceptance as a member of the Cooperative Housing program, but also the amount of the loan for which the individual can qualify. The amount of the loan for which one qualifies depends on how much one has saved. In other words, the higher the age of a prospective
Cooperative member and smaller the savings, the more limited the opportunity to participate in the program. A discussion with an official in M.U.D.H. reveals that most loans for Cooperative Housing were approved with arrangements to complete payment within 15 years. If the H.S.B. expects the loan to be settled before the borrower is pensioned in accordance with government regulations (55 years for civilian), the prospective cooperative member's age should be under 40 years old.

The 1977-78 M.U.D.H. document regarding eleven Cooperative Housing units, a total of 521 households, indicates that 61 percent of the households, were between 20 and 35 years old, 31 percent were between 30 and 39. Eleven percent of total household members have ages between 40 and 44, while the rest were 45 or older at the time the loan was granted. More recent M.U.D.H. documents regarding Cooperative Housing members indicates that more than 77 percent were in the 20 to 34 age group, and less than 6 percent were in the 35 to 40 age group. Therefore, one can conclude that the criteria set by the M.U.D.H. and H.S.B. give opportunities to those households from 20 to 40 years of age, while it excludes those who are over 40 years old. This is, of course, without considering the criteria which deal with the economic status of the participants.

The income of a prospective household is another important variable that plays a role in explaining the different patterns of housing for which individuals opt in a Cooperative Housing Program. It also affects the individual's choice of housing types as well as the quality and size of the units. In this regard, based on the information given to M.U.D.H. by household members in 1977-78, the aggregate income of both the household head and the spouse is compiled in a rather crude subdivision (see table 2.3).

A number of significant points could be made concerning the
representation of various income groups in Cooperative Housing programs. Most of all, it shows that a considerable majority of Cooperative members, 81.8 percent, have income greater than 250 BIRR per month and belong to the middle or upper-income groups in the urban population income distribution categorization.

Table 2.3 Size and Distribution Pattern of Monthly Household Income of Cooperative Housing Members (1977-78).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income of household (BIRR per month)</th>
<th>Household frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 200</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-800</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note stated</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The additional two cooperative units are included.

According to the findings of the M.U.D.H. 1976 documents, members of the population who had income less than 99 BIRR per month comprised 51.94 percent, and those who had income between 100 to 199 BIRR per month were 21.7 percent. In other words, of the total households sampled, 73.6 percent have incomes less than 199 BIRR per month. A similar survey conducted in
1979 indicates that of the total sampled survey of Addis Ababa households, 56.7 percent were found to have income up to 100 Brt per month, while 20.12 percent had income between 101 to 200 Brt per month. This is a total of 76.8 percent of the sampled households to having an income of up to 200 Brt per month. A 1964 M.U.D.H. report concerning Addis Ababa population income status, indicates that 61.9 percent have income less than 100 Brt, while 18.6 percent have income between 100 and 200 Brt per month, making a total of 80.5 percent of the population within the income category of less than 200 Brt per month. The picture regarding Addis Ababa urban population income distribution strongly suggests that economically strong households had better possibility of improving their housing condition through Cooperative Housing efforts.

The reason for the concentration of middle and higher-income groups in Cooperative Housing could be due to the high flow of information these groups have regarding the institutional, organizational and monetary requirements expected of them from M.U.D.H. and H.S.B. Most people in this economic bracket have the ability needed to get more information about the program. Moreover, they have easy access to the information, because they have better positions in the employment sectors. On the other hand, examining the eligibility criteria set forward for participation in the program, one finds that the requirements could only be fulfilled by middle or higher-income class. As will be seen in the subsequent chapter, even government constructed "Low-Cost" housing opens no doors to the criteria by which the low-income groups may be accepted as tenants.

The concentration of middle and higher-income brackets in the program could be further explained if the available options for financing are seen in terms of whether or not options could be met by low-income households.
Based on information made available by officials in the M.U.D.H., H.S.B. and the
field visit, there are three ways by which the financing of any housing program
is acted upon. There are loans from H.S.B., private savings, and a combination
of H.S.B. loans and savings. However, since the program started, all
Cooperative Housing members have used the third financial plan. That is, a
combination of H.S.B. loans and private savings.

Of the housing units exhibited for Cooperative members by M.U.D.H., the
smallest one has an area of 18.5 square meters. It consists of a one-room
unit, with the kitchen and toilet being located outside. The cost associated in
the construction of the units is judged to be, based on the 1978 value, 7,500
Birr. This cost is determined by the H.S.B. to be the minimum amount each
member should deposit in the bank in order to get a loan and, hence, start the
project. It is interesting to note that all the Cooperative Housing projects
have housing units with more rooms and better facilities than minimum
housing type M.U.D.H. exhibits (see Appendix B, No. 9, 10, 11 and 12). The only
minimum housing type constructed was in self-help and government low-cost
housing programs (see Appendix B, No. 42). Since the 7,500 Birr deposit is a
prerequisite for qualification in Cooperative Housing, under the prevailing
urban socio-economic condition, only the upper-middle and higher-income
groups are able to provide that amount. For the average urban population,
7,500 Birr in savings could be had with 10 or 15 years of hard work. A
discussion with the director of the H.S.B. regarding the lending policy reveals
that under no circumstances does the H.S.B. grant loans for individuals, groups
or organizations, such as Kebele neighborhood, if that individual or group has
no savings or collateral. The discussion further revealed that, from the
introduction of the program until June 1985, the H.S.B. has made available
59,360,000 Birr for 182 cooperative units, representing a total of 4,797
household members. Based on the socio-economic status of members in the program, the vast majority of loan beneficiaries were in the higher-income groups. With the exception of a few who have business establishments, most beneficiaries are employed in the best employment sector, and have a regular monthly income.

The extent to which the existing housing financing system favors those economically well-to-do classes is further indicated by the amount of the loans and number of households who were engaged in the private housing program. For instance, through June 1965, the H.S.B. had granted loans for 7,875 households, representing 100,217,000 Birr. In all cases, they were individuals who have well-established financial backgrounds and who sought help from the available financing system. The housing plans, as well as the materials used in the construction, are also superior to the commonly constructed houses (see Appendix B, No. 7 and 8).

Additional related factors could be pointed out as possible explanations for the under-representation of low-income groups in the Cooperative Housing movement. For that matter, this is true of any type of housing program. However, the facts have more to do with the housing financing system. Simply put, the financing system disassociates the low-income groups from benefits by making the criteria unfit and irrationally formulated, and does not take into consideration the socio-economic circumstances of the majority of the population, who happen to be in low-income brackets. The poor are confronted and frustrated the most by problems of housing and related services.

In any housing program, the cost of the housing unit is the single most important determinant of the kind of housing each member wishes to build. It directly reflects the household's present, and anticipated, aggregate income. The preferred housing cost, therefore, is a strong reflection of the members
economic status and position on the income ladder. With this in mind, it is worthwhile to make a comparative assessment of cost preferences between private homebuilders and cooperative ones, based on the 1978 M.U.D.H. document.

Table 2.4 - Approximate Cost Breakdown of House Plans given to Private Homebuilders between June 1976 – January 1978.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. cost of houses</th>
<th>No. of house plans</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3000-7000</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001-10,000</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-22,500</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As the principle institution, the M.U.D.H. is responsible for giving house plans to individuals, if requested. These individuals are usually those whose financial status do not allow them to hire a private architect. Between 1976 and 1978, the M.U.D.H. issued 1,230 house plans to individual households (see table 2.4). Among these house plans, the most preferred ones were those whose cost ranged between 3,000 to 5,000 BIRR. They amounted to 34.3 percent (390 house plans), followed by those which ranged between 5,500 to 7,000 BIRR, or 25.7 percent (317 plans). Speculation on the overall cost preference for individual housing indicates that the bulk of the house plans given to households fall into what could be described as low-cost houses. The M.U.D.H. describes low-cost houses as those which cost between 3,000 to 10,000 BIRR based on the 1985 - 86 building costs.27
On the other hand, speculation on cost preference of 521 Cooperative Housing members during the same period reveals that preferred housing units which cost less than 11,000 Birr are significantly fewer than preferred house types given by M.U.D.H. with unit costs of up to 10,000 Birr (see table 2.5). Therefore, it is apparent that a significant proportion of Cooperative Housing members' income falls into what could be legitimately considered to be a higher-income category.

Table 2.5 Cost Preference of Housing Cooperative Member (1977-79).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred cost of housing unit (in Birr)</th>
<th>Household No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,001-5,000</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-11,000</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,001-20,000</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-30,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-50,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-60,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The reality of this situation is apparent if one examines the situation from a different view. For instance, let us examine the 18.2 percent of the 521 households in the Cooperative Housing whose income is 200 Birr per month, and assume the average income of the individual household is 150 Birr per month (see Table 2.3). Let's say the household wants to build a house which
costs, on the higher end of the low-cost housing margin, 10,000 BIRR. According to the H.S.B., the maximum loan allowed to lower-income groups is 3,000 BIRR. The loan, therefore, amounts to 30 percent of the low-cost housing. If a household is assumed to have 70 percent of the total cost of the housing in his or her personal savings (which is unlikely under the current economic circumstances), according to the loan policy, a household with income of 150 BIRR can pay 25 percent of his monthly income. That is 38 BIRR per month for twelve and a half years at a 9 percent loan rate. The total payment, therefore, would be 5,700 BIRR provided repayment of the loan is made before retirement age.

As it was pointed out earlier, 70 to 75 percent of the Addis Ababa population has monthly income of less than 200 BIRR. Based on information concerning income levels and cost of housing units, under no circumstances would a low-income household have an opportunity to participate in the program. In the above example, it is unlikely a household with an income of 150 BIRR per month would afford the opportunity of building build a house which costs 10,000 BIRR, even if savings amounted 70 percent of the total house cost.

The differences in housing unit costs are a reflection of varieties in the housing types, the facilities which exist, the construction material used, and locational preferences (see Field Findings). As table 2.4 and 2.5 reveal, M.U.D.H. standard housing types offered to Cooperative Housing members do not match the type of housing members prefer to construct. In order to match member housing preference, almost all Cooperative Housing was designed by private architects and constructed by private contractors. Why then, should anyone undertake a Cooperative Housing project? The reasoning is simple and reflects certain advantages of the program.
People organize themselves into Cooperatives not because they want housing plans at no cost, but rather to have easy and quick access to the legal aspects involved in the housing process. Most of all, they want to obtain lots located in choice parts of urban areas. Cooperative Housing units are usually large in number, thus the entire complex must be designed to fit the existing and planned urban system. Connection to the existing infrastructure system becomes easy, as it is planned for the entire complex rather than as individual units. Examination of the housing of the existing Cooperatives indicates that the M.U.D.H. seems to have shown preference to this program.

For example, examining the distribution of the various Cooperative Housing sites in the city, one sees that almost all houses have the most attractive sites, are uncomplicated by the earlier tenureship system and, hence, remain open for residential development purposes. These areas were previously owned by dignitaries of the Haile Selassie regime. The areas have strategically developed highways and access roads. They have electricity and water lines, and some sections have well-developed sewage systems. They are not densely populated and, until recently, they were characterized by large and scattered individual lots. In short, the areas contain most of the important factors that individual or groups take into consideration when they make their location preferences and decisions known.28

As table 2.6 shows, more than 81 percent of Cooperative Housing projects are located in Ketena 3. This region is not only characterized by major access roads and basic infrastructure layouts but, until 1974, it was one of the urban residential areas which was inhabited by the well-to-do socio-economic sector of the urban population.

The under-representation of low-income groups in the Cooperative Housing Program is also due to the irrational price escalation of basic building
materials such as stone, wood, cement, sand and other construction materials needed for proper housing, (see Chapter IV). However, as groups organize themselves for the construction of their houses, they are given priority for easy and quick access to the necessary legal papers for connection to

### Table 2.6 Housing Cooperative; Household Size; Registration Date and Location (1977-1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Cooperative Unit</th>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Date of Registration</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Keletega</th>
<th>Kebele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EELPA (light comp.)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3/01/77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EELPA (light comp.)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14/02/77</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beit Behebret</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13/10/77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meji</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21/02/78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigil Lelombe</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25/02/78</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibret Leedige</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26/02/78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yememeharan Amba N.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28/02/78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siga Meda Terara</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29/02/78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yehibret Amba</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20/03/78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zede</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>03/06/78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeka Terara</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3/11/78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edeget Bandinet</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24/11/78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EELPA (light comp. N.1)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25/12/78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andenet Pire</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yekabena Minch</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>534</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

infrastructure service and for inexpensive materials. The organization is in direct response to the M.U.D.H. policy which states that Cooperative Housing members will be given priority in access to legal information and to the construction materials. Most houses, if constructed using materials purchased on the open market, would have cost a third more than what they cost using available channels for Cooperative Housing. As a matter of fact, cost of materials is one of the major reasons that economically well-to-do groups undertake Cooperative Housing projects.

4. Field Findings

In order to get additional information about the Cooperative Housing process, and to determine the opinions of residents about the program and the built environment, interviews were conducted with residents who took part. All the Cooperative Houses are located in the Bole residential area which is one of the best area in the urban system. It has almost all the necessary criteria that individuals or groups need to take into consideration when they express their locational preference. The field findings contain all the facts put forward in the preceding paragraphs; that is, the socio-economic status of members, the type of construction materials used, the housing types, the cost involved, and problems associated with undertaking large cooperatively sponsored housing projects.

The first case is an apartment complex located on Bole Airport Avenue. There are 20 units in this housing complex. The units are arranged in four groups of two-story buildings. They have well-kept gardens in front and back. Each unit has a service quarter in the rear. Almost all members are university graduates with five to ten years work experience, and the income bracket minimum is 700 Birr per month. In one block, all the occupants are
architects. Building construction began in 1978. Each housing unit cost the individuals 25,000 Birr, and has two bedrooms upstairs with living and dining rooms and kitchen downstairs. An interview was conducted with one of the residents, who is an architect working in the M.U.D.H., Addis Ababa Master Plan Department. When asked about their experience with the Cooperative Housing process, he stated:

... all members knew each other in the academic world. The housing complex was constructed with a combination of loans from the H.S.B. and private savings. The monthly loan payment differs in each case. However, it ranges between 170 and 250 Birr per month.

The advantage of being in Cooperative Housing is that it is easy to get materials from government-established distribution centers cheaply. Moreover, as most of the finishings, kitchen and toilet equipment is imported, Cooperative Housing members could get this equipment quickly and cheaply. This applies to other construction materials such as bricks, cement and masonry for the foundation and steel needed for reinforcing the floors. In general, the whole process (i.e. legal and construction), becomes cost efficient.

In our case, we designed the whole complex and handed it to a contractor. Of course, we had our representatives follow the whole process.... We had a few problems which impeded the construction progress. Delay in the supply of construction material due to shortage is a common case in point, which is evident in most housing programs.

A similar housing complex located in Kebele25 Kebelegna 17 is the second case. The person interviewed was a fourth year university student who was the son of a resident in the complex. In this complex, there are 26 households. Twenty-four of them have a nuclear family while two were bachelors. In the complex, there are two university professors, an Addis Ababa University Dean, an administrator of Phillips Company, the President of Ethiopian Life Insurance and three other officials working in different government
organizations. The complex is a two-story building. It was designed and constructed by a private company. The building is constructed of brick, each unit has a balcony with French window. The cost of each unit ranges from 30,000 to 40,000 Birr.

There are two types of units. One has three bedrooms (two upstairs and one downstairs). Each has sanitation facilities on both levels, with kitchen, dining space and living rooms downstairs. The other units have two bedrooms. Each unit has internal stairs, sanitation facilities on both levels, and built-in closets with storage space. In addition, each unit has service quarters, an outside kitchen (getches bette), and back and front lawns. Members meet regularly to discuss problems associated with the housing and to make contributions covering outside maintenance and monthly expenses of the guard, who is also a gardener.

This complex is perceived as one of the best Cooperative Housing units in the city. This perception is based on the overall image of the complex, such as appearance, landscaping, and construction material used. The socio-economic status of the households who live in it is also reflected. Had it not been through a Cooperative Housing program, these households would have spent much more for construction, since they would have been forced to use private channels for the supply of materials.

The third housing complex is located in a different section but in the same residential area. It is located in Kebele 18 of Kefetegna 17. It is quite different from the two previously discussed. First, there are separate houses as opposed to apartment buildings. Second, the complex is large and, third, no one perceives the houses as being constructed cooperatively. Rather, they look as if they were constructed by individuals using the Private Housing program. All the houses are made of mud and straw with masonry foundation, reinforced
concrete floors, and corrugated iron sheet for the roof. (see Appendix B, No.11, 12, 13 and 14)

The housing started in 1978 and was one of the largest type of its kind, with a total of 250 registered households at the beginning of the program. However, only 106 households managed to complete their houses. Members in this housing complex are exclusively employees of the Ethiopian Airlines Company. There are eight housing types. The smallest housing type has two bedrooms, living and dining space, and a toilet inside the main habitable unit. The kitchen is located outside. The largest housing type has four bedrooms, living and dining space, with toilet and kitchen inside the main unit. There are only three four-bedroom units. The other housing types, between the smallest and the largest, have two to three rooms, and living and dining space. All units have toilet and bath inside the main habitable unit. In some, the kitchens are located inside, in others, outside. Those which have inside kitchens also have additional outside kitchens (Ketchese Bette), and service quarters. The lot size of each unit ranges from 200 to 350 square meters.30

The cost of the houses range from 20,000 to 50,000 Birr. Income of the household heads range from 600 Birr to 2500 Birr per month. The average household size in this group is five, including a housekeeper. Observing the overall housing environment, more than 90 percent of the houses have a masonry fence and a few have fences made of corrugated iron sheet.

After the members organized as a group at their workplace (Ethiopian Airlines Company), the loan was granted to the organization. The size of loan allowed for each household ranges from 15,000 to 25,000, with an interest rate of 9 percent payable within 10 to 15 years. Each member, therefore, had to use additional money from his or her savings for the completion of the houses.
The undertaking of the housing process was left to the organization. The construction of the housing was given to a private contractor. Elected representatives of the members had the task of following the progress of the housing as well as managing financial affairs. While the houses were under construction, no member knew which house was his or hers, though they knew the unit size. In this complex, a housewife was interviewed. When asked how she viewed Cooperative Housing, she spoke as follows:

... in general, the program is good. Had it been well managed, and if the agreement made at the start with each household concerning the type of finished product had been kept intact, every household would have been happy. In our Cooperative Housing, each household was promised a housing unit complete with all finishing parts. However, this was not the case... When we were told the house was finished, it did not have paint, the kitchen and service rooms were not built; the toilets did not have the proper equipment such as bathtub or shower, washbowl, and toilet, windows and doors were installed, but not painted.

When the elected committee was asked about this, the only reason they gave was that the money which was allocated for the housing was finished. From the time each household received their housing, he or she had to take over the rest of the housing construction problems.

It has been almost five years since we started residing in the house, as it can be seen, the housing is not yet finished. My house needs fencing which is now under construction and the kitchen (Yetchese Beite) and the service room need painting.

At first the house was said to cost 20,000, but now we have added more than four thousand Birr to do the additional work. All the additional work we did was included in the agreement we made at the start except the fencing... For our house, we had a loan of 15,000 on which we make monthly payments of 125 Birr to H.S.B. for fifteen years, (see Appendix B. No. 13 and14).

She blames the major failure of the housing program, in part, on the
committee which was responsible for management of financial matters, and in part on the contractors who undertook the housing construction. When asked about the 250 original members of the Cooperative and how it dwindled to only 106, she stated:

In this housing program, a lot of patience was needed until the project was completed. It took more than a year dealing with the legal aspects and organizing the housing process before the actual construction of housing started. During that time, some people gave up on the concept of participating in the program due to disagreement and lack of patience. After construction started, which took almost three years to complete, a few households withdrew for the same reasons, as well as financial problems. The committee had to find other interested households to participate in the program.

In short, the decrease in number is due to the existence of bureaucratic housing procedures and failure to meet the financial obligation each household agreed to, before the housing process started.

When asked about the existing amenities, she observed that, except for the problem of public transportation, (almost all residents have a car), the area is one of the few which has education and recreation facilities in immediate proximity. The area has paved major roads and unpaved access roads. The area has electricity, water, sewage and telephone lines which make the connection process easy for new houses. Though all major health facilities are located in the central section of the city, the area has a small clinic for emergencies. For shopping, the neighborhood has well-organized kebele-owned Cooperative Shops which have most of the consumer goods needed by the residents. However, when there is a need for major shopping, residents have to travel to the Mercato Market Center, which is a half-hour drive from the area. The area is well-landscaped and is a residential area for economically well-to-do people. Because all residents in the housing complex work at Ethiopian
Conclusion

Much of the debate as to how Cooperative Housing Programs operate, are implemented, and the premises governing them, have been clearly stated. When government introduced Cooperative Housing, it was with the hope that the disadvantaged socio-economic sector of the population would take part the program for the construction of their houses. However, examining the program itself, the housing types, as well as the socio-economic status of the groups who took part in the program, the findings illustrate without doubt that the end result has been opposite to its declared aims. As a matter of fact, a key-point could be made that the program is contrary to the principles for which the government stands. That is, the Cooperative Housing Programs, as they have been implemented, tend to create new problems in the sphere of social inequalities, which the government has fought against. There have been inequalities in gaining access to construction materials, in the application to financial networks, and in the allocation of sites and services. Unless the Cooperative Program is transformed into a genuine system of social housing, the economically and socially well-to-do sector of the population will be singularly benefited. This does not imply that well-off sectors of the population should be prohibited from participation; it simply means that a sound program should be developed, one that is consistent with the ideological principles of the government. If the central aim of the program is to create equality in the sphere of housing and related services, the program should be redesigned to encourage participation by the bulk of the population. As the program operates today, the system governing it is far from the right course of action needed to achieve its objectives.
C. Resettlement Housing

A. Background

Resettlement Housing is a government-sponsored housing program intended to achieve two objectives. First, it is intended to minimize the density of population in a residential complex. For instance, in processes involving the upgrading of existing residential circumstances, the main objective is to achieve improvement of the infrastructure and housing conditions of the residents. However, on some occasions, displacement of the residents is inevitable due to the need for more space, or due to the need for additional infrastructure services, to ease overcrowding in the housing.

Second, Resettlement Programs are undertaken when the residential area is needed for development of projects other than housing. For instance, according to the Master Plan for Addis Ababa, which was completed after four years of study, the entire urban area is divided into sections where low and high-rise residential complexes should be developed; sections where commerce, recreation, education, health facilities, and government offices should be developed. In short, it deals with the complex issues of development of urban components, types and standards; also, it indicates how and where they should be developed. In addition to this, detailed specification of the urban infrastructure system, with development phases, has been studied. Under current urban conditions, the most congested residential areas are located in the central part of the city. These are also the areas which lack basic infrastructure services. Under the new Master Plan, these areas have either been upgraded or Resettlement Programs will be undertaken.

Implementation of urban development programs according to the Master Plan was due to start in mid-1986. But, since the 1974 revolution, only one
Resettlement scheme had been undertaken. The main reason was that the areas where the resettled population was located were needed for development of new projects and expansion of existing ones. There were three residential areas located in the central part of the city where housing conditions were so poor there was an immediate need either to upgrade the housing or to displace residents to other areas. One of these areas was needed for development of a new project, while the other two areas were needed for the expansion of existing facilities. The areas were as follows.

First, there was *Fille wouho* residential area in Kebele 24 of Kefetegna 15. This area contained a *Fille wouho* public-bath complex. It was the only one of its type in Addis Ababa which made use of naturally hot-spring water. New bath facilities had to be constructed in order to give more service to the public. Because of this, residents who formerly were settled on adjacent areas had to be resettled. The construction of additional bath facilities has been completed and is now giving service to the public.

The second residential area was in Kebele 26 of Kefetegna 15 which bordered the southern section of Addis Ababa’s Hilton Hotel. The area was needed to add more rooms to the hotel which had been planned from the initial phase of the hotel construction. Residents of the area had to be resettled in other areas. The additional construction of the hotel is almost completed and has planned to open by early 1987.

The third residential area was in Kebele 7 of Kefetegna 18 near the Abyot Adebabay (Revolution square). The area was needed to construct the Sheraton Hotel. The project was a joint-venture between the Ethiopian and Libyan governments; however, because of the loose relationship between the two governments, the project has never started and the area remains open. The residents, on the other hand, resettled into other areas. The total number of
households displaced amounts to 150. They were resettled in three areas. One of the largest Resettlement Housing complexes is located in the western section of Addis Ababa, about six kilometers from the Mercato Market Center and about ten kilometers from the old residential area. The other two Resettlement complexes are located in the southeast section of the city, on Debre Zeit Road near a national park.

The largest Resettlement Housing complex, named Kolfe, has a total of 96 households. Residents are composed of households from the already mentioned three residential areas. The Kolfe complex was selected for study, first, because the complex was constructed from materials manufactured on the site. Second, since it is the largest complex of its type, it was felt it represented opportunities for investigation of the environment of Resettlement Housing with respect to housing types and resident problems within the complex and in the region. Third, it was selected because its location is neither on the urban fringe nor in the central section of the city, but in an area where access to public transportation is available to and from work and market centers, and is near education and recreation centers. On this basis, field research on the housing conditions and on residents' feelings about the housing was pursued, as documented in the subsequent section.

2. Field Findings.

Leaving the Mercato Market going toward the Kolfe area, one passes through a residential area of middle and low-income people. Approaching the Kolfe Resettlement Housing complex, there is a small-scale open market, many butcher shops (the area is known for its meat market), bars and other stores where residents shop for consumer goods. The Kolfe Resettlement Housing environment is one of the first of its kind in Addis Ababa. After two years of
on-site construction, it was occupied by residents in 1983. Although the source of capital for construction is not clear, residents believe it was sponsored and constructed by the Ethiopian government. It is administered by the R.H.A which is a division of the M.U.D.H. The R.H.A is responsible for maintenance of the complex and its environment, as well as proper provision of necessary services to the residents. It is also the authority to which residents pay rent, and to which complaints of the residents are forwarded.

Three years have passed since the complex was completed and residents were settled. On the eastern section of the site, the complex has triangular shaped, open space, which was reserved for construction of a day-care center, administration office, and a playground for children. However, none of the facilities mentioned were built and the space is left as no-man's-land. From time-to-time, a few children play football and animals graze in the area (see, Appendix B, No. 19).

There are two types of housing units in the complex. Three residents were selected at random and were interviewed concerning the program. The first one interviewed was a housewife and former resident of the Fille Wouha area. Her husband, who worked as a driver in a private company, had an accident and his employment was terminated. The family has no income except that generated by the wife. She sells charcoal and firewood and occasionally makes Tella (traditional beer) to sale. They have one small child. The amount of rent due on the house is 13 Birr per month. In order to overcome the financial problem, the family has converted the kitchen to a bedroom and rented it to a bachelor who is a teacher. He pays them 13 Birr per month, which subsidizes the rent the family pays to the R.H.A. Unlike a few other households which have managed to buy gas-cookers, this woman uses an uncovered area in her backyard for cooking (see Appendix B, No.38). Except for
common problems shared by all residents about the housing and neighborhood, in general, she and her husband are very happy with the current housing arrangement when compared to previous housing conditions.

The second person interviewed was a woman who lives in a two-room housing unit, in the same block. She is a housewife. At the time of the interview, her husband was at work. He works near Abyot Adebaby (Revolution Square) and uses two bus lines for transportation. He is a maintenance man who earns 90 Birt per month and does additional work from time-to-time when it is available. There are three children; two of them go to high school while the youngest goes to elementary school. The family pays 13 Birt per month for rent. The household previously lived in the Fille woube area.

The interesting characteristic of this housing is that there is no one in the complex who has indicated their satisfaction with the housing unit by making any effort to improve their living environment. While others complain about the size of the rooms, this family has constructed an additional room for the two sons to be used for sleeping and study. Moreover, the family has a beautifully fenced garden with flowers and banana trees (see Appendix B, No. 36). As a storage place for firewood and other household items, the wife has made a small, covered area next to the kitchen. Everything is kept very clean. Inside the house, they have constructed ceilings, and the walls inside and out are painted white. The housewife was asked whether she likes the house she lives in when compared to her previous housing condition. The statement was:

...I, and all family members, are very happy about the house. We have our own toilet, kitchen, even backyard as you see. Moreover, the rent is very low. Before, we were renting one room for 20 Birt per month and had to share a toilet which was a disgrace to be called so, and living in a small compound with no open space outside. Here, as one can see, the
rooms are too small, but the lot is quite large enough if one wants to add an additional room, as I did.

The third person interviewed was a man who is married and has four children, ages 4 to 15 years old. The family has a housekeeper. He and his family lived near the Abyot Adestaay (Revolution Square). At the time of the interview, he was on sick-leave and his wife was at work. She is employed by Ethiopian Airlines. She gets to and from work by the company service-car. Her income was not disclosed. However, the husband has a salary of 200 Birr per month from employment in a government office. He is very much satisfied with the housing condition. The housing unit has two bedrooms, a dining and living room, a kitchen and toilet located outside. The total rent he pays is 26 Birr per month, with a total of 10 to 12 Birr monthly expenses for electricity and water. Like all others, he is happy with the housing conditions compared to the past. However, that feeling is not expressed as enthusiastically as was stated by the second woman interviewed. Internally, the roof has no ceilings and the walls need painting. The outside has a poorly-kept yard which does not have a fence. Despite the low rent and better housing conditions when compared to his earlier housing, the man leaves all responsibility for maintenance and additional work needed in the house to the R.H.A. There was no sign of efforts to make his house more habitable. However, as he was an elected person in the neighborhood’s Mahabir organization, he was a great help in pointing out the major problems associated with the housing complex. Some of them were beyond the financial ability of the residents to ameliorate.

In general, the three residents interviewed were very cooperative in discussing the problems prevailing in the housing environment, and they stated the satisfaction which was felt by all residents. The items that they found satisfying were: the rent is very low, residents have privately piped-water,
electricity, kitchen and toilet facilities. They are happy about the open space at the back, (although most people do not keep it properly) and about the size of the lot, (which is around 180 square meters). Residents were well-acquainted and have good social relations. They have had Edir and Mehber organizations since 1984. Generally, all residents thought the current housing condition was much better than the previous one. They had not met any restrictions from the R.H.A or kebele officials regarding activities pursued by the residents either within their lot or within the habitable unit. For example, construction of an additional room within one's lot, or conversion of the kitchen to a room to be rented it to others to generate income were overlooked or tacitly permitted.

The first complaint of all residents, as field observation reveals, is maintenance problems associated with the walls of the housing complex. At the time these interviews were conducted, the building was only three years old. If an outsider looks at the entire complex, he could assume the age of the building to be twenty to thirty-years old.

The problem started one year after the tenants took over. As was stated in the foregoing paragraphs, the housing complex was constructed from concrete hollow blocks manufactured on site. In some cases, cracks are so big one can see inside (see, Appendix B, No. 45 and 46). Cracks can develop from many causes or combination of causes, (e.g. shrinkage, building movement, foundation settlement, severe changes in the weather and even from improper installation of plumbing fixtures in the walls). Some of the problems could have been avoided had the responsible authority done the necessary maintenance. For instance, the wall allows water into the main habitable unit, especially during heavy rainfall seasons when most houses become flooded. Three important factors are contributing to this problem: first, is the wall
cracking; second, the top of the wall does not have any type of coping; and third, at the point where the corrugated iron sheet joins the wall, there is no properly constructed, paved drain interceptor for the water running off the roof, (see Appendix B, No. 46 and 47).

Among additional problems that the residents mentioned, walls needed to be painted and openings, roofs and ceilings needed to be repaired. The configuration of the entire housing units presents danger of fire hazards and spread of communicable disease. The sewage disposal system does not function properly and, as a result, along the side of a street, there are leakages and the effluent materials flow over the road, causing health hazards to the residents, especially to small children who play along the road side, (see Appendix B, No. 64). The size of the rooms were mentioned as being too small to accommodate all family members (see Appendix B, No. 20). The complex does not have street lights, and theft was reported as a major problem, too.

Since most residents work in their previous residential area, they have difficulty getting transportation to their work area. Most residents take two buses or taxi. Moreover, the Kolfe area has very few public buses which run on schedule. One has to wait more than 30-40 minutes in the station. The problem associated with the transportation has been reported to officials, but residents see no action taken. Alienation was one of the few social problems mentioned by the residents. The kebele officials and residents outside the complex do not consider the residents in the Kolfe Resettlement Complex as part of the kebele neighborhood. For the last two years (1983-85), all residents had problems getting their kebele-ration. The rest of the kebele population considers them as "refugees from an hunger-striken area" and state that, "market items in the area became expensive since the Resettlement
Neighborhood came into existence

Conclusion

It is clear that there is a certain degree of satisfaction with the housing among the residents in the Resettlement complex. This compares favorably with prior housing available to them; they now have better housing and facilities. The rent is low and, in some cases, households have supplemented available funds by converting the kitchen into a bedroom and renting to others. Some have constructed additional rooms to ease overcrowding. However, the entire housing complex has major maintenance problems. Of all the maintenance problems, cracks in the walls was the major complaints. The cracks were also a problem that most of the residents in other housing sites have repeatedly reported, (see Appendix B, No. 45). Residents have reported these problems to the appropriate authority, the R.H.A.; however, they have not seen help coming from the authorities, not only for the maintenance problems which need capital and skilled manpower, but for the simpler types of maintenance matters previously discussed.

D. Low-Cost Housing
A. Rental Housing Authority (R.H.A)

In search of solutions for the urban housing problem, one of the housing programs which sought to address the problem was construction of "low-cost" housing, sponsored by the government. This program is financed in part by government funds budgeted for housing and, in part, by revenue collected from nationalized housing stock. There are over 16,200 housing units with monthly rent value 100 Birr and more. These houses amount to 7 percent of the total
stock in Addis Ababa. The program has the objective of providing shelter for those income brackets of the population who can not provide decent housing for themselves. The construction of the low-cost housing program is run by the R.H.A. Although the major duties of the authority are to maintain the existing housing stock and to construct low-cost housing apartment projects and hostels, its construction activities involve a variety of projects other than housing: for example, construction of supermarkets, clubs for military personnel, small shopping centers and even maintenance of hotels which are not under the jurisdiction of the R.H.A.

From 1976 until 1984, the R.H.A has constructed a total of 2800 housing units in Addis Ababa, of which 32.4 percent (906) are considered low-cost housing units. Of these low-cost housing units, 556 were constructed in the fiscal year of 1983-84. Presumably, the tenants of low-cost housing units are in the lower income bracket. The number of low-cost housing units reflects the level of attention paid by the authority in accomplishing one of its central objectives. Examining the R.H.A capital investment on housing over the last several years, the data showed that only 9.6 percent (9.2 million Birr) out of a total of 96 million Birr has been invested in "low-cost" housing projects. The significantly smaller share of the R.H.A budget allocated to low-cost housing construction is another important indication of the what is considered an inadequate level of efforts made to provide housing for low-income groups of urban population (i.e. households with monthly income of less than 200 Birr per month).

The low level of low-cost housing production by the R.H.A, has not been without criticism. In response to criticism since 1983, the R.H.A has shown an increment in its budget for the construction of low-cost housing. For instance, for the 1983-84 fiscal year the R.H.A had a budget of 40 million Birr for the
construction of different types of housing. Of this amount, capital marked for investment in low-cost housing took 16.25 percent (6.5 million Birr). The amount is considered to be very small compared to the magnitude of housing needs for low-income groups. The amount to be invested on low-cost housing is shared by similar other cities with Addis Ababa. As a matter of fact, the increase in capital for low-cost housing was an effort by the R.H.A. to expand construction in other regional cities. However, it appeared to be a symbolic move of political significance rather than one addressing the actual housing issue. In other words, there has been no real increase in the "low-cost" housing budget at the capital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-cost Housing Sites</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Total cost in million Birr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arba Mintch</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harar</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kombolcha</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dire Dawa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseb</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baher Dare</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1032</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A more recent M.U.D.H. document indicates that, between 1983 and 1984,
1,032 low-cost houses has been constructed in different urban areas in the country. Of these, more than 50 percent were located in Addis Ababa. The rest were in other regional cities (for detail see table 2.7). During the same fiscal year, the R.H.A undertook construction of a total of seventeen apartment buildings, (six in Addis Ababa and eleven in Nazaret), and nine hostels which are intended to accommodate adult tenants. These projects have been finished and most of them are rented to foreigners who reside in Addis Ababa and Nazaret.40 (see Appendix B, No. 5 and 6).

Table 2.8. Revenue Collected by the R.H.A from Nationalized; Newly Constructed Housing Stocks; and Other Types of Buildings - 1976-1983: Addis Ababa and Other Regions, (Birr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Expected revenue</th>
<th>Collected</th>
<th>Difference (uncollected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,938,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53,436,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>45,616,000</td>
<td>43,877,900</td>
<td>1,738,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>52,187,000</td>
<td>47,376,400</td>
<td>4,810,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>56,141,600</td>
<td>56,636,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>75,418,800</td>
<td>73,851,500</td>
<td>1,567,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>75,332,900</td>
<td>74,703,500</td>
<td>2,629,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984*</td>
<td>95,595,200</td>
<td>78,849,100</td>
<td>16,746,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402,292,500</td>
<td>480,676,900</td>
<td>27,491,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Problems associated with the management of R.H.A resources have pointed to major factors impeding the effective role of the authority in the production of "low-cost" housing. As mentioned earlier, the financing of R.H.A. housing construction is done partly by government funds and partly by revenue collected from nationalized houses which are administered by the R.H.A. Examining the revenue collected by the authority from 1971 through 1983, the authority has been losing millions of uncollected Birr each year. In Addis Ababa, over 5 million Birr has been owed by different tenants. The R.H.A collects its revenue from four tenants: namely, government organizations, private organizations, individual tenants, and diplomats and other foreigners. Among these tenants who owe money to the R.H.A. are individuals tenants and government organizations.

The R.H.A. also has a legal responsibility to pay compensation to ex-owners of nationalized houses; it pays them 4 million Birr each year. Besides these expenses, the R.H.A. has basic expenditures that include funds for salaries, maintenance, retirement, emergency, and housing implementation. These expenditures have been increasing each year since the establishment of the authority, it reached a level of over 60 percent of the R.H.A revenue in 1983. On the other hand, the share of capital investment for housing projects has been decreasing each year. As seen from the above facts two issues could be pointed out which reflect the inadequacy existing within R.H.A. management.

First, the amount of yearly uncollected revenue is too high. Had this amount been collected, and had there been a program in which to invest it through construction of new houses, the yearly number of constructed houses would have been boosted. By law, the R.H.A. has the power to evict tenants if rent is not collected for more than six months. During these six months, however, tenants pay an interest rate of over 10 percent on the uncollected
balance. As one M.U.D.H. employee stated, the major problem encountered by the R.H.A. is the collecting of rent money from government and group organizations. The eviction of these organizations is not, of course, as easy as evicting individual tenants. Moreover, because the R.H.A. is a part of the government machinery and most of the group organizations are related to the state, the conflict arising from the delay of rent payments is mostly settled through internal administration policies. On the other hand, individual tenants could be sued if legal channels were followed.

The second issue is that the authority is spending too much for administration and management. The R.H.A. has over 3,500 employees. Of these, 77 percent (2,695) are registered as permanent workers and 23 percent (805), as temporary workers. Of the total number of employees, there are over 1,000 employees assigned to the maintenance work-force. Each year, from 10 to 13 percent of R.H.A. income, or over 7 million Birr, is allocated for maintenance. Despite such resources the R.H.A. service given to tenants of housing complexes is inadequate. As a matter of fact, one could conclude that there is neither any regular maintenance program, nor, is there any concern shown for tenant problems which arise from their housing and its environment.

In theory, before the R.H.A. leases a house to an individual or organization, necessary maintenance must be done. However, in almost every instance, some maintenance remains undone. Not only that, the maintenance process is time-consuming due to an apparent mismanagement of the work-force. This is due to the bureaucratic procedures in processing legal papers, delay in the supply of needed maintenance materials and, most important, due to mismanagement of allocated maintenance funds.

One interview conducted clearly reveals these circumstances. The son of the woman interviewed is a government official in Addis Ababa. He rented a
house with a monthly payment of 125 Birr. His house was among the housing stock which was previously private property. Before the family moved into the house, her son was told that the house would be painted and that the cracks in the walls and fences and other detail problems would be corrected. He had papers signed by the R.H.A. office indicating the type of maintenance to be performed on the house. His mother's statement of what happened was that:

...for more than a week, workers sat idly in the compound waiting for needed materials to perform maintenance on the house. Finally, sand, cement, and other materials needed for the paint arrived. The workers took a lot of time to do their work, because no one checked the progress of the work. At one time, there was a shortage of paint, and the workers were called off. Since then, they have not returned to finish the maintenance work. As one can see, outside walls are not painted, the fences are not maintained and are now falling apart.

Her son, who was out of Addis Ababa at the time maintenance work was done, went to discuss the matter with the R.H.A. He was shown a report that indicated an amount of over 3,000 Birr had been spent on the house. The report also indicated that all maintenance had been done. He was promised that the matter would be investigated and that necessary steps would be taken to complete the maintenance. Two years have passed and nothing has happened. The tenant is unable to find another place to live and, so, he continues to dwell in the house. Somewhere down the line, there were corrupt personnel who mismanaged the funds allocated to the project.

When tenants need to lodge their complaints about housing conditions, they are discouraged by required procedures which are time-consuming. One has to stand in a line beginning at five o'clock in the morning in order to see the proper official. The office opens at 8 o'clock in the morning. If that person is working, he has to take a leave-of-absence from work and stand in the line all
day. After tenants submit their complaints in written form; getting a response from the authority takes at least six to eight months, if at all.

The R.H.A. is entrusted with the construction of high-rise apartments and large housing complexes for different socio-economic sectors of the population. However, several questions arise about those public and government agencies who are responsible for formulating the programs and policies. Commonly heard questions are: Why are planned housing projects not finished on time? Why is there such an increase in overhead to complete a project? Why are new houses not constructed properly and existing ones not maintained adequately, thus cutting the life-span of the house and increasing future maintenance cost? Some of the answers to these questions need more investigation by the institutions that are involved with regard to how they conduct their work. The institutions responsible for undertaking the construction process and for supplying construction materials are two of the major ones which must be examined. These important problems surrounding the institutions are discussed in Chapter IV.

In summary, the importance of R.H.A. management of the housing stock under its jurisdiction, in the planning, programming and construction of new houses, is clearly visible. It is also clear to what extent the role of the R.H.A. has been playing in the construction of low-cost housing. The amount of low-cost housing construction is insignificant compared to the magnitude of the housing shortage. Not only that, the capital allocated each year to the construction of such housing is far less than one expects from the R.H.A., considering the responsibilities entrusted to it. Although financial problems are a common issue in any housing institution, in the case of the R.H.A., there is a high level of mismanagement of the scarce monetary and manpower resources that are available.
Housing complexes managed and administered by the R.H.A. have been discussed with respect to the residents' satisfaction. What became clear was that there was reluctance on the part of the R.H.A. to respond to problems in the housing environment. In an attempt by this research process to address itself to the problems within low-cost housing complexes, interviews in the field were then conducted with the aim of assessing how low-cost housing is viewed by the tenants.

2. Field Findings.

Eight sites were selected, each of them in different sectors of the urban area. Prominent residents in each housing complex were interviewed. In all housing sites, expression of feelings by the residents and field observation of the environments revealed much similarity. For this reason, the findings of only three sites are presented.

Kolfe Low-Cost Housing

The Kolfe Low-Cost Housing Project was built at the same time on the same site as that of the Resettlement Housing units. The units occupy the site along the main road, (see Appendix B, No. 21). There are 10 housing units. Each unit has two bedrooms, living and dining spaces, kitchen, and toilet within the main unit. Each house has an external toilet facility and a backyard kitchen (Yetches Bete). Each housing unit has an adequate backyard as well as open spaces on the front and side. A few of the households have kept the open spaces attractive by planting flowers and other plants. Each of these units is rented at 150 Birr per month.

An attempt was made to interview one of two randomly selected residents in the complex. However, one housewife, declined to answer any questions. An interesting thing about that case was that her family had turned the dining
space into a bar and the living space and the bedroom next to it was now a customers' sitting area. The other room was used as a bedroom. Despite these renovations, there was no sign on the outside indicating that it was a bar. Later, interviews with residents who live in the Resettlement Project revealed that the bar was opened without having a license. By law, one cannot turn a dwelling unit into one to generate economic activity. In any case, the bar operates. Four children, the two parents, and a housekeeper resided in the house. How the family members were accommodated in the unit was not disclosed; it was clear that the bedroom which was used as a customer sitting area was also used as a bedroom for the children at night.

A second tenant, who was interviewed, lives in the same complex. She is a housewife in her early forties with four children. Her husband, who works for a tourist and hotel agency, had been away for more than a year in Assab, a city on the coast the Red Sea. She is unemployed and has no income. Her husband earns a net income of about 700 Birr per month and sends money to his wife to cover monthly expenses and rent. To overcome the financial burden, she had opened a small business selling tea and snacks by making a sheltered area on the side of the unit (see Appendix B No. 22). The business was open for more than five months before the kebele officials told her to close it, since she had no legal permission to conduct the operation.

When asked about problems she had with the housing, specifically, and with the neighborhood in general, she stated the maintenance issue was the major problem, followed by lesser ones listed below. The kitchen drainage system was not working and the sinks and pipes were broken (see Appendix B No. 51, 53, 54). Windows did not open properly and handles of door and windows were broken. Toilet paints should have been plastic. The paint on the wall had peeled. The built-in cooking stoves in the kitchen occupied almost one-third of
the kitchen space. Since she had purchased gas stoves, she no longer used the built-in stove. Because of this, it is difficult to use the kitchen space in an efficient manner.

She still has a problem getting monthly food rations from kebele. She thinks that the kebele officials do not consider her as a resident of the area, and it has taken her months to get an I.D. card. Like others residents who live in the Resettlement Complex, she also has problems using public buses to go to the central part of the city to visit friends or to do shopping. She says that: 
"There are few buses on schedule, and it is usually difficult to find a seat."

The maintenance problems of her house had been repeatedly reported to the R.H.A. However, she had not had any response. When she was asked if she would buy the house if the government had a program to sell it on a monthly payment basis, she answered, "Yes, provided the cost of the house and payment could be made affordable." By comparison to other field research of low-cost housing, the Kolfe Housing units have larger bedrooms, living and dining spaces. The rent that tenants pay is also low. Considering this and the housing shortage problem, she was very willing to buy the house if the government would put a good price tag on it. What she did not like was the transportation facilities of the area and the attitude of the kebele office towards her.

Wollo Sefer Low-Cost Housing Complex

In this housing complex there are 96 units built of hollow concrete blocks. Basically, there are three types of housing units: an efficiency, a two-room unit, and a three-room unit. All three types have kitchen and toilet facilities outside at the back, (see Appendix B No. 41 and 42). Three households were selected from each housing type. Two households had been living in the
complex since of construction of the housing in 1977, and the other had been in
residence for three years, since 1981.

The first person interviewed was a young technician in his mid-thirties,
who worked at Ethiopian Airlines. He had been studying in Nairobi, Kenya, to
be an airplane technician for more than three years. When he came back, the
only house he could find to rent was an efficiency in this low-cost housing
complex. He indicated that he had been living in the house a little more than
three years. His house has one room, a kitchen and toilet attached to the unit,
with access from outside. There was a total of eight people living in the
room; there were three small children, he and his wife, two grandparents, and
a housekeeper. He earns a salary of 600 BIRR per month. The net monthly
income he receives, after deduction of taxes and other monthly contributions,
amounts to 480 BIRR. His wife is not working; hence, he is the sole
breadwinner for the family.

To solve the overcrowding conditions he submitted an application to the
R.H.A regional manager, asking permission to construct a small room next to
the kitchen. He was refused and given the reason that "...extension of a room
will ruin the beauty of the house..." However, since he could not find another,
more spacious house to rent, he built an additional bedroom of corrugated iron
sheet, next to kitchen. Almost a year had passed and no one from R.H.A. had
mentioned the case up to the time of the interview (see Appendix B No.40).

The rent the man pays is 65 BIRR per month. "It is literally a rip-off", he
stated. Considering the size of the house which is 18 square meters including
toilet and kitchen and the existing housing problems, he felt that the rent
should not be more than 20 or 30 BIRR per month. In our discussion of the
problems associated with the housing unit, he was asked about a newly painted
and well-maintained unit just on the other side of the road in front of his own
house. In responding to the question, he indicated how people who work for the R.H.A. take advantage of their positions to fulfill their personal needs and, sometimes, even to fill their pockets.

Five months ago, the house was occupied by a tenant who has now moved to another house. A man who was working for the R.H.A. was planning to move in. Maintenance men came and made repairs as needed. In addition to that, they poured additional concrete to fill the open spaces between the walls and the outside ground so that the building could settle. Cracks in the walls were repaired. New windows and doors were installed. Painting was done inside and out. Ditches were dug around the house to protect it from flood waters. In short, the house was put in good shape. However, after all maintenance was finished, the man who had planned to move in rented the house to a newly married couple.

It was heard later that since the couple was desperate to find a house to rent, they made arrangements with the R.H.A. employee, paying him an ample sum of money. It was easy for the R.H.A. employee to find another house to rent, since he is in the authority... I and other many residents, have submitted application more than a dozen times for our houses to be maintained. We never receive any response from the authority. On the other hand, they are always there when it is time to collect the rent.

The case just mentioned might sound odd, but bribery is the most widely practiced activity, either in the exchange of money or in the exchange of things. The described case is common among "lower" and "middle" level officials in the employment hierarchy of government institutions, where the masses must first make contact if work is to be done on houses.

The second person interviewed is in his early thirties and employed by the Water Research Institution in Kalete. He was among the first tenants in the housing complex. He has two small rooms. (3 x 2.20 and 3 x 4 meters). One of the rooms is used as a bedroom, the other as living and dining space. He has a wife and a two-year old daughter. At the time of the interview, he was
expecting his second child within a month. He receives a net income of 460
Birr per month. His wife is not working. He has a housekeeper to whom he
pays 20 Birr per month. He pays 75 Birr per month in rent. Here again, the
rent is seen to be high compared to the size and overall cost of the house
which, for the R.H.A., was less than 11,000 Birr. According to his statement,
the rent should be a maximum of 40 Birr per month.

There are a lot of maintenance problems within the house. One of the major
problems which brought the man to confrontation with higher officials of the
R.H.A., was the problem of flooding. On the front side of the house the ground
level is lower than the adjacent road. In the rainy season, the house is flooded
because water gets into the front door. There are no ditches or sewer system
to collect the surface water. The tenant repeatedly complained about the
problem to the R.H.A., but nothing was done. In order to minimize damage
caused by the flood, he had completely water-proofed the front door. Because
of this, the entry door to the front side of the house could not be used. In the
last three years alone, he had spent more than 1,500 Birr on the house. He
showed the receipts for expenses to R.H.A. officials, but no refund was given
him. He had painted the house three times in the last 6 years because the
R.H.A. had refused to do so. Besides questions asked of him concerning major
problems regarding the housing, he was asked whether he would buy the house
if the government had a plan for selling it. He would like the idea very much
but he was not sure the government would have such a plan. Continuing the
discussion on this matter, he stated that:

Four years ago, all the toilet equipment within the complex was
stolen overnight, as if there was a theft campaign. It seems that it was
carried out by organized criminals and was done calculatingly to put
authorities into a state of agitated confusion.
... during the same year, many people employed in the construction and housing sectors had been laid off. Also during this period, a rumor was heard that the R.H.A. had planned to sell this housing complex to the tenants or to other interested people. This was an effort to unload the responsibility of administration for some of the Low-Cost housing. Following the rumor, many applicants submitted their names to the R.H.A. to buy a house if such a program existed. I was one of them, however nothing happened and nobody heard a rumor of that type again.

Regarding the stolen toilet equipment he said:

... since the authority did not replace the parts, most people bought used ones from Mercato Market Center. Actually, the same stolen equipment was sold on the open market. Some believed that the theft was committed by people who knew the complex well, who had taken part in the construction of the complex and were probably among the laid-off workers. Some residents think that people who live in the same Kebele did it. In any case, it has been a mysterious situation and nobody has heard more about it again.

... in addition to the theft of the toilet equipment, most households reported loss of valuables from their houses. Nobody saw any broken windows or doors after the theft occurred. What happened was that most doors on the houses had the same locking system, as well as similar keys. In other words, a person who lived next door could, using his key, open most of the houses in the complex. However, after many complaints and after the toilet equipment was stolen, the authority finally changed the locks of each house. The change was not to a better quality lock, but to a lesser one. Most residents started complaining about the new keys and locking system because the keys did not lock or open properly, and some of them broke easily.

The third person interviewed was a housewife with thirteen children. The family is member of Adere, a minority Muslim ethnic group from the southern part of the country, Harar City. The family previously lived in the Ogaden region in a city called Gijiga. During the war between Somale and Ethiopia in early 1976, the family fled to Addis Ababa. After staying in a hotel for more
than a year, they found a house to rent in this government complex. Her husband works at Ethiopian Airlines, and earns a net income of approximately 700 Birr per month. The family has lived in the same house for nine years and were among the first tenants. They pay 90 Birr per month for two bedrooms and a room used for living and dining space. Kitchen and toilets are located outside, (see Appendix B, No. 41).

Since the housewife is culturally different from the neighbors, her use of space differs in many ways from the other residents. She and her smaller children who do not go to school, spend their days either in the back or front yard. Usually they eat breakfast and lunch outside, mostly in the backyard. One of her major complaints about the housing unit was concerning the two opposite doors, located in the living and dining room. Since they do not like closed doors, the doors are left open most of the time. One time, two of her small children became ill as a result of the air-draft created and were in bed for several days. Since then, she has tried to close one of the doors, but because it had become a habit, the children always left it open.

The other major problem was that the space in the backyard is too small to accommodate all the activities that the family must undertake. In this household, most social, as well as household activities, are undertaken outside. Moreover, though the complex was designed to bring the neighbors together, she and her family feel alienated. Most of the time, she said that she went to other areas to spend free time with her friends, who live in Mercato area. Most neighbors simply minded their own business. Through the last eight years, she said she has not seen any sort of social organization which could bring the neighbors together to discuss neighborhood problems, such as theft, rent issues, or maintenance. In 1985, there was a plan to organize the residents in a Mahaber-type group, but at the time of the interview it was far
from being organized. The lack of traditional social organizations has been seen by all residents interviewed as one of the negative aspects to living in the housing complex.

The major problems pointed out by the three residents interviewed in Wollo Seffer were the smallness of the rooms which do not accommodate the needs of the households, the lack of storage spaces, and the unnecessary openings which were a hindrance to efficient use of the space. The rent that residents pay is excessive when compared to the service they receive from the R.H.A. concerning maintenance. All walls have cracks, especially around door and window openings, so large as to allow insects and other animals like lizards, rats, and snakes to pass through. The wall which separates any two units, does not go all the way to the roof, but only up to the ceiling. Because of this, any noise or talking in the next house is clearly heard. There are no street lights and no paved road within the complex nor do they exist in the surrounding neighborhood.

The location of the entire neighborhood is not convenient for transportation to and from the central section of the city. One must walk fifteen to twenty minutes before finding a taxi or reaching the public bus-stops. Of all the problems pointed out by residents, the health hazards inflicted by malfunction of the sewage system has been of most concern. During the rainy season, large volumes of surface rain water run into the pipes through the manhole, which is located in front of the toilet, then to the septic tank (see Appendix B, No. 61, 62). As a result, solid waste or sludge, is washed onto the surface through the improperly fitted septic tank cover. During the summer, when there is shortage of water to drain and liquefy the solid waste, pipes become clogged. When this happens, several households are forced to refrain from using their toilet facilities and to use open spaces instead.
Hamle 16 Low-Cost Housing Project

This housing project was built in 1977. There are two types of housing units in this complex. One type has 5 detached houses. Each house has two units and are arranged in a row. Each unit has two bedrooms, and a room which serves as dining and living space. Each unit has a separate outside kitchen and a toilet at the back. The second type has a total of 20 units, each having two rooms, an outside kitchen and toilet. The complex is built of concrete blocks. In the detached type housing, there are 12 households. Four households share two units. Of all houses researched, the Hamle 16 complex seems to have no major maintenance problems except in windows and doors. The building is in good condition. There are no cracks either on the walls or in the concrete floors.

Four households were selected for interview, two from each housing types. Of the two households who live in a two room type unit, one has three persons in the family, a wife, a husband and child. The other household has 5 persons, a wife husband, two children and a housekeeper. Each of the two households pays rent of 60 Birr per month. The households' heads generate income of 220 and 300 Birr per month. The wives are not employed. Their views concerning the housing are similar to that of other residents in low-cost housing. Among the problems mentioned were the smallness the size of the rooms, rent too expensive compared to the service received, and minor maintenance matters such as door locks being broken, doors and windows not closing properly, and walls needing paint.

The other two households selected for interview live in a three-room type unit, sharing the rooms. They have divided the dining and living space into
half, using a big wooden closet. The total house rent is ninety Birr per month, hence, each family pays 45 Birr. One of the families, who had been living in the complex since 1982, consists of two children, a wife and husband. They have fenced the small front yard, which had been the main entry to the house. The space is used for cooking and preparing other foodstuff, using charcoal. When firewood is used, the family must use the kitchen which is located at the back. The toilet is shared, and both facilities, kitchen and toilet, are reached by going around the house. The husband, who is in his thirties, is employed in a government office and has income of 300 Birr per month. The wife, who is twenty-five, is not employed and remains at home with two small children. This family came from Asmara in 1982. They could not find a house to rent, and were forced to share this house. Almost three years have passed in their search for better housing, but it is unlikely they will get one soon. They stated that the major problem was overcrowding.

An interview was conducted with the head of the household, who is the primary tenant. He and his family were among the first tenants in the complex. They have lived in the same house for almost nine years. There are six people in their half of the house, a wife, husband, three children, and a housekeeper. Since the family has an accommodation problem, they have constructed an additional room made of corrugated iron sheet and attached to the living room. It is used for study and is also the sleeping area of the older children, (see Appendix B No. 39).

The head of the family retired almost three years ago from an insurance company. Since then, he has searched for a job, but has been unable to find one. He is a healthy and sharp-minded person. His monthly retirement income amounts to 300 Birr. His eldest son who is 23, lives with the family and works in a government office, generating additional income of 200 Birr per
month. The other two children attend high-school. When asked whether financial problems or other reasons prompted his allowing another family to share the house, he stated:

...it was purely to help them. Since they could not find a house and were new to the city, we found it necessary to assist the family by sharing the house. Moreover, we knew them before they came to Addis Ababa. This living arrangement will continue until they find another house to rent.

His feelings concerning low-cost housing are not different from that of other people interviewed. However, when asked to comment on the housing shortage which exist in Addis Ababa and what government steps he thinks would be appropriate, he stated:

As you know, there is nothing beyond government capacity that cannot be achieved if it wants to. After all, we have managed to successfully bring a well-founded revolution intended to dismantle the feudal system and bring a socialist system. Following this, there have been many legal changes regarding social, economic, as well as political matters. Some of these changes were directed towards the welfare of the urban population and the urban system. Among these reforms, proclamations were issued concerning land and housing matters. The decrees were met by the people with pleasure and implementation in the field started immediately.

Today, rather than urban housing and land problem be lessened, we see an enormous shortage of housing and the problem of getting land. Almost three years have passed since we have seen housing being constructed. No one knows why the blockage was created or why the system stopped running as smoothly as it used to at the beginning. It is difficult for me to say the government should do this and that.

As the discussion continued, he said that he believes that the government is in a better position than individuals to realistically achieve a well-defined goal if it wants to do so and that statements given by an individual would be a
waste of breath. However, reasons given by M.U.D.H. officials, as to why the housing process ceased during the last three years, including the following that were mentioned to him: the city expanded in an unplanned fashion, making the government unable to cope with the provision of basic infrastructure service for newly developed housing areas; and, the demand for high capital and skilled manpower to properly implement the planned housing program could not be met. When asked what he thought of the reasoning, the man commented as follows:

As Addis Ababa expands, government has the responsibility to provide all the necessary services which make the housing concept proper. Such is the objective of the political system. Providing such services as roads, electricity, water lines and other amenities are government responsibilities. If these basic housing needs are not provided, the housing program should not have started in the first place. What it shows us here is the housing program and policies were not well-defined, and maybe the responsible officials who are in charge of implementing the program and for making proper decisions, either do not know what they are doing or maybe do their work based on bad intentions.

... for example, there are many residential areas developed outside the city limits while there are open spaces available within the city where infrastructures have already developed. The A.M.C.E. residential area where more than three thousand people have settled is one example. Currently under construction a housing project on Nefas Seilk Road, which is a joint project between the Ethiopian Government and World Bank, is another apparent example. One can go on citing examples of housing, private or government sponsored, constructed on the outskirts of the city. People living in the housing have problems of transportation, schooling, access to water lines. The area is far from the city center where most people are employed, and far from health and recreation centers. Why, then, are these houses developed there and not within the city? ... I cannot give you any convincing reasons.

... for instance, between this housing complex where I live, and the A.M.C.E. residential complex, the distance is a minimum of three
kilometers, and the distance between here and Bole Airport, is seven kilometers. In a total of a 21 square kilometers, one finds a few scattered houses. This area could have been used for construction of all those houses developed outside the reach of the city. In short, there are a lot of available open spaces with infrastructures already developed and which are appropriate for housing development.

When asked whether the land and house tax has become a major criterion for development of complexes on the city fringe, he said:

Not at all. I worked in an insurance company more than fifteen years until I was told that I retired. I know about this tax business. I assure you that no one with a proper mind would prefer to build his house outside the city because the yearly tax is cheap. If a modest house is constructed in the A.M.C.E. area, where the area is graded as no.3 for taxation purpose, the yearly land, house, and other service tax runs about 30 Ethiopian Birr. A house owner in this area, which is in grade 2, would pay yearly tax around 60 Ethiopian Birr. Now, you tell me, if a prospective homebuilder has a choice of site location, where do you think he would prefer to construct his house? This area at least, is close to the center, close to health, recreational, educational, market, transportation facilities. There are, already developed, major and access roads; connection to electricity and water line is easy. In the A.M.C.E. area none of these amenities is available. To make them available, individuals cannot afford to provide the cost involved. It could only be done by the government. Therefore, think of the money one can save living in this area, compared to what one spends living in the A.M.C.E. area.

He was then asked to reflect on the following: land is given to private house builders in areas where there is no development of infrastructures and the government (R.H.A) keeps constructing houses on the outskirts of the city; Where then did he think the fault lies?

I cannot give you any reason except that the whole administration and management of housing system is run by bureaucratic people. Don't you know that those officials who make decisions concerning the way the housing is developed now, knew that people who live in different housing projects located outside the city need the type of infrastructures, and
amenities we just talked about?... they know very well, but they seem to care less. They see people suffering because of lack of proper housing, lack of transportation and lack of water supply.

... the whole result is bureaucracy and an ill-advised management system. I do not think the big leaders, on the top level of the political hierarchy, wanted this thing to happen. As the situation is, now, the masses blame the big leaders, while the big leaders have given the responsibility of management of the different programs to middle level officials in the different institutions. It seems clear to me that these officials make ill-advised decisions knowingly so that, first, the government's ideal program, as announced at the beginning, is disrupted. Second, as a result of an unplanned development program set forward by the same officials, they knew that massive social, economic and political unrest would result. In this way, the masses blame the "big leaders" rather than those officials who actually are responsible for making the mess. Moreover, it seems to me that the government has the responsibility to investigate why such disordered development is taking place and to make a close observation of these officials.

In continuing the discussion, the man said he knew that a new housing policy was being developed and that the Addis Ababa urban system was under study. He could not see any reasons why land-allocation and construction of housing stopped. What one could infer from this lengthy discussion was that houses are, indeed, being developed outside the city limit and in areas where proper infrastructure services do not exist. That is a clear indication of an ill-advised housing program. Also, there appears to be a reluctance on the part of the responsible authorities to see that houses are constructed so the urban services are used in an efficient manner and to see that overall development of the urban system is undertaken in a planned fashion. Houses developed today, whether by the R.H.A., by individuals or by groups, are built without considering the basic amenities needed by the residents. This implies a waste of the available resources and a future demand for high capital investment on
installation of the infrastructure in order to make the urban system functional. For these setbacks, the authorities who are responsible for issuance of the construction permits, for the allocation of the lots, and for undertaking the housing schemes are, themselves, blamed.

Conclusion

The slow pace of Low-Cost Housing Developments is attributed to three major factors. First and foremost, as information from officials and the preceding discussion reveals under the current economic situation, the R.H.A. and other housing institutions face an insurmountable problem in the financing of low-cost housing. Because of this, at least until 1986, the notion of whether or not low-income households can afford to pay for government-constructed housing has been a major criterion in deciding whether or not construction is cost-beneficial to the R.H.A. This, of course, raises questions among the masses and even among tenants of low-cost houses who categorically, are among middle and higher income class. A question commonly raised is concerning the ideology of how the R.H.A. can, within a socialist system, market housing when the government itself has defined housing as a basic right of every Ethiopians? This question, posed by many people, does not actually imply every citizen has the right to free housing and no one seriously expects the government to supply houses to people, even to those groups with low-income, for free. However, everyone rejects the current R.H.A. housing practices. Its housing practice reinforces existing social inequalities by formulating housing programs intended to increase the production of high-cost housing for high-income classes, rather than promoting low-cost housing, so that the lower socio-economic sectors of the population could benefit. In addition, the authority, knowing an acute housing shortage exist in Addis Ababa, seems to have been motivated by profit-making;
that is, of course, without giving expected services to its tenants. On this point, there seem to exist no disagreement; it is clearly expressed by all residents interviewed.

The second factor which contributes to the slow pace of low-cost housing development is the reluctance of housing institutions, especially the M.U.D.H., and, hence, the R.H.A., to promote housing standards using indigenous and commonly accepted construction materials. In the construction of housing for the public, it seems that higher standards, using some imported materials as well as using some foreign design standards, are welcomed inside the housing bureaucracy. But, modest housing standards which could be constructed with cheaply available local material, seem unappreciated by the authorities. Types and cost of building materials obviously play an important part in construction of any housing for low to middle-income people. The approach to this enormous and complex goal depends upon the objectives. In this case, the goal is the construction of low-cost housing affordable by the masses. The point of view, shared by most of the urban population, is that indigenous construction materials, must be employed to the fullest extent possible in order to keep costs down. Construction materials commonly used by lower-income persons, and often by middle and higher-income homebuilders, are soil, wood, straw mixed with mud, and concrete blocks. These indigenously available materials have not been used extensively in any housing, especially "low-cost" housing constructed by the R.H.A., except in one case,46 (see Appendix B, No. 35). The use of these materials is labor intensive and, above all, most of the construction industry labor force has the necessary skill.

Basically, these two factors are interrelated. However, in regard to the first one, there is a deliberate intent by the R.H.A to construct high-cost housing with quick capital return. This policy is characterized by a reluctance
of the R.H.A. to recognize the objectives for which it was established, namely, the housing needs of low-income groups. The second factor shows that, while there is a way to provide low-cost housing using readily available and inexpensive local materials, the authority backs off from using these materials which would provide low-cost housing at minimum capital and make the rent affordable to the low-income tenants.

A third factor which also contributes to a reduction in low-cost housing development is mismanagement of resources. Actually, this factor is a problem inherent in almost every housing institution. As was apparent in earlier discussions, there are two ways resources are mismanaged. One is the inability of the authority to collect revenues from its clients. This problem requires an in-depth investigation, which is not part of this research, into the way clients conduct business with R.H.A. The other area where mismanagement of R.H.A. resources occurs is the methods by which the authority executes its day-to-day work routine. Undebatable issues relating to the mismanagement of R.H.A. resources are: misplacement of the work-force; decline in productivity; poor work performance of employees; inefficiency in documentation of logistics matters which create exploitatable circumstances; and the reluctance to make in depth investigations of client complaints especially concerning maintenance issues.

One explanation of the cause of mismanagement of resources, in this institution and other government offices, is that there is a lack of awareness by administrative officials and the work-force in general of the need for a disciplined work-system consistent with socialist production norms. Responsible people in most departments are insensitive to problems and are, therefore, unable to provide appropriate solutions. These persons also have an "anti-proletarian" spirit that scorns the thinking and expectation of the
masses. Moreover, administrative personnel give preferential treatment to other officials, relatives and close friends. This, of course, has caused tremendous damage to the proper function of the R.H.A., in the form of corruption within the work-force. The hope that the old ways of conducting business will be replaced by a revolutionary consciousness seems to be a far cry in the future.
E. The Self-Help Housing Program

1. General Information

The Self-Help Housing Program has been seen by many housing experts as one of the programs which presents urban masses with the opportunity to provide itself with decent housing. This program is new in Ethiopia but, since its introduction, it has became one of the major programs which is appreciated and welcomed by many urban poor. If one looks back over the history of housing development in Ethiopia, it becomes clear that all housing has been developed on a Self-Help basis. However, today, the concept of Self-Help has gained different meanings. Now, one expects the government to play a major role in the overall process. The people anticipate government aid in housing finance, in preparation of sites, in providing easy and quick access to construction materials, and in facilitating legal processes. Help is also expected in the design of the housing and in the provision of infrastructure services.

Historically, there have been limited efforts devoted to the promotion of the Self-Help Housing Programs as appropriate housing delivery mechanisms, either on governmental or institutional levels. Since the introduction of the program in 1977, few urban poor have benefited from it. The total number of Self-Help Housing Programs initiated is very low compared to the magnitude of the housing needs. Between 1977 and 1983, a total of 1,222 houses were constructed in Addis Ababa using the Self-Help Housing Program, (see table 2.9).

In fiscal year 1983-84, the M.U.D.H. financed the construction of a total of 460 self-help units in Addis Ababa, with an estimated cost of over 1.8
million Birr. The number of total houses constructed through the Self-Help Program between 1977 and 1984 amount to 1,682 housing units. This is, an average of 240 units yearly.

Table 2.9 - Government Financed Self-Help Housing Project, (1977-1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Completion</th>
<th>Number of houses</th>
<th>Costs in Birr Total</th>
<th>Unit cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977/78</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>276,826.64</td>
<td>1,730.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978/79</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>228,308.01</td>
<td>2,038.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979/80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>134,196.05</td>
<td>2,236.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/81</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>960,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981/82</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>984,000.00</td>
<td>3,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982/83</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,050,000.00</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>3,633,330.70</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Outside Addis Ababa, government initiated, “Aided” Self-Help Housing activity is limited in number. For instance, only one case could be pointed out. In 1981-82, 28 “Aided” Self-Help houses were constructed with a unit cost of 2,678 Birr in Debre Zeit. Debre Zeit is approximately 25 kilometers away from Addis Ababa. However, with the European Economic Commission (E.E.C.) grant which has been available to Project beneficiaries at a 6 percent interest rate, the government has undertaken more “Aided” Self-Help Housing Programs on regional level 49 (see table 2.10). Therefore, over the eight-year period from 1977 to 1984, there were a total of 2,885 units being constructed throughout
the country. The estimated total cost invested in these Self-Help Housing units was 8.6 million Birr. Of this amount, 63.4 percent was financed by the M.U.D.H. and 36.6 percent was financed through the E.E.C. Moreover, the information strongly suggests that while government initiative on Self-Help Housing focused on urban areas, specifically in Addis Ababa, the E.E.C., on the other hand, focused on regional areas.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Number of Housing Units</th>
<th>E.E.C. Grant</th>
<th>Government Contribution</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>525,520.00</td>
<td>20,143</td>
<td>525,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avassa</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>333,821.00</td>
<td>11,508</td>
<td>345,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akaki</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>262,446.00</td>
<td>8,383</td>
<td>270,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shashemane</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>275,622.00</td>
<td>11,746</td>
<td>287,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dire Dawa</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>551,682.00</td>
<td>17,641</td>
<td>569,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilla</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>313,101.00</td>
<td>12,725</td>
<td>325,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessie</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>384,238.00</td>
<td>13,236</td>
<td>296,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debre Zeit</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>292,657.00</td>
<td>12,650</td>
<td>305,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combolchea</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>323,688.00</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>334,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>3,142,775.00</td>
<td>117,432</td>
<td>3,360,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Most Self-Help Housing has a unit plan provided by the M.U.D.H. The units have two rooms including a kitchen and toilet facilities located at the back of
the unit. Housing plans are designed to allow for future expansion whenever the users' financial situation allows. On average, the size of land allocated to the individual is 150 to 200 square meters. As the financial status of the participants does not allow them to take advantage of durable building materials, many resort to traditional ones of mud and wood for walls. In some recently constructed houses, masonry foundation and concrete floors without reinforcement have been used.

2. Criterion for Eligibility and Types of Self-Help Programs

Several criterion are set forward by the Housing Research and Service Department of M.U.D.H. Among these are age, where a civilian applicant cannot be less than eighteen nor more than 39 while military personnel must be from 18 to 34 years old. Applicants should be employed, and have a monthly income of up to 250 BIRR per month. Moreover, applicants for this Program have must be organized, with membership ranging from 20 to 50 households, and they must be willing to accept a design provided by the M.U.D.H. The design is usually a twenty-five square meter area with units having external toilet and kitchen facilities. Before their applications are processed, each member must deposit in the H.S.B. twenty-five percent of the basic material cost. According to 1977-78 M.U.D.H. cost estimates, the deposit amounts to 400 BIRR. After deposits are made, the M.U.D.H. assigns lots to the group, accompanied by detailed unit designs. When the construction process begins, each member deposits in H.S.B. another 25 percent of the total construction cost, making a total deposit of 50 percent.

What is expected from members in the housing process is clear: each member is to provide labor, skilled or unskilled. According to M.U.D.H. cost estimates unskilled labor given by members amounts to 10 percent of the total construction cost. Members have the responsibility of providing construction material and
have the responsibility of dealing with any financial matter involving transportation of it. Members are responsible for laying piped-water and electricity lines as well as other infrastructure services. In short, the major role of M.U.D.H. in Self-Help Programs is to provide technical assistance, to provide housing plans, and to help the organization get easy access to needed services by recognizing them as a legal entity. For instance, members are given access to government controlled construction material, to technical assistants, and to the water and electric company.

There are basically two types of Self-Help Housing Programs. "Pure" Self-Help Housing and "Aided" Self-Help Housing. In summary, the basic difference between these two types of Self-Help Housing Programs lies in the financing of the housing. While the "Pure" Self-Help groups take total responsibility for financial matters, the "Aided" Self-Help groups receive get financial assistance. The M.U.D.H., in cooperation with other financial institutions, namely, the H.S.B. and E.E.C. and World Bank, have the responsibility of dealing with the financing. The following outline of the two types of Self-Help should summarize the differences:

"Pure" Self-Help Housing

1. low-income group

2. Age 18 years and above (Note: the higher age limit is not defined)

3. Members should be self-employed or employed by an organization or institution and should be organized cooperatively regardless of place of work

4. Monthly income should not be above 250 BIRR

"Aided" Self-Help Housing.

1. low-income groups and below poverty level.

2. Age 18-39 for civilian and 18-34 for military people

3. Members should be among workers employed by one or two different organization or institution which could be at different employment areas. This is to facilitate the monthly payment of each member which would be deducted from their salaries.

4. Monthly income should be 127-250 BIRR.
5. Each member should deposit 25 percent of the material cost at the initial stage and an additional 25 percent after the project begins. - Not stated

6. Size of unit area and lot differs. - Lot area is up to 200 square meters for each member and typical unit area is 32 square meters including outside kitchen and toilets.

7. Membership size should be 20-50 households. - Membership size should not be more than 20 households.

8. Members are eligible for loan from H.S.B. No other agency or institution is responsible for financing the housing. - The M.U.D.H., in cooperation with other institutions or agencies, namely, H.S.B., E.E.C. and World Bank, is responsible for arranging financial matters.

9. If members ask for help, the M.U.D.H. provides the groups with technical assistants and skilled manpower capable of dealing with problems associated in housing process. - M.U.D.H. must provide the group with technical assistance and skilled personnel needed in the implementation of the project from start to completion.

10. Members are free to decide which house belongs to whom, either at the initial stage or while the housing is in progress. This is done on a "lottery type" basis. - Members are not allowed to know which house is for whom until the whole housing project is completed. Only then does each member know which unit belongs to whom on a "lottery type" basis.

11. For both programs, cost of a unit ranges 1500 - 1600 Birr according M.U.D.H. This cost includes electricity, water lines, roofing, floor, painting and concrete work. (Note: this cost is underestimated. Under the 1984-86 construction costs have tripled.

12. For both housing programs, M.U.D.H. provides groups with only one type of expandable housing plan.

13. In both housing programs members have the right to construct an additional unit within an individual lot or change the unit configuration once each member takes over responsibility.

3. Field Findings.

In order to further understand how the Self-Help Housing Program work, two Self-Help Housing sites were researched, and residents were interviewed concerning the implementation of the Program and their satisfaction with it.
Wollo Seffer Self-Help Housing Project.

Wollo Seffer Self-Help Housing was one of the first housing projects undertaken in 1979. It took two years to complete. Originally, there were 40 households who organized to participate in the program and all were residents in Kebele 36 of Kefetegna 18. However, since there was not enough open land in the same neighborhood for all to be accommodated, they were divided into two groups and assigned to two areas. One group was settled in Kebele 36 of Kefetegna 18; the other group was given lots in Kefetegna 18, but in a different Kebele administrative zone. Both groups knew each other prior to starting the project.

Each member has the same type of unit and lot size, 160 square meters. Each unit has two rooms, kitchen and toilet at the back. All have a big front yard and and a small back and side yard (see Appendix B no. 31 and 32). All the houses were constructed cooperatively with each member contributing his or her labor, time or other resources in the process. The average family size of these household groups ranges from 5 to 6 persons. Four residents who, at the time of the visit were having traditional Ethiopian coffee in one of the houses, were interviewed. In Ethiopia, the preparation of coffee has its traditional procedures and is also of great social importance. When neighbors come together at coffee time, it is then that any news is shared. The closer each household relationship, the more confidentially the matters having social, economic and political nature are discussed. It was under such traditional, coffee-drinking ceremonial circumstances that interview was conducted. Questions were directed to all present, though it is customary that the head of the house leads the discussion. When questioned about the criterion for membership in the Program, the statement was:

...at that time, the income criterion for individuals to be members
of Self-Help Housing had to be above 90 Birr and below 150 Birr per month. Most of the members in our group had an income in the nineties and were employed. Today this criterion has changed. Then, we were informed that a loan of 60,000 Birr was allowed for all twenty of us.

What happened after you were told that a loan of 60,000 was allowed?

...after the loan was granted, we all came together and had a briefing by the M.U.D.H. officials about the type of housing and how the whole process would be undertaken. Moreover, we were also told that each household would pay a total of 4,000 Birr through the time period of 15 years. We were not asked to make a deposit initially, or once the construction process was started. Today, however, each member has to put personal savings in the bank before any of the housing process is started.

...with that 60,000 we were told that the housing construction materials would be wood, mud and straw for walls, corrugated iron sheet for the roof, and the house will have a foundation of concrete. Having signed legal papers and after receiving the detail housing plan, a committee, elected among ourselves, began managing financial matters and determining how construction material and labor would be supplied. Each time we withdrew money from the bank (H.S.B.), we had to submit in written form for what purpose the money was used and show a receipt of expenses.

When asked the role of the M.U.D.H. in the overall housing process the household head stated as follows:

The role of the M.U.D.H. was apparent in the early stage of the housing process, which was to facilitate financial matters and deal with legal aspects involving paper work. For instance, we had to have legal documents to gain access to any institution for housing purposes, and this is provided only by M.U.D.H.,... to get quick access for cheap construction material from government-owned stores, we show the papers, and we get priority over private homebuilders.

How about assistance with regard to skilled manpower or technical matters?
... we had to cooperatively provide ourselves with the necessary technical and manual labor from the beginning until the completion. For instance, among the members, there were two men who were skilled in making roofs. This, of course, saved us money, since we did not pay or hire an outsider for the job. Everyone had contributed his or her labor, in the carrying out of different parts of the housing construction, ... such as fetching water to the site, mixing of the mud with straw, in erecting the walls, in digging the toilet pit, and even in the early stage of preparation of the site for housing.

In other words, everything was done by the members?

... only from time-to-time did the M.U.D.H. send people from the office to check on how the the construction was progressing... We also had to hire a truck to transport construction material such as wood, soil from outside the city, and straw. We did not have any help with the transportation problem, which, if we had, would have saved us a lot of money.

It should be noted that, during the interview each of the four people participated in the discussion. In continuation, when asked about major problems anticipated in the housing process, the following was said:

... problems !! problems !! there were many problems we faced. As this type of housing program was new in nature, none of us had experience in dealing with the legal aspects or the type of construction and management work that was needed. None of us were in a position to contribute additional money, so whenever we had problems which required money, we had to depend totally on the amount of loan granted us.

Question was asked whether or not they had problems concerning the allocation of money or if their money was enough for construction of the houses, as planned. The reply was:

One of the major problems we faced was at the beginning... After collecting and storing the basic construction material, we went over the
overall financial matters. We found that if we had to make foundations of concrete or masonry-stone, the money needed to buy the supplies, the transportation costs, as well as the amount needed to hire skilled persons to do the job, would be too high. There was no way the house would have been completed. This was one of the major problems encountered at the beginning. As a result, the houses have no foundation nor do they have concrete floors.

They were asked how it happened. They were told that the loan given them was intended to cover expenses needed for the foundation and the concrete floors.

... one might think that this was as a result of mismanagement or improper use of the money we had. It was not that. If one really thinks of the overall labor cost, to which each member had contributed freely, this total cost would be more than the cost of the houses. Each member was working six to eight hours each day, including Saturday and Sunday. If one was not able to participate, he or she had to hire a daily laborer, which happened often. Sometimes lunch was cooked cooperatively out of our own pocket...

... In any case, the mistake lies with the M.U.D.H. for they either knowingly or unknowingly, underestimated the cost involved in construction. Although, they stated at the beginning that the money was enough to construct the twenty houses with concrete foundation and concrete floor without reinforcement, it was impossible to do so for each house for less than 3,000 Birr.

They were asked what other problems they anticipated

The other problem was, partly our fault, but more directly, it was as a result of a lack of cooperation between M.U.D.H. and H.S.B. on the financial agreement. We were allowed a loan of 60,000 Birr, but we got only 50,000 Birr. What happened was after we constructed the houses, kitchens and toilets, and installed windows and doors, we were left with the job of the walls, which needed a smooth surface and paint. At this stage, we had only one line of piped-water, at only one point of the whole...
complex. In short, we had not yet installed piped-water and electricity to each house.

... furthermore, none of us had our own houses, some members were residing with relatives and some were paying rent. None of the members knew which house, on which lot, belonged to whom.

... these factors, including a time-consuming construction process aggravated by problems of getting construction material on time, as well as problems associated with morale, led to frustration of the members. A meeting was held among us, and a decision was made to celebrate by calling officials from M.U.D.H., H.S.B. and Kebele to explain to them our gratitude and to draw our names and house numbers, so that members would know which house was his or hers.

... at this stage of the housing process, the total cost had been 50,000 Birr, the remaining 10,000 Birr, we planned to use cooperatively for final touches, such as painting the walls, and adding water taps and electricity to each house... Every one was happy with the program's success at that stage and everyone knew which house was his or hers. We were promised that we would receive the 10,000 Birr to do the remaining work on the housing. After the party was over, most of the members decided to move in immediately and finish the job while living in the house. A few stayed for several months in their old place because they wanted to see the house properly completed before they moved in.

... our committee, meanwhile, made a great effort to withdraw the 10,000 Birr from H.S.B. for continuation of the work, but the committee received a response saying, "... since the house is almost finished, and is in a condition in which people can live, we have decided that the money is to be given to other groups engaged in similar housing programs...". We then gave up fighting the case. Since then, every one has tried to finish the house by paying the money from his pocket.

Almost five years have passed since they moved in. From the outside, none of the houses seem to have proper wall paint. When asked why residents had not been able to finish the work needed, they replied:

... our financial situation does not enable us to feed ourselves
properly, let alone put money on housing. Life has become very expensive. Today, most of us have lost our jobs. As for me, I had to stop working at the beginning of September (1985), for health reasons. I have four children and a wife to support. Other neighbors have similar family sizes and most have income of not more than 100 Birr per month... so it is very difficult to support the family, let alone spend money for improving our homes. Besides, each member has to pay 24.44 Birr each month for fifteen years. We have only made the six year's payment.

When asked whether the payment was arranged on the loan of 60,000 Birr or on the actual amount of 50,000 Birr, all four stated that the payment had been set from the beginning on the basis of the 60,000 Birr loan agreement, and that they began payment immediately, in the same month the housing process began. At the end of fifteen years, each household would have paid a total of 4,400 Birr. The actual cost of each house at completion was calculated to be approximately 3,000 Birr. Today, if a houseowner wants to sell his house, the sale price would range between 10,000 and 13,000 Birr. As a matter of fact, in 1983, two households who had problems paying the monthly 24.44 Birr, sold their houses for 9,000 and 10,000 Birr, respectively, to other people.

When asked, from their point of view why they were refused the remaining money, all agreed that:

... it was mainly jealousy. In the first place, none of the officials expected us to bring the housing process to the stage where it was when we gave the party. Afterwards, when we went again and again to ask about the rest of the money, officials in the lower hierarchy, who usually are in charge of making reports about housing progress to the higher officials, always discouraged us by giving reasons unrelated to the original loan agreement. It was apparent from their way of talking that our success was viewed with jealousy and ill-will. Moreover, indicated in their statements that once a house has a roof and four walls, it should be enough for us. There was no sign of respect for the agreement in general. On the other hand, they were very quick to make it known to the
public, using newspaper and television how successful the program had been.

They were asked what type of help, in general, they expected from M.U.D.H. and other institutions when they decided to participate in the Self-Help Housing Program.

According to the government proclamation concerning Self-Help Housing, it was the responsibility of the agencies, to make easy and quick, the legal and technical procedures involved in the laying out of piped-water and electricity lines. In our case, it took six months to one year after the completion of the house to put those facilities in each housing unit. The M.U.D.H. was also supposed to give us help in cleaning the site. We did it ourselves using our own hands.

... the other important issue which never materialized was that, originally, the housing program was packaged for the construction of a small day-care center, as well as small shopping facilities which would be used by residents of the Self-Help Housing Project and by residents living in the adjacent government Low-Cost Housing Complex. This program was later seen by the agency as being unessential... We must go to Mercato Center or to Kebele Shops to buy household needs. It is difficult to get transportation to other urban centers... the bus stops are far from our area, they are always full and taxis are expensive.

When they were asked how they rate the Self-Help Housing Program, they said:

... basically, we all are very grateful for the government assistance given to us, especially concerning the financial matters and allocation of the lots. However, the loan only was viewed by many of us as only part of the help the government would be providing. The different agencies should have at least helped us in the transportation of construction materials, in the preparation of the sites, and in providing piped-water and electricity. Besides this, the loan agreement should have been respected so that the entire housing project could be finished as planned and all residents would have been happy.
The reply whether their problems were experienced by others who undertook similar housing programs was as follows:

...after our case, many groups of households who undertook Self-Help Housing learned how to deal with management of their resources, and with officials. However, the basic problems associated with transportation of construction material, and easy access to electricity and water remain unresolved in the overall process.

The group, asked for final comment about the Self-Help Program, replied:

...one other major issue is that, the Self-Help Program had to be expanded to reach the majority of poor urban residents who cannot, under any circumstances, provide themselves with decent housing. Under the current Program, very few households would be eligible because the income criterion has changed. In our case, we were lucky because we were among the first ones, and material cost were not as expensive as they are today.

After discussion with the residents, when asked if they would permit pictures to be taken of the front and back-yard, none of them wanted pictures to be taken. In any case, all houses, without exception, had a fence and big trees planted around the boundaries of the lot. Inside the lot, all had small gardens where they had planted flowers, as well as onions, potatoes, cabbage, peppers and other vegetable plants for household consumption. The environment was well-kept. As a matter of fact, none of the other housing had outside environments as well-kept as the Self-Help complex. All four people also stated that when their financial condition permits, they will construct additional rooms. In general, they are very thankful and happy about the Program.

Self-Help Housing on Asmara Road

This Self-Help Housing Project is located along Asmara road, in the
northeastern part of the city, in Kebele 24 of Kefetegna 17. There are a total of 20 households, whose age ranges between 30 and 35. Most households have a nuclear family, with the exception of two, who are planning to marry soon. All members are employed in the M.U.D.H. The average family size of the households is four persons. Incomes of heads of the households range from 150 to 170 Birr per month.

The size of each lot is 216 square meters and each house is a two-room unit which serves as a living and bedroom. Toilet and kitchen are located in the back yards. The total cost of each unit to each family was 3,500 Birr. The loan amount granted for the project was 70,000 Birr, payable in fifteen years. Each member pays a monthly total of 30.15 Birr. At the end of fifteen years, therefore, each member would have paid a total of 5,427 Birr.

Household occupancy began at the end of 1982, and it was then, that monthly payments began. Each unit has an earth floor and corrugated iron sheet roofs without ceilings. The walls are made of mud and straw and not yet painted. Unlike the Wollo Seffer Self-Help Project, these groups have managed to make a foundation of masonry for each unit. The group also have Equit, Edir and Mehaber associations with a strong social relationships between them. To get an in-depth understanding of how this Self-Help Project proceeded during its construction phases, an interview was conducted.

The man interviewed is currently employed by the M.U.D.H. with a monthly salary of 150 Birr. After deducting tax, the monthly loan payment, and pledges for famine, he receives a net income of 80 Birr per month. He has a wife who is unemployed, a three-year old daughter, and another relative to support. He walks to work each day. The one-way trip takes him 45 minutes. Public buses usually do not come on time and, if they do, he may not get a seat. For this reason he walks to work, using a short-cut.
Before he joined the Self-Help Housing Project, he was living in an area near his job. He lived in one room where the owner had built a service room for their main house. It was a small room used as a sleeping and cooking area. Before the nationalization of extra houses in 1975, he paid 12 Birr for rent. After the nationalization, however, he paid 5 Birr per month. Today, he has his own house, and is very grateful that things developed this way. Although he discussed problems associated with the entire housing process, as seen in the subsequent paragraph, he considered the problems to be related Addis Ababa's overall economic situation in specific, and Ethiopia's in general. Moreover, he felt that, intentionally or unintentionally, the bureaucracy created within each housing agency, has contributed to the problems. Similar questions asked of the Wollo Seffer households were also asked of him. Concerning the housing construction process in general he explained:

...after organizing ourselves into cooperative groups, we selected our own committee to deal with the legal aspects of the process as well as to follow the construction work. The committee had the responsibility of reporting the work progress and bringing to the members' attention the problems encountered during each phase of the work. We discussed the problems to find proper solutions. The elected committee was also responsible for reporting every fifteen days what the expenses were and how they were spent.

In our case, we had to hire daily laborers and skilled people throughout the construction phase. Since we are all employed in the government institution and work five and one-half days a week, we were able to work on the Project only on Saturday afternoons and on Sunday. If a member is away due to work or sickness or for other reasons could not contribute their share of labor, the person was required to hire a laborer. If the person failed to do so, he would be asked to pay an amount of money equal to the expenses of a laborer. In most cases, that amount is 3.00 Birr per day, which is the minimum daily wage of a simple laborer. On this matter, the rule was very strict.
... besides the daily laborers hired, we had a contractor responsible for building the foundation and who provided construction material for the foundation, which had to be transported from outside Addis Ababa. In addition, we had an agreement with the contractor to do the roof work while we provided the materials. The agreement for the work costed us 9,000 Birr.

We had no problems concerning access to construction material or financial matters. Since we had been made a legal entity, every thing went smoothly until the completion of the houses. However, the money we had in the bank ran out before we installed electricity and piped-water. We started moving into our houses at the end of 1962. After a couple of weeks, everyone installed electricity. Each household had to pay 150 Birr for the connection. Since there was no water line near the area, we had difficulties getting the agency to take action concerning the issue.

The problem of drinkable water persisted almost for two years. During this period, each household had to fetch water from a Bowser (government-installed piped-water), located a 10 minute walk from the housing site. Each family used to pay two Birr each month and could use as much water as they needed. However, after continued complaints to M.U.D.H. officials, one member took the responsibility of dealing with the case. Finally, he succeeded in convincing officials to lay the piped-water around the complex. Once this happened, each household accepted remaining expenses as well as responsibility for the work for bringing piped-water onto the lot. The cost for the connection of water from outside into one's lot was 210 Birr, payable immediately. Since it was difficult for individuals to install the water by paying the amount at once, they organized into groups of three or four to install the water one at a time in each house. Each household in each group contributed a fixed amount monthly, to cover the initial cost of the connection, and used the water until his turn came for connection.

Among the problems, transportation was pointed out as the major one,
followed by a lack of nearby shopping facilities. One has to go to either Sholls Michael or Agoze Market places which are 15 to 20 minutes walk, (see Appendix B, No.18). Education facilities are not seen as a problem, since there is one near the residential area. There is no health facility located in the immediate neighborhood. In general, things have worked out well for these members of the Self-Help Housing Project and they feel great satisfaction with their housing conditions.

Conclusion

It is clear, from the two Self-Help Housing Programs described, how they work. Neither of the two cases seems to have differences distinctive enough to identify them "Pure" or "Aided" Self-Help Housing Programs as defined by the M.U.D.H. Both projects, Wollo Seffer and Asmara Road, could be characterized as the same type, the only difference being that one group is organized on the basis of living in the same kebele while the other group is organized as members who work in the same work-place. In both groups, the only assistance given by the government was to aid members in getting the loan.

Technical assistance given M.U.D.H. to both groups was limited. Neither of them had technical assistance in preparing the site or in transportation of construction materials to the site. The cost involved in these processes was viewed by all as being enormous. If the group had been provided assistance such as skilled persons to do the roofing, the loan would have been sufficient capital to install electricity, water lines and concrete floors.

It is very difficult, therefore, to find any consistency in the actual implementation of the Self-Help Housing Process with the program as stated
by the M.U.D.H. Moreover, it seems that recently organized Self-Help Housing members have learned to manage their resources efficiently, and to achieve the end-result as planned. In the case of the Asmara Road Self-Help Housing, the circumstances under which members organized have undoubtedly helped the housing process, since they were part of the manpower of the key institution which deals with urban housing.

What can be deduced from the interviews is that these low-income people had an opportunity to provide themselves with decent housing through the program which has created a sense of pride in achievement, a sense of competence, and a satisfaction which has stemmed from direct personal action. To some extent, these ideals were clearly stated and manifested themselves in the project's physical environment. In most cases, they have well-maintained gardens, well-kept fenced lots, and a well-defined entry. (see Appendix B, No. 33, and 34).

Of all Housing Programs, Self-Help seems to be consistent with the argument governing the concept of providing autonomous habitats. Housing and all other personal and specific services must be provided and managed autonomously by the users. However, the autonomy is far from absolute, because there continues to exist problems in gaining access to the essential resources such as building technology, construction material, and skilled manpower. While the problems associated with land-access and financing were fully solved, at least on paper, this problem persists on a different scale when it comes to practical application. In practice, the accessibility of these basic resources is a function of laws and their administration. These, in turn, are a function of the prevailing authority. However, what was concluded from the field findings on Self-Help Housing is that while authorities guaranteed access to fair shares of land and capital, and allowed
the users to act autonomously, they failed to provide them easy access to the essential infrastructure services, such as drinkable water and electricity. The rational explanation as to why these households had difficulty in getting quick access to such infrastructure services is due to the lack of coordination between the responsible authorities. Although difficulties encountered in obtaining construction materials were mentioned as a major problem, it is a problem which prevails in all sectors of Housing Programs.

Another important aspect which could be deduced from the practice of Self-Help Housing is that there were resources generated from the users which either are not, or cannot be, provided by the Housing Institution. Such resources include the labor, the input of time by members, and other non-quantifiable resources such as morale, collective discretions and responsibility in the housing process. These resources would not have developed had there been more institutional intervention in the housing process.

If one examines purely the housing process itself, regardless of the criteria for eligibility set forward by the M.U.D.H., there were three sets of operations involved in the overall housing process. They were the operations that generally proceed construction, the building operations themselves, and the management and maintenance of what was built. For practical purposes, these sets of operations were distributed between two sets of "actors" who control the resources for the process. They were the M.U.D.H., in cooperation with the H.S.B., and the users. Of course, between these two actors were the suppliers, which in the case of Self-Help, was the government who dealt with the supply of materials. It is clear that the government and its institutions, (i.e the M.U.D.H. and H.S.B.), are motivated primarily by broad political purposes. One, therefore, expects the pattern of decisions concerning the housing
process to contain prescribed lines of action. However, although there were decisions made by the M.U.D.H. and the H.S.B. in the planning of the housing programs, the outcome according to the rules actually had no impact on the action of the users, who were in the process of actual construction, management, and operation of the built-form. This is a significant point in that the decision-makers of the housing process are the users themselves rather than the institution. This is essentially what one observes in the Self-Help Housing process undertaken in Addis Ababa.

The expectation of interviewed residents concerning the role of the M.U.D.H. was not irrational. Residents expected assistance in the transportation of construction materials, aid in the preparation of the site, and help in providing skilled workers. This process of Self-Help is seen by many experts to be a practical method of providing housing for the low-income group with the sponsors supplying only what the users cannot manage themselves. However, whenever the process involves more institutional intervention, there is also a price to be paid by the users, impeding their effective role in the housing process. Without the user's effective role, the entire process would have resulted in a mismatch of objectives: the resources may not have been used in an efficient manner to meet user's needs, or to achieve the desired standard of housing.

In general, and from a practical point of view, the Self-Help Housing Program has certain important features. The size of the lot, the housing design type which allows expansion over time, the existence of institutional rules which do not limit the users' activity within their lot, all have potentially positive options. Therefore, from this point of view, Self-Help is the only Housing Program which has had a measure of success and is appreciated by the users.
F. Kebele-Sponsored Housing

1. Background

The role of kebele neighborhood unit, within a central government system, as in the case of Ethiopia, is usually of considerable importance in determining the success or failure of any community-based project and its implementation. By government-issued proclamations kebeles were authorized to participate in the construction of new houses, to maintain existing ones, to construct educational facilities, clinics, roads and other infrastructure services as needed within the neighborhood. They are, also, given the responsibility of establishing cooperatively-owned, income-generating economic facilities, intended to give service to neighborhood residents.58

For initiating the above mentioned kebele-based projects, the proclamation grants each kebele neighborhood access to revenues collected from nationalized housing that do not exceed 100 Birr per month.59 Of all the responsibilities, major emphasis was put on the construction of economical houses, maintenance of existing ones, and the improvement and installation of new infrastructure services.60

However, looking back on the political development of the kebele system, its influence upon housing issues and other neighborhood services has not always been successful. While government issued proclamations that indicated intentions to create an autonomous urban neighborhood where resources are administered and managed by the residents, in practice, the reality of management of resources and resource allocation to kebele-based projects have been seen to be quite different. In the past, and even today, several factors been contributed to kebele neighborhood's inability to activate neighborhood sponsored housing or, for that matter, any type of
project needed within the neighborhood. This section, therefore, attempts to
give an insight to the contributing factors of why *kebele* neighborhoods were
unable to initiate any neighborhood-based projects.

2. Lack of Control over its Resources.

In any *kebele* neighborhood, there is some kind of income-generating
establishment which is controlled and managed by the neighborhood. Some
important ones are nationalized houses and business establishments, such as
cooperative butcher shops, flour mills, and tea rooms, to mention a few.
Furthermore, according to the proclamations, revenues collected from such
community-owned businesses are to be used in the financing and development
of community-based projects. This arrangement is in cooperation with the
Higher Urban Dwellers Association, (U.D.A.) which are under the C.C.A.A.
jurisdiction. However, the question here is not whether the resources are
enough to initiate different projects (that is another matter), but do *kebeles*
indeed have control over their resources?

As mentioned in other sections, the urban nationalized housing stock is
classified into two categories which are administered by two different
institutions. Houses which have monthly rent less than 100 *Birr* are
administered by the *kebeles*; houses which have monthly rent over 100 *Birr*
are administered by the R.H.A. Accordingly, the money generated by renting
*kebele* houses is marked for investment in *kebele*-sponsored projects. What
has happened in practice is that revenue collected by the *kebele* rental houses
and services is handed to the C.C.A.A. In turn, the C.C.A.A. gives each *kebele* a
monthly budget to run the *kebele* offices and initiate neighborhood projects.
The monthly budget of each *kebele* differs depending on the size of the *kebele*
office and size of the service facilities that *kebele* office runs. Based on
available information, the monthly budget ranges from 300 *Birr* to 500 *Birr*
per month. The money is used to run the *Kebele* offices, pay salaries of the accountants, the secretary, the guards and, depending on the size of the *Kebele*, the salaries for people who do other clerical and field work.

Then, what does the C.C.A.A. do with the revenue generated from *Kebele*-owned resources? What is the C.C.A.A.'s role in the development of *Kebele* neighborhoods? In response to these questions, we shall first examine how the C.C.A.A. utilizes the revenue collected from the *Kebele*-administered rental houses. Second, we shall identify the circumstances under which *Kebele*-based projects, if any, are financed.


Throughout the history of C.C.A.A., especially after the establishment of the U.D.A., the major problem within this institution concerned financial matters. There was too little capital, but many responsibilities which required high capital investments, as well as skilled manpower. For instance, in fiscal year 1984, expected revenue was about 53.4 million *Birr*. On the other hand, revenue needed for that year to accomplish planned urban projects amounted to 146.00 million *Birr*. The information of how the 53.4 million *Birr* was spent indicate that 42 percent, or 22.5 million *Birr*, was for salaries and 58 percent, or 30.8 million *Birr*, was for capital investment in urban projects. A close examination of the budget report reveals that there is no mention of capital investment for neighborhood housing and related services.

1985 documents of C.C.A.A. regarding revenue collected from rental houses and forecast of budget expenditures, indicated that 18.6 million *Birr* had been collected. Of this amount, 9.3 million *Birr*, (50.5%), was spent for compensation of the ex-owners of nationalized houses, 5.9 million *Birr*, (31.7%), was spent for administrative, investment, maintenance and
emergency expenses. The remainder of the budget, which amount to 3.3 million Birr, (17.8%) was to be used for capital investment of C.C.A.A. sponsored projects, (see table 2.11). Of these C.C.A.A. sponsored projects, commonly being considered for Kebeles, are the construction of new Cooperative Shops and offices and the extension of existing facilities. Construction of new houses and services and maintenance of existing ones were not among the projects considered. According to Proclamation 101 of 1976 article 9 (5), and Proclamation No. 206 of 1981 article 13 (5), the U.D.A., hence the C.C.A.A., is charged with maintaining existing housing stock and constructing new low-cost housing, as well as providing related services to neighborhood units. This was to be accomplished by directing Kebele resources to such projects.

Table 2.11 - C.C.A.A. Expenditure of the Revenue Collected from the Nationalized Houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of expenditure</th>
<th>amount in million</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure for compensation</td>
<td>9.355</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary expenses of Kebele</td>
<td>5.869</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure for investment</td>
<td>3.288</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance and emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.512</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although the C.C.A.A. has boosted the capital for investment in urban projects in the past, the actual progress made in Kebele housing and related services is minimal, if not non-existent. For instance, in examining the types of projects accomplished in 1984 and 1985, none of them has direct impact on the welfare of the urban masses and their residential circumstances. In 1984, there were 57 projects with a capital expenditure of
21,767,834 Birr. Of these projects, over 40 percent, were for maintenance to existing city roads. Almost all projects are located outside residential areas occupied by poor urbanites. Furthermore, a close examination of those areas where the projects were undertaken indicate that the areas surrounded residences of foreign dignitaries or high-income social classes, government administration offices, or foreign and local business establishments. There were only two projects, Cooperative Shops, in Kebele 22 of Kefetegna 5, undertaken by the C.C.A.A. with a cost of 132,000 Birr. A budget of 2 million Birr had been allocated for construction and maintenance of low-cost houses, but no information was available on how the project has progressed. A similar amount of capital was also mentioned on the 1985 budget report. It is clear, therefore, that although projects undertaken by the C.C.A.A. are important, they seem to have no impact on the environment of the poor urban neighborhood.

Like other aspects of the urban system, Kebele housing conditions are determined by profound shifts in the financial ability of the municipality to invest in housing, particularly in those Kebele neighborhoods lacking the basic amenities. Why is the C.C.A.A. not able to allocate a budget for Kebeles to undertake neighborhood projects? A familiar response, given by officials, was "lack of capital". However, examining revenue collection management, one finds an irrationality in the way the C.C.A.A. is expected to cover expenses entrusted to it from only the revenues collected from Kebeles.

The revenue that the C.C.A.A. collects from the Kebeles is also used to pay compensation to former owners of nationalized houses. The amount for compensation is fixed by the Compensation Commission, according to Proclamation No. 70 of 1975. Any former owners of the houses having a monthly income under 250 Birr, at the time of the nationalization, was eligible to be compensated. According to research conducted by the C.C.A.A.
in 1984, there are 18,000 persons in Addis Ababa currently being compensated.\textsuperscript{70} As the study further indicated, in 1984, revenue collected from the nationalized houses, with rental value under 100 Birr per month as mentioned earlier, amounted to over 18 million Birr. Of this amount, the C.C.A.A. paid over 50 percent of the revenue to compensate the former owners.\textsuperscript{71} What was left, therefore, had to be spent for U.D.A. administrative purposes and on projects basic to the function of U.D.A. service systems.

The idea of compensating former owners seems to have been based on objectives intended to minimize the socio-economic and political chaos expected as a result of the reform. However, a discussion on the topic of compensation with an official reveals that,

\ldots most families should not be compensated, as they were not dependent on the rent generated from the houses they owned at the time\. There had not been a systematic study concerning which households were eligible for compensation and which were not. Moreover, these families are not required either to maintain the nationalized houses, nor are taxes levied on the income they get from compensation\. The situation seems unfair and benefits the former owners.

There is some truth to the point above. If one examines the history of housing development during the former regime, only those economically well above the majority of the population had the possibility of constructing extra houses for leasing purposes. In most cases, these people had other sources of income, such as small business run by the family. Moreover, as they knew, the nationalization of houses, was inevitable; most managed to sell the extra houses, especially those types which would be economically beneficial if sold. A few have managed to distribute the houses among their relatives with some sort of payment arrangement. The nationalized houses, therefore, were actually those houses which owners did not mind losing.
In order to understand how little revenue was left for the kebiles after paying compensation money, two cases are presented, based on C.C.A.A. unpublished files. In kebele 27 in 1985, revenue collected from nationalized houses with rent-value of less than 100 BIRR, amounted to 4,500 BIRR per month. Of this amount, 4,200 BIRR was paid to former owners for compensation. The amount ranged from 15 BIRR to 60 BIRR for each ex-owner. Therefore, with only 300 BIRR, this kebele had to administer itself and was expected to undertake neighborhood-based projects.

In another kebele, of 837 tenants, 600 families paid rent totaling to 4,282 BIRR. This amount was used to compensate 90 former owners, on an average of 47.5 BIRR per month. The practice does not help to balance the socio-economic situation existing between the tenants and the ex-owners, it aggravates it. It does not boost the revenue collected from nationalized houses, either. Rather, it minimized the aggregate financial situation so as to have little beneficial impact on neighborhood housing conditions. Since ex-owners have no responsibilities in maintaining the houses and because the C.C.A.A. has a shortage of capital to invest in the maintenance program, the living condition of the tenants of those nationalized houses has been worsening.

Why has the C.C.A.A. encouraged the development of urban neighborhoods through resident participation? The C.C.A.A. has also developed a program for road construction and other community-based projects. The program calls for the cooperation of residents of kebele neighborhoods. Here again, only well-to-do areas seem to have benefited from the program. That is because one of the major premises of the program states that residents must contribute half of the cost involved in the construction or maintenance of neighborhood projects.

In search of a solution where residents could participate in their neighborhood development, the C.C.A.A. developed a "Meet-Me-Halfway"
Development Program. The program has been working. But again, it was only in those neighborhoods and residential areas where the economically well-off reside. Those kebeles composed of low-income residents have not participated because their economic situation does not permit them to raise the amount needed to undertake these projects. The reality of the extent to which such neighborhoods could participate in the program seems not to be understood by the officials who thought the program would benefit the poor neighborhoods. Therefore, it seems worthwhile to look at how feasible resident participation is in partly financing neighborhood-based projects.


If a kebele neighborhood needs services such as public toilets, maintenance of neighborhood roads, and other neighborhood-based projects, it has to mobilize its resources. They have to do so without any support from the U.D.A. offices. This means that the residents must be able to raise the capital, labor, construction material and technical means for the project. However, they cannot. Most of the residents who live under kebele jurisdiction where development is most needed are poor. They are not able to feed their families adequately, much less contribute money for development projects.

As it has been indicated in field findings of the case study, there are few people among the urban population who are engaged in formal employment which would assure them a regular monthly income. Furthermore, over 75 percent of the Addis Ababa population generates monthly income below the poverty level. Under such economic circumstances, the feasibility of resident ability to allocate part of their income to collect the capital needed for their neighborhood-based projects seems unlikely.

Although, in theory, resident participation in neighborhood projects sounds
Table 2.12. Percentage Distribution of Domestic Expenditure by Income Class for Addis Ababa Population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Less 100</th>
<th>101-300</th>
<th>301-500</th>
<th>501-700</th>
<th>700+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drink</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Footwear</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services 1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services 2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services 3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Service 1 - includes expenses of transportation, communication medical care, reading and recreation.
Service 2 - includes expenses for fuel, light and water.
Service 3 - includes expenses for other types of household goods and services.
* - covers expenses for jewelry, personal care, domestic utensils, stimulants etc...


good, freely provided labor without capital to pay for materials and expenses does not meet the objectives of the program. The actual success of Ketele-sponsored projects through mobilization of available resources are mostly a function of the socio-economic condition of the people. Within such broadly defined categories of the "urban poor" there are wide differences in actual incomes, resulting in equally wide variation in the ability to afford any
contribution. In general, within the lower-income groups of the urban population, the proportion of income that can be set aside for housing and related services is small. A large proportion of the income must be consumed for food and other essentials. Even if there are savings, it cannot be presumed that they are available for investment in shelter and for contribution to public projects. The savings are usually intended for purposes such as insurance against sickness or incapacity through old age, or for sending children to school.

Examining the available documents for Addis Ababa on distribution of household budgets, the findings reveal the situation as seen in table 2.12. In every household level under each income category, expenses for food ranks first, followed by other expenses. However, it is interesting to note that for those population groups on the lower end of the income ladder, the expenses for food are almost half the monthly income, while expenses for housing and related services share less of the budget as compared to that part of the population higher on the income ladder. As for the high percentage of the household budget for food, the explanation is that poor households usually have more stomachs to feed. This is compared to those higher income households who have the education for family planning and have fewer children and dependents to feed. Moreover, higher income households spend more for housing and other types of services when compared to low-income households, as their desire for better living conditions is related to their socio-economic condition. A similar pattern of household budget allocation for the items discussed in the Addis Ababa household population is also apparent in 17 other major urban centers. It is, therefore, these basic facts which one has to consider in answering why kebeles, composed of population on the lower-income ladder, are not able to undertake any community-sponsored projects without having any assistance.
There are alternative programs developed in which urban neighborhoods could participate. But, the question is how realistic are these programs when the neighborhood is composed of low-income residents? For instance, according to estimate of one M.U.D.H. official, a neighborhood such as Kebele 25 needs a minimum of 1.5 to 2.0 million Birr to undertake upgrading of the housing and infrastructure services. Those Kebele neighborhoods, which have environmental problems such as flooding, would need more capital to adequately deal with such problem. Just to help us understand the circumstances under which such a program could be undertaken, and the feasibility of the program itself, let one assume that the cost of upgrading the major circulation network of Kebele 25 Kefetegn 6 (around 2,100 meters length), would be 500,000 Birr. This would be done with the assumption that residents, whose houses are along this circulation would not be displaced.

There are three alternative programs existing to date. First, there is the C.C.A.A. program which is intended to encourage resident participation in projects directed to their neighborhood. Second, there is the use of the budget that the C.C.A.A. allocates to a Kebele. Third, there is mobilization of resident resources. Looking at each program and considering the premises under which they operate, none of them seems promising enough to be regarded as an upgrading of the main circulation network of the neighborhood. Even if one considers a combination of the three programs that, too, is not enough to accomplish the project. For instance, of the 500,000 Birr needed, 250,000 is expected to be provided by the Kebele residents. The rest of the capital is assumed to be covered by the C.C.A.A. In Kebele 25, there are 1,117 households. Over 50 percent have income under the poverty level, with about 15 percent of the remaining households falling in the middle-income category, (see Chapter II, table 1.7).

If every household is expected to participate in the effort of mobilizing
resources for the project, it means that every household must contribute resources equivalent to between 200 and 230 Birr. The residents as individuals or as a group could get low-interest loans from the H.S.B. or other financial establishments. This, however, is not a solution for initiating neighborhood projects because most Kebele neighborhoods, whose population is composed of low-income households, would lack effective security for loans. This implicitly means, that the loan policy itself is not designed to encourage access to normal credit facilities by those Kebele neighborhoods which are socio-economically disadvantaged.

Therefore, it is this reality and others pointed out earlier, that make it clear whether or not Kebele-sponsored projects, are feasible. Based on information concerning the socio-economic circumstances and the magnitude of problems existing in such neighborhoods as Kebele 25, it is unlikely that these Kebele would able to improve their environment using available financial channels and programs. This, of course, calls for major changes by the government in the way Kebele resources are handled, and in the way the loan policy works. It also calls for a larger allocation of the government budget to the Kebeles so that they can undertake projects intended for the welfare of neighborhood residents.

Conclusion

After the assurance of political peace and order in the urban centers, each poor urban individual expected the central and local governments to adopt ambitious neighborhood-based programs. They expected it would be done based upon diagnosed criteria which had taken into consideration the needs of the people who would be served. Moreover, every individual expected, if such programs did exist, that it was the responsibility of each resident to see that the project succeeded, through resident participation, and mobilization of
neighborhood resources.

In the past, the Government has made efforts to provide reforms aimed at housing and related services. Several housing programs have been developed, including ways to deal with the financial aspects of housing. However, it seems that the real urban poor are unable to take part in these programs. This is due to the nature of the premises governing the programs, and the requirements by which it is determined whether the urban poor can participate.

Government’s efforts to mobilize residents for neighborhood development has been an effective way of encouraging resident input. However, it has always been politically motivated. The methods has been used to strengthen the bureaucratic fabric of Government, rather than to address the real problem of the residents. A case in point is, the mobilization of the residents for the construction of kebele offices and an assembly hall. Even mass education had political motives. The Kebeles, hence, all U.D.As, mobilized the educated urban residents to teach the illiterate to read and write and to upgrade the political consciousness of residents. The idea was, and still is, very much appreciated by all residents and has brought many changes to the political consciousness of residents. On the other hand, the knowledge residents gained from the mass education program, does not have immediate impact on the standard of living. Since the education was merely elementary, it did not enable them to find employment and did not open other areas of opportunities. If the educational program had provided such benefits, the residents, at least in theory, would have been able to improve their living standard by engaging in some employment. Therefore, it is clear that this action was motivated, one way or another, by political aims rather than by an objective addressing itself to the real neighborhood problem.

Any community project’s success depends upon the voluntary participation
of residents. Residents only volunteer to do things which they believe to be worthwhile. Although there are an infinite variety of residents desires, there are basic needs which create common values among them and they acknowledge the necessity of dealing with the problem in a communal way. These basic needs includes the construction and maintenance of community streets, the provision of day-care centers, the construction of inexpensive housing, and the installation of public sanitation facilities.

For these types of projects, of course, some sort of Government assistance is needed. Residents, too, know that they cannot undertake a project totally financed by themselves. Understanding the situation, the institution has made efforts to initiate neighborhood development programs. Upon examination of the circumstances of these program, there exists an irony in the way the programs were formulated. In other words, people responsible for the formulation of the programs did not seem to have a good grasp of the economic problems existing within neighborhoods composed of low-income residents whom they are supposed to be serving. This argument is clearly demonstrated by the examination of the premises governing the programs, and whether or not these programs can be of benefit to the *kebele* neighborhoods.
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1. Shito Mersha, Urban Development. ... Ibid. In the report, he argues that the rapid growth of Ethiopian Towns has been the result of migration rather than natural birth.

2. Ibid., p. 69.


5. C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... Ibid., Table 1.

6. This number of production units indicates housing units constructed by different government and private institutions using the existing housing delivery mechanism. For detail see, C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... Ibid, p.4.

7. This was based on the assumption that the backlog (26,000 units per year) be covered in ten years and the average need for houses related to the growth of population would be 15,000 units per year.

8. M.U.D.H. Housing Finance Problem and Approaches. (Addis Ababa: M.U.D.H., 1980). The report indicates that the annual housing need for the country (Urban and Semi-Urban), during the 1980-1985 period amount to 90,000 units. This represents an investment of 608 million Birr per year. Of these total units, 45 percent of the housing need is in Addis Ababa.

M.U.D.H., Annual Housing Needs for Ethiopia 1976-1983 period. (Addis Ababa: M.U.D.H., nd.). The report indicates that the housing need amounts to 102,000 units. Of these, 47,000 units (46%) are needed in Addis Ababa.


M.U.D.H., "National Plan 1976." cited in C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... Ibid. The report indicates that the annual need for Addis Ababa is 26,000 units.

9. Due to the mismatch of supply and demand of proper housing, one
commonly observes the outcome of the process being an increase of squatter settlements. For instance, a study done by the World Bank indicates that 90 percent of Addis Ababa's population was accommodated in squatter settlement areas. In other major urban cities like Mexico City, 46 percent of its population was accommodated in a similar situation. Similar accommodation circumstances were reported in Ankara and Calcutta, i.e. 60% and 33% respectively. For details see the World Bank, Housing Sector Paper. IBRD, 1975, pp. 62–63.


13. It is impossible to estimate the total number of people who have benefited from programs such as sites and services or upgrading. So far however, it is clear that a large proportion of projects have been financed through international agencies. For instance, the World Bank made its first loan for sites and services to Senegal in 1972, and in 1974 extended its operations to upgrading with loans for projects in Calcutta, Manila, and Dar es Salam. For detailed information, see United Nations, Physical Improvement of Slums and Squatter Settlements. Report of ad hoc Expert Groups meeting in Nassau, (Nairobi: UNCHS, 1977) P. 6. See also David G. Williams, "The Roll of International Agencies: The World Bank." in Payne G. K. (ed.), Low-income Housing in Developing World. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964), pp. 173–190

14. The only example of a settlement upgrading project undertaken in Addis Ababa or, for that matter, in the nation, was the Tekle Haimanote residential area. Existing housing has been maintained, streets are widened but not paved, and public sanitation facilities have been provided. However, some residents had to be moved to other areas and their settlement environment which is located in Nefas Silik, is not yet finished.


18. Ibid., p. 20


20. Ibid., Article 15 -19.

21. Ibid., Article 17


27. The cost range of low-income houses as stated by M.U.D.H. is acceptable when considering the escalation of construction cost of a house, during the last five to seven years. For instance, based on construction cost information documented between 1976 - 1978, a house constructed of mud and wood, cost 90 BIRR per square meter in 1976; in 1977, the cost of one square meter was 125 BIRR, and in 1978 it was 200 BIRR. Therefore, a house which would have cost 5,000 BIRR in 1976, would cost 6,944 BIRR in 1977 which is an increase of 39 percent. The same house would cost 11,110 BIRR in 1978, which is an increase of 122 percent of the 1976 cost. This tremendous cost difference is
not only apparent in the field of housing, but in the overall economic life of the country, especially in basic consumer goods.

28. In theory, many individuals' decisions are influenced by factors in their choice of housing and site location. Such areas and sites are characterized by already existing housing stock in the matter of housing composition and spatial distribution; accessibility to work places and services; existing trends of urban growth; the immediate physical and social environment including the land-use prototype; level of development in regard to availability and quality of water supply, schools, health, shopping, and recreational facility areas are some of the criteria individuals consider in their housing choices. Security from undesirable influences and general prospects of the area for future development are, also, important factors that individuals or groups take into consideration when they make their locational preferences and decisions.

In the Addis Ababa Urban System, however, the above outlined criteria are far from being available, even partially, in most locations of urban land-use patterns. However, most Cooperative Housing sites are among the few urban residential sites which more or less possess the above criteria.

29. The cost of each unit was 25,000 Birr, based on 1978-80 construction costs. As one informant stated, "...today (i.e. 1986), I could easily sell this unit for a minimum of 35,000 Birr." This is due to location, the housing type and due to escalation of construction material cost.

30. The lot size determines the amount of space available for construction of the house as well as open space needed for undertaking different activities. This is a major issue when it comes to choice of housing. Since the nationalization of urban lands, every family has the right to obtain up to 500 square meters of land for residential purposes. For Cooperative, Self-Help, as well as Private Housing, the M.U.D.H. has been providing land based on the size of the house type. For instance, based on the available data, the following lot sizes for different houses have been used a working standard for allocation of lots from 1978 through 1982. (See Table 2.13). However, information on 521 Cooperative Housing members indicate 82 percent (425), prefer the maximum allowable lot size (i.e. 500 square meters), while only 13.8 percent (72 households) preferred their lot size to be between 400 and 450 square meters. Only 2.1 percent (11 households) preferred 300-350 square meters lot size; and 1.7 percent (9 households) wanted more than a 600 square meter lot size.
Table 2.13. Residential Plot Size Distribution on schedule for Housing Cooperatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit area (square meter)</th>
<th>plot size (square meter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-120</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121+</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Though this was the image of household preference concerning lot size, actual plot allocation by the M.U.D.H. to the members is influenced, most of all, by the size of the housing unit and by the level of development that has occurred in the area of the selected site. On the other hand, the household's lot size preference is strongly influenced by variables such as family size and house type intended to be built. The income level of a household does not seem to have any connection in preference of lot size. One reason could be that, since land is free, every one wants the maximum possible lot size.

The desire to have more land for housing development is also intimately related to socio-economic status of the households. For instance, for low-income households, a bigger plot size offers an opportunity for informal activities such as raising domestic animals, growing vegetables or undertaking other income-generating activities. For higher income groups, a larger plot size offers an opportunity for gardening, private play area for the family, and extension of the housing units.

31. An attempt was made to interview a household head from each housing type. However, very few were found to be willing to be interviewed. A housewife whose husband was at work at the time of the interview cooperated in discussing the overall housing process.
She is in her late thirties and has two school age children (a ten-year old girl and a thirteen-year old boy). Her husband works at Ethiopian Airlines and generates an income of 600 Birr per month. Her house is one of the smaller types. The housing has two bedrooms, a living and dining space and a toilet inside the main unit. At the back, there is a kitchen (Yetehese Bett), and a service room. In the front and on the side of the house, she has a small garden. The masonry fencing of the house is still under construction and is planned for completion in the middle of 1986.


33. Several cases could be cited at this point. For instance, Mercato super-market, at a cost of 4,279,400, was constructed by R.H.A. The Military Officers' Club, with a cost of 1,082,700 million, was also constructed by the R.H.A. Both projects are in Addis Ababa and have been constructed since 1985, but have not yet started operation. For further information see M.U.D.H., Report on the 1983-1984 Fiscal Year Work Accomplishment. (Addis Ababa: M.U.D.H., 1984), PP. 10-11.

Moreover, a discussion with a former official in the R.H.A reveals that, the agency was involving itself in the maintenance of other buildings which are not basically under its jurisdiction. For instance, in 1984, there were regular meetings of African leaders in Addis Ababa and due to this, a nearby hotel, (Gion), had to be renovated for accommodation of the officials. New furniture and carpet was installed and walls had to be painted. Although, it is not clear where the expenses for the work came from, it was the R.H.A. maintenance crew who worked for two days, night and day. This work was the responsibility of the Ministry of Tourist and Hotels.

34. This number of housing units include high-rise apartment buildings constructed for the accommodation of foreign Diplomats and for hostels for bachelors. The 906 housing units considered to be low-cost are those whose construction cost ranges between 7,000 -12,000 Birr, and where tenants are assumed to be in the lower-income bracket. For information regarding number of houses constructed using different housing programs see C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... Ibid., P. 4, table 3.


36. C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... Ibid., p. 8.
37. For the fiscal year 1983-84, the R.H.A. had planned to invest 40 million Birr in apartment buildings, hostels, villes and low-cost housing. The share of capital for Low-Cost Housing during this period was 16.25 percent. This is a significant increase when compared to investment in Low-Cost Housing over the the past years. For details see C.C.A.A. Low-Cost .... Ibid., p. 8, table 6.

38. See estimated housing needs for the 1985-1989 C.C.A.A., Low-Cost .... Ibid., pp. 5-6, see also, Haile Michael Lique, The Necessity of .... Ibid., pp. 31-35.

39. This argument is based on the fact that when one examines the increase of construction cost over the year, though there seems to be an increase in the amount of capital invested on Low-Cost Housing, the increase actually covers the cost difference of construction material and expenses involved in the management of the housing process rather than the construction. Moreover, Low-Cost Housing as defined by the R.H.A does not actually cover low-cost housing, but housing for the middle and higher-income classes (see also interview results).

40. One of the major construction activities by the R.H.A is high-rise apartments, (see appendix B, No. 5 and 6). These apartments are designed to meet the needs of foreigners who reside in the capital, as well as for Ethiopians who are accustomed to the European way of life. The rent is expensive; the minimum monthly rent paid for a one-bedroom apartment is 250 Birr per month. A discussion with an ex-official of the R.H.A reveals that the apartments were constructed with the idea of accommodating foreigners who work in the country. Although, the R.H.A renting policy permits any Ethiopian to rent the apartments, there are few Ethiopians who could afford to pay the rent the R.H.A demands. Moreover, the unit design does not meet the Ethiopian way of life. The rooms and the kitchens are small and are not enough to accommodate typical activities of an Ethiopian household, especially one with a large family.

On the other hand, the hostels building, were intended to accommodate bachelors and unmarried women who have incomes of at least 500 Birr per month. Here, again, most hostel buildings are occupied by foreigners who are working in Addis Ababa for a short period of time. The hostels are affordable by some Ethiopians, especially university graduates; however, it is difficult to find vacancies.
41. This amount is the cumulative revenue owed till 1982. See also M.U.D.H., *Ten year Development plan*. Ibid., p. 37.

42. Examining the 1983 revenue collected by R.H.A, individual tenants owed 7.2 million Birr; government organizations, 3.6 million; and, diplomats 0.2 million Birr. This is a total of 16.9 in uncollected revenue. For detail see M.U.D.H., *Report on the 1983-84*. Ibid., p 6.

43. Each year the two agencies, C.C.A.A. and R.H.A., pay a total of 13.8 million Birr, for compensating the ex-owners of nationalized housing. The C.C.A.A. compensate ex-owners of houses whose monthly rental value is under 100 Birr, while the R.H.A. compensates owners of houses whose monthly rental value is above 100 Birr. For detail see C.C.A.A., *Low-Cost*. Ibid., pp.14-17.


45. Year-after-year, the R.H.A's number of employees has been increasing despite the inability of the agency to manage and maintain existing housing stock (see table 2.14).

Table 2.14 - Work Force of the Rental Housing Authority, (R.H.A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Permanent workers</th>
<th>Temporary workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2319</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. There is one Low-Cost Housing Complex constructed by the R.H.A., located near the A.M.C.E. Interview with one of the residents who lives in a two-room unit reveals that she is generally happy with the housing. It is constructed of mud mixed with straw, wood for the vertical and horizontal frames, concrete for the floor, and has an outside kitchen and toilet. Her complaint was that the rent was expensive, 30 Birr per month. This complaint was not without reason, because the housing complex is located in the outskirts of the city. Travel expenses to and from her work place, which is located in the inner part of the city, and travel expenses to shopping areas, when added to the overall housing expenses, are considered expensive by her standard. Beside this, the configuration of the housing, which is row-houses up to ten units, is not appreciated because the dividing wall between the units is not insulated. Any sounds from the next unit could be heard in the adjacent room.

47. For detail information regarding Self-Help Housing Programs initiated through the 1983-84 fiscal Year, see M.U.D.H., Report on the 1983-84... Ibid., P.8

48. Cost was estimated based on the percentage of revenue invested at the end of 1984 on the 460 units. For detail see M.U.D.H., Report on the 1983-84... Ibid., p. 9. See also Haile Michael Lique, "The Necessity of..." Ibid., pp. 28-42.

49. Ibid.

50. Traditional ways of making coffee plays a major role in bringing together those households who live next to each other. If one household prepares the coffee in the morning, it is customary to invite two or three people, usually adults who reside in the next houses. This way, each household prepares the coffee in turn at different time of the day and invites the neighbors. Usually, the neighbors are closely attached in many social aspects. For example, they borrow from one another any type of household utensils. In bad and good times, they are always there to share the burden and the celebration. How long neighbors have known each other does not affect the creation of relationships for drinking coffee together. Coffee is brewed three times; the first cup being the strong one and the other two, mild.

Though this type of coffee ceremony has been exclusively practiced among the Christians, especially the Amhara ethnic groups, (since they are major coffee drinkers), today, it is practiced among every ethnic group. If there is a Muslim household living next to a Christian one and it is known that the senior members of that household drink coffee, it is customary to invite one another
for coffee.

Nowadays, the existence of that strong relationship between neighbors seem to be disappearing. The major reason for this is that the cost of living is very expensive, and specifically, one cannot find even the poorest quality of coffee in the market, even if one could afford to buy one kilo which cost 22 Birr in the black market, of 1985. The condition has worsened since the 1974 change. Coffee has been, and still is, one of the major export commodities which generates major foreign currency for the country. The coffee production and marketing is controlled by the government. As coffee ceased to exist on the market for the public, and as it became more and more expensive, the traditional way of drinking coffee which has existed for centuries, and the social importance which neighbors had enjoyed, has also begun to fade away. However, there are still many people who continue drinking coffee in the traditional manner, though the quantity and strength of coffee has lessened. With the coffee ceremony, there was eating as well as males playing traditional games like "Gebeta" (chess-like game), and women doing knitting and basketry. Today, this type of traditional coffee-drinking ceremony is more apparent in low-income classes than it is in well-to-do circles.

51. The reason they refused to allow me to take pictures was, in part, my fault. When I first approached them for an interview, they were suspicious and unwilling to be interviewed. However, after a little explanation of the purpose of the interview and after showing them papers given me by different officials, they invited me inside. They were very friendly and openly expressed their feelings. At the end of the interview we all were standing outside, as the owner of the house was explaining the types of plants and vegetables he had in the garden.

As a standard procedure, I asked the owner whether or not he or she would have any objection to my taking pictures. However, he did not consider the pictures to be important for the research. Since he considered his house as not having special features, he became suspicious of me having a mission other than research and tried to explain to me why he did not want pictures of his house and garden taken.

I told him that I had a permit for taking pictures which had been given me by officials and I could show him a permit number. This number was given to me to show to kebele officials or city policemen if I happen to be stopped while taking pictures. However, the permit number alone, without any written statement, does not make any sense to a resident. For this reason, he did not want me take any pictures. Without further argument, I explained to him and
others my intentions so that there would not be ill-feelings between us.

52. Every employed person, whether in private or government establishments, has to contribute one month's salary for the famine, which was at a devastating stage during 1980-83. The payment is made over a period of one year. Each month, therefore, a certain amount of money is deducted from the salary for 12 months. The pledge for famine is made regardless of that person's other expenses. In the case of this interviewed person, 12.50 Birr is deducted from his salary.


54. For instance, theoretical deduction done by many scholars, based on case studies of housing in different nations, reveals that local autonomy and direct, or indirect, dweller control depend upon the availability of the appropriate tools and materials. These include, building technology, the availability of construction material, skilled manpower and, above all, the availability of land and financing. For detail see, Ibid.; see also HABITAT., The Residential Circumstances of the Urban Poor in Developing Countries. (New York: Preager, 1981).

55. As land is nationalized and a housing financing system is established, the Ethiopian situation is ahead of other countries with similar problems.

56. In this case the authorities are the M.U.D.H. and C.C.A.A.

57. This issue is stressed by many research groups based on the argument that, since dwelling environments must function for their inhabitants and because people's housing priorities are varied, control over the actual construction process, the management of resources, as well as maintenance of what is built, must be put into individual and local hands. For detail see, Turner (1977), Ibid., p. 45 and Fathy (1973), Ibid., pp. 19-43.

59. In urban Addis Ababa, there are two institutions which are in charge of the management of nationalized housing stock: the Kebele Organization and the Rental Housing Authority (R.H.A.). Each of them have different housing types with regard to quality, quantity, and rent values. The Kebeles manage 135,347 housing units. The rent values range from less than 5 BIRR per month up to 100. In the category of housing units managed by the Kebeles, about 70 percent are rented for less than 10 BIRR per month and only 5.5 percent have rent value between 50-100 BIRR per month. On the other hand, the R.H.A. manages over 16,200 houses of which approximately 50 percent are rented for 100 to 200 BIRR per month with the rest, above that. For detail, see C.C.A.A. Low-Cost...Ibid., p. 25, table 5.

60. P.M.A.C., "...Proclamation No. 104 of 1976 " Ibid. p. 79-80, article 9(4,5), and "...Proclamation No. 206 of 1981." Ibid., P. 119, article 13(7,8).

61. C.C.A.A., 1984 Fiscal Year ...Ibid.,1985, P. 1

62. Ibid.

63. According the information stated in C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... pp.13-14, the amount of the revenue collected from rental houses is 18.6 million BIRR. This information conflicts with the information in the C.C.A.A. 1985 Fiscal Year Budget Report. In that Report, the income generated from the tax, building permits and rental houses was said to amount to 11.6 million BIRR. For information see, C.C.A.A., 1985 Fiscal ...Ibid., P. 1

64. Of total C.C.A.A's expenditure in 1980, the revenue invested for different development projects, the amount was 30 percent. In 1981, it was 41 percent, in 1982 it was 50 percent, and in 1984, it was 58 percent. Finally, in 1986, it was 56 percent. For detail, see C.C.A.A., 1984 Fiscal ... Ibid. p.1


66. Ibid.

67. For detailed information about the types of projects and areas where these projects are undertaken, see C.C.A.A. 1985 Fiscal ...Ibid., P. 123-126.

68. After the nationalization of all major economic sectors, urban lands
and extra houses, the P.M.A.C. established a Compensation Commission by issuing Proclamation No. 70 in 1975. This Commission is appointed by the Head of State, from among persons who are sufficiently qualified in law, economics, engineering, agriculture and business administration. The Commission is responsible for the execution of any agreement relating to the payment of compensation for all types of nationalized properties. It is responsible for seeing that the C.C.A.A. pays former owners, from the rent it collects on houses administered by it. For detail see P.M.A.C., "... Proclamation No. 14 of 1975." Negarit Gazeta, Ibid.

69. As one examines the housing market during the prior government administration, one finds that most people built houses or expanded the existing ones so they could have additional income by leasing the houses. These people were not necessarily rich, but usually had some sort of business establishment. Understanding the economic status of the owners, the government fixed the 250 Birr monthly income as a criterion for former owners' eligibility. If one examines the types of houses most ex-owners owned, one would find the houses have rental values of not more than 50 Birr per month and are in poor condition.

70. See C.C.A.A., Low-Cost ... Ibid.

71. In earlier years, although the number of compensated owners was not indicated, according to official information, the revenue spent for the compensation of the ex-owners had been consuming more than 60 percent of the revenue collected from the rented houses. In recent years, however, there has been a decrease in the amount paid for compensation. This is due: first, to some houses being dilapidated and compensation stopped; or, second, the time of compensation having expired.

72. Addis Ababa Water and Sewerage Authority, "Sample of 710 Households ..." Ibid. This report indicated that the poverty level in 1981 was 165 Birr per month.

73. A study done in 1983 for 17 urban centers about the distribution of household budgets indicated that a typical household with monthly income of 100 Birr spends 49 percent for food and 12.6 percent for rent, while services consume 27.5 percent of the household income. Similarly, households with income of 100 to 300 Birr spend, 49 percent for food, and only 10.7 percent for rent. The study also shows that the higher the income level of the households, the more savings observed for housing, the less expenditure on food and the increase of spending for recreational purposes. For details see F. Wegayehu,
CHAPTER IV

Assessment of the Construction Authority; Research and Training Institutions; The Building Industries and Distribution Structure

In the preceding section, there has been an effort to evaluate the existing housing programs and institutions responsible for their initiation, in the light of the array of issues. Some of the problems pointed out were attributable to M.U.D.H., C.C.A.A., R.H.A. and H.S.B. However, the problems cannot be totally understood without knowing the problems which exist for those responsible for providing, skilled manpower, construction material, and scientific research relevant to housing. There are also the institutions to consider which are solely responsible for the actual construction of the housing and other projects commissioned by the government and private organizations. With this view in mind, Chapter IV attempts to evaluate how well-equipped these institutions are with the necessary resources to properly perform the duties entrusted to them.

A. The Ethiopian Building Construction Authority, (E.B.C.A.)

Prior to the nationalization of privately-owned construction companies, the government established the Housing Corporation Agency in 1976. It was administered by the M.U.D.H. It had the responsibility and duty to initiate government-financed housing and urban-development projects. It continued to operate, without adequate supplies of skilled manpower and necessary technical equipments, until 1982. Although the organization was achieving
progress in internal management and organizational structure, some of the projects it was to undertake have never left the drawing boards.\textsuperscript{3}

The National Boring Organization is another major, privately-owned company which undertook major work in the construction field. The government nationalized the company in 1977, and its management was transferred to the M.U.D.H.\textsuperscript{4} Although most skilled personnel left the company after it became nationalized, it continued to conduct research on soil types, drilling wells, and undertook foundation work as needed in the construction of high-rise apartments and office buildings.

Like other government institutions, problems which existed in these two organizations were not unique, but were inherent in the type of work they do. Five major problems existed within these two institutions. First, there was a lack of adequate funding to run them properly. Second, there was mismanagement and an improper use of the work-force.\textsuperscript{5} A lack of heavy machinery, needed to facilitate the construction of projects was a third problem. This problem was outstanding because it meant that most projects had to be completed by hand labor, thus making the construction process inefficient, time-consuming, as well as expensive. Fourth, there was disorganization in the supply of construction material. Because the organization did not have a planned and organized system through which it could supply its project with the necessary construction material, it was victimized by the practice of bribery and other corruption, such as being charged with highly priced items through false agreements with privately-owned suppliers.\textsuperscript{6} Fifth, the lack of employee-confidence and disorganization of the workers are problems which contributed to poor performance on contracts agreed to by the two agencies. The fact that the success of the work depended on decisions made by other departments of the
M.U.D.H. had a negative impact on the performance of the employees within the organizations. Experts in the field were usually afraid to make decisions in order to avoid responsibility for failure. Consequently, a higher official was needed to issue orders regarding what was to be done. Because most officials lacked the necessary knowledge, this led to a more time-consuming decision-making process, hence slowing the implementation of the project.

The government, aware of the problems which existed in construction industry organizations, and in an effort to consolidate both small and large scale nationalized construction companies, issued a proclamation which sought the creation of the Ethiopian Building Construction Authority (E.B.C.A.). Under Proclamation No. 191 of 1980, the Housing Corporation Agency, the National Boring Organization and other large firms, which were formerly owned and operated by foreign or indigenous organizations, were to be reorganized and managed by the E.B.C.A. Moreover, E.B.C.A. became an independent Ministry. Funding for the authority is drawn from a combination of government allocation, service fees and charges, and money obtained from loans and foreign aid. All financial, manpower, technical resources which were formerly managed by the various private and government organizations shifted to E.B.C.A. administration.

Since its establishment, the E.B.C.A. has monopolized construction activities, especially those types of projects sponsored one way or another by the State. E.B.C.A. has organized three major departments through which all types of projects are implemented. These departments are the Light Construction Department, the Material Testing and Foundation Department, and the Heavy Construction Department. The Light Construction Department is responsible for development and implementation of programs in rural areas. The Material Testing and Foundation Department is responsible for undertaking
work required by both departments. Information available, however, indicates that most of the work done by this department confirms the department's active role in rural-oriented projects. The third, and most important department for the implementation of urban and rural projects, especially those which need complex planning and resources, is the Department of Heavy Construction. Some of the major construction projects undertaken by this Department include recreational, health and educational facilities, government and private-organization sponsored housing, office buildings, market centers, resettlement facilities in rural areas, industrial and tele-communication buildings, and other heavy construction.

Although E.B.C.A. has completed many projects since its operation, and continues to diversify and modify its administrative and management structure, the inherent problems are many. Seeking to identify problems in E.B.C.A., an interview was conducted with two department heads. Beside problems inherited from the previous organizations which continue to exist, other problems were pointed out as being critical ones which hinder E.B.C.A.'s ability to conduct its business in a satisfactory manner.

Most officials who supervise the implementation of a project lack the experience and, sometimes, the knowledge needed to follow up the work involved. This has caused major problems in the field in the coordination and implementation of a program, as well as in the exchange of information within the vertical and horizontal administrative structure of E.B.C.A. departments. A score of problems resulted. These include that:

...the work-force is not used efficiently or in a productive manner. Some skilled people are not assigned to projects for which they have professional knowledge. Too many laborers are sometimes assigned to a project which needed few. Most of the labor is not managed properly... workers do not arrive at the site on time, they work slowly... foremen of
projects are not strict in performing their duties.

In conjunction with the above, one observes behavior among officials which allow them to avoid the responsibilities entrusted to them. They often use legal tactics intended to free themselves of blame should anything go wrong. While they are responsible for making decisions, either at the construction site or in the office, their non-performance has caused unnecessary paperwork, and delays in the implementation phase of a project.

The E.B.C.A. lacks an organized and knowledgeable committee to audit allocation of resources for day-to-day work. As is true of any institution, it is clear that efficiency and work-output levels depend on individual and group work performance. E.B.C.A. does not have an organized inspection system to determine whether or not employees perform their work as expected. For instance, based on the interview information, many employees take time-off from work by giving false reasons which satisfy the legal requirements for someone to be excused from work with pay. The problem of absenteeism, therefore, is seen by many as one of the most subtle and obscure enemies of E.B.C.A.

E.B.C.A. has many different departments. Inquiries as to whether or not these departments are equipped with the resources necessary to properly perform their jobs, reveal that almost all departments are ill-equipped. For instance, one of the basic problems faced by the Department of Architecture and Engineering is a lack of equipment for designing and drafting. The department also lacks well-trained architects and engineers who would handle the complex technical issues involved in the many phases of a project. One person interviewed pointed out that:

... much of the time, the authority invites foreign experts to work on
a project for a certain period of time. After these experts leave the
country, the authority faces the problem of finding skilled people to
complete the remaining work. In such situations the people, who are
assigned the work, face problems in pursuing the projects the way foreign
experts have outlined. One contributing factor to this dilemma is that the
design specifications and codes used by foreigners are unfamiliar to local
designers. Moreover, projects designed by these experts are criticized as
being over-designed and costly.

... also, most designs do not take into consideration the availability
of construction material produced locally, or whether there is enough
skilled manpower capable of dealing with problems faced during the
implementation phases of a project... the standards are too high. This
situation creates conflicts among the local and foreign experts, thus
affecting the function of the authority.

Disorganization in the supply of construction material and needed
equipment is another major problem in E.B.C.A. The Supply and Equipment
Service Department, in cooperation with Planning and Programming Service
Departments and the Department of Finance, is responsible for producing and
storing material and equipment, as well as seeing that they are efficiently
utilized and distributed. Nevertheless, the problems which exist in this
department indicate a high level of inefficiency in coordination and
implementation. This exists, within the department's administration system
and in its relationship with Planning and Programming Service Departments and
the Department of Finance. No organized channels exist where information can
be exchanged quickly, accurately and in an understandable manner:

... When construction material and equipment needed for a specific
project is requested, the Department has repeatedly shown weakness by
not documenting material to be either maintained or replaced. Not only
that, if there is a need for coordination of supplies with other
departments, there is a failure to do so. A repeatedly observed
phenomenon is the distribution of equipment and construction material to
project sites where they are not actually needed...
...this disorganization also applies to the way that manpower is allocated. For instance, most often, unskilled workers are assigned to projects which need a skilled work-force or too many workers are assigned to projects which actually could have been done by a few.

E.B.C.A. also faces major problems concerning the proper allocation of funds and proper management of basic expenses. These include expenses for equipment maintenance, fuel, labor costs, travel, and construction material. One factor contributing to this situation is a lack of experts in the field and the presence of dishonest people. Experts who are able to follow marketed products needed by the organization with respect to price, quality, and availability, do not exist. One person interviewed stated that:

...expenses forwarded by the Supply and Equipment Departments have shown to have no relation to the actual prices of the equipment or to expenses for labor, fuel, maintenance and other things the Department claims to have purchased.

E.B.C.A. has a department which supplies needed vehicles. It is responsible for providing vehicles by buying new ones, maintaining existing ones, or by contracting with private businesses. First, this department has problems with regard to proper use of the vehicles. For instance, E.B.C.A.-owned vehicles are not assigned to the type of work for which they are designed. Vehicles owned by private owners are misused also. In most cases, the vehicles are parked while they are supposed to be working. Second, it has been observed often that E.B.C.A.-owned vehicles are being used for personal purposes. Third, although the department has a repair shop, it lacks skilled technicians, appropriate equipment, and spare parts which are necessary to deal with maintenance problems. As a result, most maintenance work is done by privately-owned repair shops.
In conclusion, the problems which exist within the E.B.C.A. are many and interrelated. After analyzing the problems discussed in the preceding pages, one can cautiously infer that the root of the problem is the inability of the responsible officials to foresee whether or not the departments are capable of undertaking the type of projects to which they are assigned. In the past, the E.B.C.A. has undertaken projects without systematically evaluating its resources such as capital, manpower, construction materials, or technology. Mismanagement and inefficient use of resources have resulted in delays in the completion of projects. Not only this, but the magnitude of projects initiated by the authority, without consideration of management efficiency in its organization, has created circumstances ripe for the misuse and abuse of power. Considering the volume of work that the E.B.C.A. is charged to perform, it lacks adequate equipment and resources necessary for proper performance. The manpower assigned to the implementation of projects lack experience and skill, thus making the implementation process time-consuming, expensive, and qualitatively low.

B. The Housing Research and Training Institutions.

To define policies, programming and planning, it is essential that studies be conducted on the technical, social and economic aspects of housing. In conjunction, it is necessary to develop training programs which supply competent workers for the designing, construction, management and administration of the programs. Examining the situation in regard to research and field training, departments do exist in institutions created to provide them; however, although the departments so named they are far from executing the expected job.
There is an established department in M.U.D.H., which specifically undertakes all relevant research on housing. The Housing Research and Service Department was established to collect and document information important to the social, economic, technical and managerial aspects of housing, in both national and international areas. The department has made an effort to collect this information, but there is a lack of organizational skills in documenting and managing it, so that can be easily retrieved. Under the current circumstances, documents are widely dispersed in various departments, and one can find needed information only through difficult bureaucratic procedures.

In addition, the Housing Research and Service Department lacks personnel who possess the skills necessary for analysis and dissemination of knowledge gained from housing information or from information on the urban system. This problem becomes apparent when one questions premises governing housing programs. It has been proven beyond doubt that a level of irrationality is inherent in each Housing Program when it is examined in light of the existing socio-economic reality. After examining the mismatch of policy objectives and results of the programs, one must question how much of the gathered information is available, how accurate it is, and whether it is being properly used by policy makers.

Concerning construction materials and technical matters, there was nothing to indicate whether or not the Department pursues research on the subject. But a discussion with a departmental official brought to light the absence of such research activity:

...M.U.D.H. planned to do research on locally available construction material and on the application of appropriate technology. However, we face problems of financing and a lack of skilled people in the field. For
this reason, I cannot tell you with confidence about any progress made by the Department on this matter.

E.B.C.A. is another authority which has a Research Development, and Training Service Department. This Department is in no better situation than that of the Department within M.U.D.H. It has no organized, equipped center where training and research is done. Prior to the establishment of E.B.C.A., organizations sent employees to technical training centers, the university, and other technical schools in the nation. Today, these opportunities are limited, and foreign government scholarship opportunities are not taken advantage of.

At present, the Building Technology Department, in coordination with the School of Architecture, run the Material Research and Testing Center. A discussion with the Director of the Building Technology Department, concerning the extent of research taking place, revealed that only limited research is being done on building construction material. Basically, since 1962, research activities have been curtailed to almost non-existence. The Department is engaged in the testing of material for E.B.C.A. and other government or private institutions. The testing of soil, concrete materials, and steel are done in the department. The reasons that research on construction material is not done are:

...lack of financial and moral support by the government, lack of time among the staff members to do such research, and lack of necessary technological means.

There is no argument one can make about the reasons stated above. If the system of higher education and the budget allowed to it by the government is examined, one can find misplaced priorities in the educational policy. That is not the central subject of this study; however, to understand the situation, one
merely needs to note the limited number of persons who receive higher education in housing and other construction fields.

The College of Building Technology and the School of Architecture, are among the few institutions which provide higher levels of training in housing and other construction fields. Each year, 100 to 110 students are admitted to the Department of Building Technology; of these, only 60 percent take the final examination. The remainder are dismissed with no chance for re-admission. Of the 60 percent, only 25 to 30 students get their degree. Those who fail are given one more chance to take the examination. Likewise, the School of Architecture graduates 15 to 20 students each year. These two institutions are the only ones in Ethiopia which offer higher education in the field of housing.

Two questions were forwarded to the Director of the Building Technology Department. First, he was asked whether there are enough graduates to satisfy the specific demands for skilled manpower in the field and in general for the construction industry. Second, he was asked where these graduates are generally assigned to work. In response to these questions he stated:

When one compares the available openings to the number of graduates, it is believed that the number is quite enough... Here, the government uses as a determining factor in education, the availability of a market for the graduates. Since there are very few privately-owned construction companies, and most do not have vacancies, it is the government's responsibility to find jobs for these graduates... On the other hand, the government claims not to have enough capital to expand employment opportunities... Under such circumstances it is the decision of the Central Planning Committee on Education that one must hold responsible for limiting the number of graduates... It is a political issue rather than a question of whether the number is enough or not.

Most graduates are assigned to work in E.B.C.A. and M.U.D.H., with the exception of the few who are sent to work in the Army or institutions of
health and education.

Another training center, which is run by the C.C.A.A. in cooperation with the French Government, graduates 5 to 7 students yearly. These graduates usually are sent to work in other urban centers. The Civil Engineering Department, which is in the School of Technology, graduates 20 to 35 students yearly. There are, of course, other technical schools which offer a 2 or 3 year course where a student can obtain a diploma or a certificate upon graduation. These schools graduate an average of 60 to 70 students yearly with a slight increase in the last five years.16

In conclusion, it is apparent that there are institutions which have established departments to pursue research on building materials, on socio-economic and housing issues of the population, and on urban matters. It is also clear that the university and other technical schools have research and training facilities for professions dealing with the housing. While institutions like M.U.D.H. and C.C.A.A. conduct research regarding housing in the nation on a satisfactory scale, the information and the knowledge gained seems to lack proper organization and documentation so as to be easily accessible and, thus, be disseminated to policy makers and to academic circles. On other hand, research on construction materials is minimal. There are no institutions which are committed to doing research on those construction materials which could be easily mass-produced, or accessible at low cost. This research, if conducted, could make it easier for low-income persons to construct houses. Although, a shortage of monetary resources was stated by each institution as the reason they were unable to offer intensive training and research programs, it is equally true that there exists a reluctance within the institutions to coordinate and establish programs which could make use of available resources. As the situation is today, qualified
institutions are far from producing enough adequately trained people in the field of housing and other construction industries. To answer the question of whether or not the system of higher education produces a sufficient number of skilled manpower, one must know to what extent the government is committed to promoting higher education, in general.

C. The Building Material Industries and the Distribution Structure.

The building-material industry suffers from deficiencies which make it unable to meet potential and present construction needs adequately. The inadequacy is apparent in the shortage of building materials on the market, in the escalation of prices, in the inefficiency in production, and in the poor distribution of products. The problem has become more acute since the nationalization of industries. Today, all building-material manufacturers are administered from the Ministry of Construction and the Ministry of Industry. Although the two Ministries are the primary agencies which make decisions concerning production levels and operations, there are several other agencies involved in the decision making process. However, the housing institutions, such as M.U.D.H. and C.C.A.A., take part in neither the administrative nor decision processes. This, apparently, has prevented accurate planning for building material production with respect to housing programs.

If one examines the information on table 3.1, in macro-economic terms, housing accounts for too small a share both of Gross Domestic Product, (G.D.P.) and Gross Fixed Capital Formation, (G.F.C.F.). According to available information, from 1973 to 1981, the national housing investment dropped from 4.3 to 2.3 percent of G.D.P. and from 35.2 to 20.8 percent of G.F.C.F. During the same period, investment in all urban housing dropped from 1.6 to 0.5 percent.
of G.D.P. and from 13.1 to 4.7 percent of G.F.C.F. Basically, there are two major factors contributing to the low level of investment in housing. First, there is the incapacity of national construction industries to produce adequate material for housing. Second, the cost of produced material is too high, compared to both international standards and to the cost of labor and raw materials.

Table 3.1. Percentage Share of Investment in the Construction; in Housing in the Nation; in Housing in the Urban Areas as of the G.D.P. and G.F.C.F.( in millions of Birr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>G.D.P. at Current Factor Cost (2)</th>
<th>Gross Fixed Capital Formation (3)</th>
<th>Construction Investment (4)</th>
<th>Housing Investment in the Nation (5)</th>
<th>Investment in the Urban Housing (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of 2</td>
<td>% of 3</td>
<td>% of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>4629.2</td>
<td>569.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5140.2</td>
<td>549.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>5103.2</td>
<td>579.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5530.0</td>
<td>509.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6146.3</td>
<td>560.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6490.4</td>
<td>545.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>7086.5</td>
<td>698.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7629.0</td>
<td>854.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8156.4</td>
<td>914.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55911.8</td>
<td>5780.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To illustrate, galvanized corrugated iron sheet is the principal material used for roof cladding and for fences. Available information indicates there are only two factories producing this material, with a yearly production capacity totalling 14,530.6 tons. In Addis Ababa, there are two major ceramic brick factories, each producing, a little over 5 million pieces of brick. According to M.U.D.H. reports, the amount of galvanized iron sheet produced yearly meets only 30 percent of the demand, while brick production meets 10 percent of the yearly demand by housing construction sectors in the nation.¹⁷

In the distribution process of construction materials, there is no price regulation. For instance, information from the Housing and Saving Bank indicates that the 1984 prices of corrugated iron sheet, wood, cement, glass, bathroom fixtures, plastic tiles, and electrical materials, when compared to 1976 prices, had increased three to four times.¹⁸ Of these materials, while wood is locally produced, cement, and corrugated iron sheet are partially imported, all other materials are imported.¹⁹ The increased cost of building construction materials has, in turn, drastically increased the overall cost of a house constructed with locally produced materials. Based on low-cost housing construction cost information documented by M.U.D.H., a house constructed of mud and wood in 1976, cost 90 Birr per square meter. In 1977 construction of the same house cost 125 Birr per square meter, and in 1978 it cost 200 Birr per square meter.²⁰ Concrete blocks are another common construction material used in housing construction. In 1976, a house made of concrete blocks cost 175 Birr per square meter. In 1977 and 1978, the same house cost 225 and 275 Birr per square meter, respectively.²¹ In 1981, houses constructed of concrete block cost 360 Birr per square meter; in 1982, 430 Birr per square meter and, in 1983, 500 Birr per square meter.²²

The information on table 3.2 is to show the extent of escalation of prices
in construction material, based on government house construction. In such houses, construction material is distributed through government established agencies. Construction material sold by government agencies have, actually,

Table 3.2 - Addis Ababa Unit Price of Building Material, including Transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>1982*</th>
<th>1983**</th>
<th>1984***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>quintal</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>quintal</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ash</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachitic stones</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conc. blocks</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete supply &amp; erection</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar (supply)</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>128.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones, masonry</td>
<td>m³</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks masonry</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks masonry</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete block</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from files of:

the lowest price when compared to materials supplied by a private agency. As discussed in Chapter III, those who have access to inexpensively priced construction material are those who are either organized in a Cooperative Housing Program, or in a Self-Help Housing Project. It can, therefore, be concluded that private homebuilders actually had to pay more for construction materials provided by private suppliers.

The use of bricks and stones in the construction of houses is uncommon among low and middle-income homebuilders because of the price escalation of the material, especially since the Revolution. Even high income groups have problems financing houses constructed of brick. For instance, the cost for one square meter in a brick house constructed in 1976, was 225 Birr; in 1977, was 275 Birr; and in 1978, was 325 Birr. Examination of recent data further suggests that the rise in the cost of brick has created circumstances such that even prospective high-income homebuilders cannot afford the capital needed for brick construction. Most homebuilders utilize stone for the foundation. Here again, considering the many components used in the foundation such as cement, lime, red ash, and sand to form mortar, a cubic meter of stone foundation cost 87.50 Birr including labor cost of 12.00 Birr.

Therefore, the question which arises after examining information on cost of materials is what possibility does the low-income sector of the population have of acquiring decent housing using basic construction material? The high cost of construction material simply is not affordable by the low-income population. In other words, considering the circumstances as they exist today, the chance for the low-income people to provide themselves decent housing is minimal. According to a recent study, the cost of a square meter of low-cost housing is eight to ten times higher than the average minimum monthly salary of a typical low-income individual. The study further suggests that the
ratio of one to one, instead of eight or ten, is considered fair. That is to say, that one month of the minimum low-income salary equals the cost of one square meter of a low-cost house.

In conclusion, it is clear from preceding information that the building industries are far from adequately providing needed material for housing. Government support for expansion of the building industries is not satisfactory. The low level of investment in construction is apparent. The low level of investment is a result of escalating housing costs, which are directly related to the high cost and inadequate supply of construction material. This, of course, has a great impact on the ability of the majority of the population to be provided with necessary construction material.

The situation calls for the government to allocate more capital for the expansion of the building material industry and to make efforts to undertake research about and promote use of readily available and reasonably durable building materials.

Conclusion

The idea of creating an institution such as the E.B.C.A. to deal with construction in development projects seems to be an appropriate one as well as one to be appreciated. When one looks at the magnitude of the work and the vastness of responsibility the government has assigned to E.B.C.A., one cannot expect total efficiency, especially within the less than six years since its establishment. Many improvements with regard to administration and management of resources have been made. Yet, the problems impeding the authority in the performance of its duties adequately and efficiently have not been addressed.

The lack of adequate finances and the lack of heavy equipment, most of
which had to be imported at high cost, are unquestionable factors affecting the performance of the authority. However, leaving aside the problems existing in the social, political, and economic circumstances of the country, based on the information gathered from interviews and literature, it seems that problems associated with organizational and structural relationships of E.B.C.A. departments have been, and still are, major factors contributing to the inadequacy of the authority to efficiently conduct its duties.

Most problems could be traced to the way each individual performs duties assigned him or her. That is, of course, with major emphasis placed on all official levels. Prior to the nationalization of construction companies and the establishment of E.B.C.A., employees were concerned with neither political or governmental policy. In fact, they were trained to think of their role in the agencies as being removed from politics. But, what happened following nationalization of construction companies, which were consolidated to form E.B.C.A., was that the formerly dispersed bureaucratic apparatus deployed itself into the E.B.C.A. structure. Since these persons had the necessary skills, to a certain extent, they organized themselves and strengthened their positions. If one adds to this the lack of experience or knowledge of the employees to deal with issues having sophisticated socio-economic or political implications, it is clear to what extent bureaucratic problems would inevitably arise and hinder E.B.C.A.'s job performance.

Because the E.B.C.A.'s structure is large and its scope of work wide, bureaucracy takes on a new character in relationship to departments, to the means of production, and to its political role. As discussions with various persons reveal, there are some functionaries who, not previously entrusted with making decisions on administrative levels, have been moved into posts which require political decisions as well as decisions affecting the proper
performance of the E.B.C.A. The fact that they hold administrative posts, or
that they are entrusted with power to make important decisions, allows them
to associate themselves with state administration. In this way, they create
bureaucratic posts and privileged positions, while at the same time creating a
frustrating situation among workers, a situation which affects progress. As
long as this specific stratum of employees exist at the heart of the authority,
the bureaucratic apparatus will grow, and gain more strength. It is the most
profound and serious factor contributing to the array of problems discussed.

To achieve efficiency in the performance of E.B.C.A. or, for that matter, any
organization, two factors must be coordinated. First, employees must develop
an awareness and new attitudes toward the way they perform their duties
within the given socio-economic and political system. Second, there must be
an adequate supply of skilled manpower, monetary, and material resources,
which will boost the morale and performance of the employees. In the
construction field, this factor will dramatically improve the effectivness of
the agency.

The deduction one can make from the discussion on housing research and
training institutions is that the efforts of government or institutions to
expand research and training facilities for housing and the construction
industry, in general, is too little. The problems faced by the construction
industry with regard to skilled personnel capable of dealing with problems,
are simply too great not to have more emphasis placed on research and
training. For instance, the lack of adequate skilled manpower and research
facilities are felt to be major factors contributing to the problems existing
within the institutions concerning mismanagement of resources and the
inefficiency in performance of their duties. Furthermore, mismanagement and
inefficiency are problems in all social and economic institutional sectors and
at all levels.

The building construction industry, it appears, must produce more than what they currently do. The price of building material has been increasing at a faster rate than the incomes of the population. Consequently, the home-builder is finding it increasingly difficult to acquire even the basic materials for construction of their homes. Aside from the cost of material, the transportation of building material and construction labor costs are components, to be seriously considered, in the overall housing process. Needless to say, in order to accelerate the pace of housing construction, by and for the poor, there is an urgent need to rationally supply basic building materials at a reasonable cost. Government support in the development and widespread use of building materials is also urgently needed. Since the problems surrounding building material are not only those of increasing cost, but also those of shortage, the government should allocate more resources for the expansion of existing and the creation of new industries.
NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

1. See P.M.A.C., Proclamation No. 82 of 1976, Ibid.


3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 8.

5. Ibid., p. 4. Until the corporation was taken over by the E.B.C.A., it had a total of 1376 regular and 683 temporary workers. By any standard, this workforce is perceived to be very large. The common problem observed in the management of this workforce was that too many workers were assigned to projects which actually could have been done by few. Also, there were many employees who sat idly without having work to do, but were paid.

6. There are many people in the construction industry who take advantage of the changes brought by the Reform. Most people find ways to enrich their pockets. One way is to make an informal agreement with the supplier, but present a formal paper to the departments. Illegal though it sounds, it is a commonly practiced activity among employees of any government-owned organization where the organization is not self-sufficient and is dependent on the supply of goods available on the market.


8. For instance, there were over 3,700 regular and 16,376 temporary workers at the time E.B.C.A. was established. While most of these temporary employees were in the Rural Project Authority, almost 50 percent of the regular workers were from Housing Construction Corporation. For detailed information concerning the number of workforce in each organization at the time E.B.C.A. was established, see E.B.C.A., Ibid. p. 33.

9. In Fiscal year 1974-85, there were a total of 45 projects undertaken with a cost of over 3.1 million Birr. Of these 26 projects were research on soil types, 11 consisted of laboratory research and foundation work, and 3
were drilling water wells. For detail see E.B.C.A., 1985 work ..., Ibid., pp. 4-5.

10. For a detailed list of projects and their cost as well as sites where projects were undertaken, see E.B.C.A., 1985 Work ..., Ibid., pp. 54-57.

11. These interviews were conducted in an informal manner with people whom I had close acquaintances in the early years of student life. One has a degree in Architecture and, has done graduate research work in the field of Urban Planning and is a departmental head. The other has B.A. Degree in Architecture with over fourteen years of work experience. Both are aware of the problems which exist within the agency and were employees in the Housing Construction Corporation before it was consolidated with others to form the E.B.C.A.


13. There are a total of 86 automobiles, 184 pickups, 6 V.W Combis, 5 Vans, 84 Station Wagons and 117 Courier Trucks. These vehicles are convenient to use doing work for others. As drivers are employees of E.B.C.A., when they have the opportunities, they use the vehicles for transporting objects for private businessmen, thus generating income. Problems associated with the uses of government-owned vehicles for private business had been a major issue faced by the government. It has now been more than four years since the government began strict measures for abuse. Vehicles must now be left at work; before, drivers took the vehicles home. Also, work performed and mileage has to be documented and reported. Nevertheless, drivers still find ways to exploit any opportunities available.

14. Among the basic equipment, there is 1 truck crane, 16 other types of cranes, 132 dumptrucks, 27 dumpers, 6 bulldozers, 11 rollers, 15 loaders and excavators, 3 graders; 2 scrapers, 3 forklifts, 11 tower cranes and other miscellaneous equipment, few in number. For details, see E.B.C.A., 1985 Work ..., Ibid., pp 62-63.

15. It is the government who assigns graduates to work. This started after the revolutionary change.


18. Cited in C.C.A.A., Low-Cost .... Ibid., p. 23

19. For detail information about the type and quantity of construction material imported by name of importer, see M.U.D.H., Locally Manufactured .... Ibid., p. 7.


21. Ibid.


24. Information on privately constructed brick housing between 1963-84 suggests that the cost of one square meter of brick house ranges between 550 to 650 Birr, depending on the type and size of ceramic brick. See C.C.A.A., Low-Cost .... Ibid., p. 21, 46


CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS OF
THE 1986 HOUSING POLICY

After evaluating the housing situation in Ethiopia, one begins to question: What good has come out of this government? Is the situation better or worse than during the Haile Selassie regime, and in what ways?

Political events from 1974 to 1979 has brought problems of a socio-economic nature to the surface. That have resulted in heightening the awareness by the population of the socio-economic reality that exists in the country. At present, there is a government in power which recognizes the vast problem of economic development needed in the country and it has taken steps to alleviate the living standards of the population.

Clearly, during the term of this government there have been tangible gains made in the sphere of housing and urban affairs. This government has successfully abolished all important constraints impeding proper urban planning and development. For instance, the Proclamation of July 1975 abolished private ownership of all lands within the urban areas, nationalized extra houses held for investment, and provided reduction of rent by 15 to 50 percent. Also, it allowed each citizen the opportunity to gain access to land for the purpose of housing construction. In short, laws were established whereby the population could manage urban affairs in cooperation with the government.

On the neighborhood level, the government established a distribution system of resources by which basic resident needs could be provided with a
degree of justice and equity. The establishment of a rationing system as well as the establishment of cooperative services within neighborhood units are an example of this efforts to achieve equity. Also, the number and severity of crimes diminished and the sense of social cohesion among the population was restored.

Today, the government recognizes the existence of the housing problem whereas there was no sign of acknowledgment of any problem during the prior government. This has led to development of different housing programs: Self-help Housing, Cooperative Housing, construction of Low-Cost Housing, and Upgrading and Resettlement Housing Programs. For the management of these programs, the government restructured existing institutions and created new ones. To facilitate the planned implementation of any type of socio-economic and political development, including improvement of housing, this government established a structure of hierarchically organized urban units.

In light of the socio-economic and housing circumstances existing in the country, the steps taken are the right course of action towards comprehensive planning. However, the question with which this study was concerned, was not whether the steps taken were right or wrong. It was, rather, an issue which raises questions as to how these steps lead to real changes in improving the housing situation. This, in turn, required an understanding of how the government or the responsible people who were in charge of making decisions appraised the housing problem and prescribed the means by which objectives could be achieved.

Here, the problem was a housing shortage that raises two questions in terms of existing improper housing conditions and in terms of new houses needed to accommodate the growing population. First, was this problem well-defined in terms of its goals which were the provision sufficient housing
that would meet adequate standards? Second, were the means provided to allocate the available resources (i.e., the material and technological resources, the monetary resources, and the human resource)?

With this in mind, the study reveals four important findings. Each is tied to the broader objectives and intentions of the steps that the government has taken. However, close examination indicates the inappropriateness of the prescribed means to accommodate the housing problem within the prevailing circumstances. This has resulted with mismatch of intentions and outcome.

The first, and the most important, finding was concerning the programs. The governing premises (i.e., set of conditions) of the different housing programs only favor the socially and economically well-to-do sectors of the population. When the housing programs were first introduced, one of the major intentions was to stimulate the supply of housing for the poor. Here, the key variable which determines the success of the programs was the provision of a system for financing the new housing. This financing system finally became a "decision-rule" for determining the eligibility of prospective home-builders in the program.

For example, the government had made a commitment to promoting the cooperative housing project and construction of government-sponsored, low-cost housing. One of the key criteria, for participation in a cooperative housing project, was that each member had to provide the collateral needed to qualify for a government loan, for which there was a prerequisite deposit of 7,500 Birr in the H.S.B. Under the prevailing socio-economic conditions of the urban population only higher income groups were able to fulfill this criterion. This criterion, as important as it was, resulted in the exclusion from participation of the bulk of the urban population.

Another important case in point was that the standards of housing
undertaken by the government for low-cost houses did not match standards that the mass of population would have preferred. This was especially true with regard to size, cost, and location. For instance, of the low-cost houses constructed to shelter the low-income sector of the population, the study indicated that, with the exception of a few, most units were occupied by the economically well-to-do. The main reason was that the rent that the government demanded for the houses was too high. This might have been a result of the construction cost or a result of the size of the unit. Here, one has to bear in mind that the occupancy of low-cost houses by higher income tenants does not imply that the units satisfied their needs but, rather, that their willingness to accept the units was due to shortage of houses in the market. This was, of course, contrary to the original objective of the housing programs which was aimed at minimizing the existing social inequalities in housing.

On close examination of the standards for the housing, the findings support the belief that the standards were too high and, consequently, the houses were too expensive for low-income home-builders. On the other hand, for higher income households, the unit size and the facilities that were provided were not satisfactory. What happened was that most house-plans given to cooperative members and to individuals in private housing project were re-designed by private architects so as to fit the desired unit size, facilities and personal preferences.

Aside from the above points, the overall design-criteria employed in low-cost houses did not take into consideration the basic variables which exist in a proper housing environment as perceived by the tenants. For instance, all houses lacked the amount of space required for their activities, as well as the quality of space to accommodate the social needs of tenants.
Furthermore, the house lots were not clear as to their boundaries hence affecting tenants' sense of belonging.

Another point which undermined the proper function of the programs was that, to be successful, access to construction materials should have been provided cheaply and easily. This was true for other basic services such as installation of piped-water and electricity. Here, although the government had established ways by which people would gain access to the supply, most participants had difficulties in obtaining them because of the time-consuming and bureaucratic procedures involved. For example, in the self-help houses in Asmara Road it had taken more than six to twelve months to have piped-water and electricity installed in the houses. On the other hand, in order that an individual might gain access to opportunities offered by the government, such as cheap construction materials and services of legal nature, he or she had to be organized in one of the housing schemes with special emphasis on cooperative programs. Otherwise, that individual had to use the private channels that were relatively expensive compared to that of the government. What all this implied was that, while the central goal of the programs was to reach the majority of the population who lacked proper housing, the means adopted were inappropriate to the existing economic conditions.

The second finding involves the operation of the decentralized level of the government. The Ethiopian concept of decentralized government raises some of the most intractable problems in the field of public finance. It is obvious that the exercise of central government power at the local government level (i.e neighborhood unit) entails expenditure at that level. These neighborhoods have to secure funds and revenue from somewhere to finance expenditure. As to these two self-evident propositions, and all issues and decisions that flow from them, there seems nothing but disagreement. For example, some of the
questions raised are: What are the best sources for revenue? Why is there a wide-spread, growing dependency on the higher levels of government for the funding of the neighborhood units? Does this dependency reduce the autonomy of neighborhood government and does it undermine accountability and responsiveness to neighborhood needs?

By examination of the main sources of revenue available to neighborhood units and how they were utilized, the second finding reveals that there was a strong contradiction between government view and definition of kebele neighborhood units as an autonomous socio-economic and political unit and the actual operation of the system in the field. Neighborhood resources, such as revenue from rental houses and cooperative services, were supposed to be managed and utilized for financing neighborhood-based development projects. What became apparent was that the neighborhood had no authority over these resources. Furthermore, they did not have the power to make decisions as to matters concerning their immediate needs. Decisions were made for them by the higher institution, in this case by the C.C.A.A.

An important factor which supports this finding grew out of the neighborhood based programs that the C.C.A.A. had introduced such as road construction, upgrading of neighborhood houses, installation of piped-water, street lights, and public sanitation facilities. These programs required the participation of residents in financing half of the cost for the project while the other half was funded by the government. The key to the success of these programs depended on the ability of the neighborhood units to raise the monetary resources needed. This, in turn, depended on the extent of control they had on their resources and on the economic circumstances of each household which was expected to contribute. However, because of the failure to cope with these inner basic realities, the programs did not succeed in
achieving their goals.

The overall focus of this finding is on the question of autonomy. This is, of course, the basic question and problem for all systems of decentralized government, anywhere. The institutions and the urban units, which serve as subdivisions of the State must have, for effectiveness as well as political credibility, some measure of independence in the allocation of their resources on neighborhood needs.

The financial problems of neighborhood units were inevitably closely interrelated with most of institutional decisions that had to be made about any sort of development either on neighborhood level or on any overall urban system. Furthermore, there was a clear link between the financing of urban units and their relationship with the central government. The link was through the institutions. Here, one observes a decentralization of power, or, the passing of power from the central government down to the institutions. To the same degree, there developed a new and correspondent centralization of power at the level of the institutions that controlled the neighborhood units.

The third finding gives insight into the institutions which are responsible for making decisions related to housing and urban affairs (i.e., M.U.D.H., R.H.A., E.B.C.A., C.C.A.A.). Here, the public expected the institutions to serve the political objectives of the central government. Furthermore, the institutions were seen as center of information and a forum where discussion would take place and where mutually agreeable decisions would be made. Above all, they were seen as authorities responsible for providing services in an efficient manner under the political direction of the central government.

However, considering efficiency as a criterion and the objectives implied by it, the findings reveal several multi-dimensional problems with regard to management. The most important of all, and apparent in all the institutions,
was a lack of organized channels for the exchange of information between two
or more institutions and, internally, between departments in each institution.
This resulted in the making of ill-defined decisions with overlaps and
oversights in the programs and in the general mismanagement of monetary,
manpower, material and technological resources.

Such institutions as C.C.A.A. and M.U.D.H. are supposed to be open to citizen
participation and are responsible for gathering adequate information about
public wants and needs. This would have led them to making better decisions
in the public interest. The institutions were expected to assure uniform
guidance in fundamental matters of general national significance and to
provide broad opportunities for the development of local initiative and
activity. The findings reveal that there was no sign of such commitment on
the part of the institutions. For instance, there was no research undertaken on
housing whereby the information gathered could have resulted in programs
that were more beneficial to the population. While there was a need for
skilled manpower, little effort was made by the institutions to communicate
the problem to the central government.

The fourth finding was that there was a high level of tenant dissatisfaction
regarding the units, their environment, and the service received from the
responsible authority (i.e., R.H.A.). Their dissatisfaction was centered mainly
on lack of maintenance of such elements as walls, roofs, openings, kitchen and
toilet equipment. This discontent was further aggravated by the reluctance of
the authorities to even respond to complaints from the tenants.

For example, tenants assumed that if there was a maintenance problem
they could go to the responsible authorities and ask that it be fixed. On the
other hand, the authorities might not have had the capacity to make the repairs
and would simply ignore them. The dissatisfaction with the whole process
further exasperated the tenants because they thought that they were being ignored. They could not understand the inherent problem existing within the institutions when it came to providing the necessary resources, because there was a problem of communication on the part of the authority.

Regardless of political ideology, with these four findings in mind, along with the style of decision-making that the government had adopted, the blame for the problems seems to come to rest on the shoulders of those in the middle level of administrative hierarchy of the government system. To understand this point clearly, one needs to know how this system of government works with regard to relations between the different levels of government. It is an over-simplification to talk about this subject when, to discuss it, one would need a political analyst. However, it is possible to identify a number of characteristics which could help us understand the structure and distribution of power.

Briefly, the existing government has focused on the different formal relationships of power and influence between central and sub-governments. This is expressed through the main categories of central control methods: legislative, judicial and administrative. For instance, if we consider the system of government in the sphere of housing, the central government power can be broken down by distinguishing between administrative control and political influence. Here, for the purpose of administrative control, the central government has powers of approval, appointment and default (the power to cancel or suspend a program). The heads of M.U.D.H., E.B.C.A. C.C.A.A. are appointed by the party and are given statutory power to make decisions as to matters concerning housing and urban systems, in general. By contrast, methods of influence include agreement before action rather than sanction and enforcement after it. For instance, influence of the central government on the
local decision-makers (i.e., the institutions) is exercised by means of circulars and other communication means such as approving proposals, granting loans, and allocation of financial aid.

However, the main conclusion to be drawn from the application of control is that the relations between different levels of government, (i.e., the central party, the institutions, and neighborhood units) are characterized more by negotiation, dialogue, and persuasion than it had been in the early period of the Revolution, when resolution of overt conflict was by the use of ultimate sanctions.

Therefore, the institutions are by no means the passive recipients of central directives. For instance, after the central government had declared that housing was a major problem, and stated that the masses had to be sheltered, it gave directives to the institutions to develop appropriate means of achieving the goals. The responsible institutions proposed different programs including premises governing those programs. Before the actual programs started to operate, the institutions negotiated with the central government. In this process the problems and prescribed means were evaluated. The flow of information in this process was usually one way because the institution provided the central government with such information as to convince the government that the idea of the institution was correct. In this matter, the people on the top (i.e., the center of the government) clearly understood some of the general dynamics involved in the housing supply problem. For instance, to shelter the mass of people in proper housing, construction industries had to be expanded, the public income had to be increased, and new employment opportunities, created. All these programs need capital. Since the government could not find, by itself, solutions to the financial problem because of the existing socio-economic problem, the
government agreed to accept the proposals by the institutions. It could not reject them because it would have undermined or weakened its administrative control and influence. So, institutions came out as the winner in the battle for “power” as a result of lack of communication on the part of the government and as a result of distorted information flow from the bottom, up. This further suggests that the whole decision-making system was open to official manipulation and that the operation of the system was dictated by political decisions. So, this is why the underlying problem of the four findings is based on the way that the middle administrative hierarchy of the government operates.

One might also call into question the decision-making style of the government, as well as that of the institutions, which see the housing problem through a lens that strongly focused on specifically defined objectives. This point of view, as the basis for decisions imply and require an efficient, tightly controlled, highly structured and dependable, system of supply and demand.

However, this particular style of decision-making may be inappropriate to the problem at hand. This is because one of its assumptions is that the means can, in fact, always be found to satisfy the objectives. In other words, the government had stated the objectives very clearly, but the means for reaching that objectives were inadequate.

While concluding that to which this study began to address itself, which was the evaluation of the housing programs between 1975 and 1986, it seems important to now speculate about future. Immediately, this focuses on the validity and merits of the major the direction that the new Housing Policy, issued in February 1986, will take. This new policy, of course, was issued after the field research for this study was completed and evaluation begun.

The Housing Policy of 1986 clearly indicates what directions government
responsible for allocating land and granting construction permits. Since the previous policy stated that any person was entitled to land for the purpose of housing and that any person had the right to sell his or her house on the market, many individuals found ways to establish highly profitable businesses constructing and, then, selling houses at a profit of two or three times the cost. There were people who were assigned land two or three times. There were many cases, too, where each family member over eighteen years old was allocated land. When the shortage of land was felt, due to the government order to stopping construction permits and the allocation of land until a new policy was issued, people began paying great amounts for small shanty houses in order to get the land. The intention of this policy is to stop that activity. In connection with this, the M.U.D.H. has established committees, in consultation with other government agencies, to determine of the price of houses and other buildings (see Appendix C).

The government policy also states that any Kebele-owned houses shall be sold to the government. It seems that this point deserves more investigation, since Kebele-administered houses are owned by one of the government agencies, the C.C.A.A. However, what is promising is that now tenants have the opportunity of owning the house by buying it from the government. This, too, is very important because, in the past, the government was unable to properly manage the housing environment, especially with regard to maintenance problems. The findings in this study also support the proposition that if houses are sold and not rented, the new owners would properly maintain them. This depends, though, on whether or not the government takes steps to bring down the cost of construction materials so as that the prices are within the budgets of the households.

The new Housing Policy also has taken a step forward by allowing people
who own or rent a house to co-dwell with others. It stresses that no person or family are obligated to accept a co-dweller unless it is that person's desire. Moreover, co-dwelling requires that a contract be made between the principal and co-dweller. This policy is based on the hope that the housing shortage will be partly met.

Although the concept of co-dwelling is not new, until this policy was issued, no one was permitted by law to co-dwell with another person other than a relative. Prior to 1974, there were many homeowners who generated income by leasing extra rooms to others. When the law against this passed, many households lost the extra income. It created a housing shortage and overcrowding in some of the existing houses. Since family members who used to live by co-dwelling with others could no longer do so, they had to share space with parents. Therefore, this step taken by the government, to deal with the problem of accommodation, is a step appreciated by many and is supported by the findings of this study.

However, the business of co-dwelling has to be followed closely. First, since there is a real shortage of housing, house-owners and other tenants could use the situation to make a profitable business by charging the co-dwelling person unreasonable rent. Second, the government must watch those Kebele officials and others, so that they do not force tenants and homeowners to share their housing. Otherwise, while the objective of the co-dwelling policy is to minimize the housing problem, it might create social tensions that would be regrettable and unhealthy to society.

Most important, the new Housing Policy indicates a commitment by the government to the construction of more houses. The government intends to undertake the construction of prefabricated housing projects. Little can be said about whether or not this system of construction can meet the growing
housing needs. Although the housing needs are very high, the resources to meet these needs are low. This type of housing requires a capital-intensive investment in factories to build the units. Also, resources are required for investment for other social and economic projects.

Based on housing schemes initiated by other countries using prefabricated construction, some have succeeded in solving the acute shortage of houses. But, this type of housing did not succeed without creating social problems and problems in ways the housing was distributed. For instance, in the Socialist countries of eastern Europe, housing is allocated, generally, according some criterion of social merit. As a principle, housing goes to those who contribute the most to the common good; in other words, to those who deserve housing as a reward. The official directives about housing allocation indicate some preference for productive workers. Beyond that requirement, the allocating authorities can exercise their own discretion in defining social merits, and rewarding certain individuals with housing and housing subsidies. What really happens, in practice, is that the beneficiaries in this system of housing distribution are always those people who have already been rewarded with higher income. This means the whole housing distribution system is actually creating inequalities not only in housing, but also in real income as well.

However, in Ethiopia’s case, the social problems arising from such housing programs are not the central issue of our argument at a time when the majority of the population do not have adequate housing. First, the prime objective of the policy is to provide shelter, second, the assessment of the social impact will have to wait until some future date. In this respect, the decision by the government to pursue construction of some prefabricated housing should be encouraged. But, the questions which arise from the production of prefabricated housing in Ethiopia are more practical and
problematic, in nature. Under the current restricted technical knowledge and limited resources in the country, there is little supporting evidence that prefabricated housing units can be built cheaply or in sufficient number. This system involves heavy import costs, expensive material, machinery, and technology foreign to the local craftsman.

If this system of construction is transferred to Ethiopia from other countries with little or no modification this, too, will be a major problem. The country has a different climate than the countries where the prefabricated housing is being used. And, for a deeply ingrained culture, the design is unlikely to suit living requirements of the families for whom it is intended. There are also other important considerations that the government must make, not only regarding physical comfort, but regarding maintenance, respect for local values, and cultural attitudes towards housing. Based on the findings of this study, there is a strong immanageable evidence of maintenance problems in all government-constructed housing projects. Also, dissatisfaction concerning the housing situation is higher among tenants although the housing authorities do not readily admit such problems. In fact, they do not even consider maintenance to be a major problem. Examples from other countries reveal that public housing programs, based on prefabricated construction projects, have run into extensive and expensive maintenance problems.

This is not to suggest that prefabricated houses are inappropriate in the solution of housing problems in Ethiopia. It may well serve the needs of middle and upper-income urban households. The construction system is also in demand for offices, commercial, education and health-care buildings. But, when viewed from the need to improve or provide housing for the masses, it does not seem to provide a realistic solution. If used, the government must develop an equitable distribution mechanism, monitor it carefully to
guarantee that it is properly and fairly implemented.

On the other hand, considering government support for this type of housing construction, the inevitable result will be that little or no attention will be paid for the support and development of other building technologies and materials which are better suited to the low-income capability. This, of course, will only further exacerbate housing problems.

By and large, steps taken by the government could have positive results in solving the housing shortage in Ethiopia. This study does not argue with the kind of Housing Programs government has proposed. The research is not against comprehensive planning and, most certainly, is not against state intervention whose aim is to help the poor, to fight exploitation, and to reduce inequalities. This study is the first step towards analyzing the underlying system of planning and management of housing in the new socialist system existing in Ethiopia. It is hoped that this study will be utilized to understand the problem existing in the ways the housing programs operate and, most of all, to assist in informing the appointed decision-makers of the underlying constraints that are inherent to, and a factor in, providing housing for the disadvantaged.
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Case one: Houses in a compound
with access directly from major winding path

C = Court-Yard
U = Unit
R = Room
K = Kitchen
T = Toilet

common space for children playground for welcoming guests for occasions of marriage, mourning and other purposes (a tent or a temporary shelter is used)

Unit 1
Partially sheltered backyard for storage place, undertaking household work.
living room, eating space, sleeping space for children, corner area as a store

Unit 2
Immediate outside space for undertaking outdoor activities

Unit 3
Sleeping, eating and living space
A passage which connects the units in the compound with the neighboring units

Shared toilet
Case Two: a unit at the back

Open or partially sheltered outside area

Living, eating space
Sleeping space
Narrow passage
Front yard

Toilet
A unit with access from a small path
Main entry to unit
Access from a path between two units

Case three: Houses at dead-end of small paths

Shared toilet (U1, U3, U2)
Shared kitchen (U2, U3)
An open space at the center common for all households for undertaking any social or commercial activities
Private toilet
Case four: a unit in a compound. Main entry from a small path direct to unit

Typical spatial arrangement of units in Kebele 25 Kefetegna & neighborhood
Kebele 25, Kefetegna 6 Neighborhood

- Sample Housing units
- Kebele office, Cooperative
- Shops and other Facilities
- Major Gullet Areas
- Major Solid- Waste Dumping Points

- Cooperative Farm
- Major Access Road
- Secondary Road
1. A prominent resident of Kebele 25, Kelelegno 6. Behind him is the major road leading to the Mercato Market Center.
2. Kebele 25 and the surrounding neighborhood housing site.

3. Children of Kebele 25. Note also, Kebele 25 and the surrounding housing site.
4. The major thoroughfare north of Kebele 24 which leads to the Mercato Business Center. It also marks the Kebele 25 Administrative territory.

5. The major thoroughfare located in the southern section of Kebele 25.
6. The Akaki River. Note, children playing along side the river, people washing clothes, and in the far behind and front, areas where the surrounding residents dump garbage.

7. Cooperative farm located at the southern section of Kebele 25. Far behind is the Kebele 25 neighborhood.
8. (above), The Mercato river which run north-south on the eastern section of Kebele 25. In summer, the river becomes an open sewer, and in the rainy season it is flooded heavily.

9. (side), Here a toilet, which was constructed of masonry stone has now been destroyed because of the river flooding.
10. The area under the bridge on the northern section of Kebele 25 is a common site where residents of the surrounding Kebeles dump solid waste.

11. One of the wooden bridges which connects Kebele 25 with the neighboring Kebeles, (Kebele 26 and 36 of Kotelegna 4)
12. The busy road, north of Kebele 25 where major informal economic activity take place.

13. A Kebele 25 resident, undertaking service-giving economic activities outside his house.

15. One of the major circulation networks which marks the administration territory of Kebele 25 (left), and Kebele 24 (right), of Keleteyno 6.
16. Lack of play space for the children is one of the major problems Kebele 25 and surrounding Kebeles face. Here one finds, any time of the day, children playing on the street.

17. Children of Kebele 25. Note a public toilet (behind left), constructed in the middle of an overcrowded housing environment.
18. Kebele 25 Resident Assembly Building

19. Kebele 25 has a plan to construct a new assembly hall in the near future. Here, the Kebele has collected masonry stone for the construction of the foundation.
20. (above), One of the problems residents fear is the fire hazard. Here, the damage to the house in the center was caused by fire.

21. (side), A backyard garden.
22. One sees, from time to time, a weaver weaving traditional clothes outdoors.

23. A tent set on a narrow street to welcome people for different occasions, such as for marriage, mourning, and celebration of religious ceremonies.
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A TWO-ROOM UNIT

TOILET

KITCHEN

BEDROOM

FRONT YARD

LIVING & DINING

MAIN ENTRANCE

UNITS ARRANGEMENT ON THE SITE
(LOW-COST - MUD & WOOD)
TYPICAL A TWO-ROOM UNITS
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(LOW-COST & RESETTLEMENT)
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A TWO-ROOM UNITS

KITCHEN
TOILET

BACK YARD
LIVING & DINING SPACE
BEDROOM
FRONT YARD

TYPICAL UNITS ARRANGEMENT
(RESETTLEMENT & SELF-HELP)
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A ONE-ROOM UNIT

KITCHEN
TOILET

BED-ROOM
LIVING
&
DINING SPACE

UNITS ARRANGEMENT ON SITE (LOW-COST HOUSING)
A THREE-ROOM UNITS AND
SITE ARRANGEMENT
(LOW-COST & COOPERATIVE)

THIS SIDE ATTACHED RESETTLEMENT
UNITS
ATTACHED TWO-BEDROOM UNITS AND TYPICAL SITE ARRANGEMENT (LOW-COST HOUSING)
1. The Revolution Square, (*Kebele 6, Keletegna 18*)

2. The Bole International Airport Avenue, or, Africa Avenue. It is along this Road, one finds major government sponsored high-rise apartments, (*Kebele 26,27, Keletegna 18*).
3. The Mercato Area - a major Business Center.

4. Churchill Avenue, where one finds business and government establishments. It is also along this road the one finds major recreation and health centers.
5. Newly constructed government sponsored high-rise apartment, beside the Bole International Airport. (Kebele 26, Keletega 18).

6. Newly constructed government sponsored high-rise apartment, beside the Bole International Airport. (Kebele 27, Keletega 18).
7. Housing unit constructed using the Private Housing Scheme in Bole Residential area, (Kebelo 20, Kefetegna 17).

8. Housing unit constructed using the Private Housing Scheme in Bole Residential area, (Kebelo 17, Kefetegna 17).
9. A recently constructed Cooperative Housing Complex, near the A.M.C.E. (Car Factory),
(Kebele 24, Kefetegna 17).

10. One of the units with two bedrooms, living and dining space, toilet inside the main unit and
kitchen at the back yard, (Kebele 24, Kefetegna 17).
11. Housing unit built under the Cooperative Housing Scheme in the Bole Residential area. Note, Kitchen and Service room at the back, and well maintained fence. (Kebele 17, Ketetega 17)

12. Larger housing unit built under Cooperative Housing Scheme in the Bole Residential area. Note also, the masonry fence and well kept garden inside. The pieces of glass on the top of the fence wall are to prevent burglars from jumping into the compound. (Kebele 17, Ketetega 17).
13. One of the housing units built under the Cooperative Housing Schemes in the Bole Residential area. (*Kebele 17, Kotelegna 17*).

14. One of the housing units constructed under the Cooperative Housing Scheme in the Bole Residential area. (*Kebele 17, Kotelegna 17*). The housing construction process continues with a gradual collection of construction material. The fence (see No. 13), and kitchen at the back, are still not finished.
15. The Kebele River, which runs north-south, on the eastern section of the city Addis Ababa, (Kebele 16, Keletegne 13).

16. The Kebele River, (Kebele 16, Keletegne 13). Note that most people who lack a water supply use the river for washing clothes and for other sanitation purposes.
17. Like the Akaki River, the Kebena River, is used for irrigating Cooperatively owned small farms. (Kebele 20, Kefergna 15)

18. Along the side of the Kebena River, an open Market which operates twice a week. Note damage done due to erosion when the river floods. (Kebele 8, Kefergna 16).
19. Kolfe Resettlement Housing, (Kebele 9, Kebede <=24). The unpaved road is dusty during the summer and becomes muddy during the rainy season.

20. Kolfe Resettlement Housing, (Kebele 9, Kebede <=24). The Triangular space was intended for the construction of resident’s service building and a day care center.

22. One of the unit in Kolfe Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 9, Kebedegna 24). The household once used the sheltered area as a tea room to generate supplemental income.
23. Low-Cost Housing Site, (Kebele 19, Kelelegna 17).

24. Low-Cost Housing Site, (Kebele 21, Kelelegna 12).
25. Low-Cost Housing Site, (Kebele 20, Kelelegno 15).

26. Low-Cost Housing Site, (Kebele 20, Kelelegno 15). This is one case where the housing site has a playground for children of the neighborhood.
27. Access road under construction which connects development in the Nefas-Selk area, to the central section of the city, (Kebele 57, Keretegna 19).

26. Resettlement Housing Units being constructed near the access road. It is one of the housing projects sponsored by the Ethiopian Government and the World Bank, (Kebele 57, Keretegna 19).
29. Nefas-Selk Resettlement Units, (Kebele 57, Ketolegna 19).

30. Nefas-Selk Resettlement Unit - a two-room unit, kitchen and toilet facilities at the back, (Kebele 57, Ketolegna 19).

32. Self-Help Housing in Wollo Seffer - a two-room unit, kitchen and toilet facilities at the back, (Kebele 36, Keletegn 18).
33. (side), Wollo Seffer
Self-Help Housing, (Kebele
36, Kotelegna 18). Note a well
maintained and defined entree.
34. (below), Wollo Seffer
Housing Environment, (Kebele
36, Kotelegna 18). Note also a
well maintained fence.
35. (above), Low-Cost Housing constructed of mud and wood, (Kebel 22, Keretegna 16),
36. (side), Kolfe Resettlement housing, (Kebel 9, Keretegna 24). A few residents attempt to create a livelihood by sub-dividing their back yard into small fenced spaces.
37. Kolfe Resettlement Housing, (Kebele 9, Keletegnu 24). shows the extent of overcrowding in a two room unit.

38. Kolfe Resettlement Housing, (Kebele 9, Keletegnu 24). The same unit used as a sleeping area, and for storage of household utilities and cooking.
39. Hamle 16 Low-Cost Housing unit, (Kebete 15, Kefenegn 17). The tenant constructed an additional room of corrugated iron sheet to ease overcrowding.

40. Welilo Seffer Low-Cost Housing unit, (Kebete 36, Kefenegn 18). A similar case to that of No. 39, (above). The addition of units is against the R.H.A. regulation.
41. Wollo Seffer Low-Cost Housing - a three-room unit, kitchen and toilet at the back yard, (Kebele 36, Keletegna 18).

42. Wollo Seffer Low-Cost Housing - a one-room unit (Kebele 36, Keletegna 18).
43. (side), Kolfe Resettlement. Note wall condition
44. (below), Kolfe Resettlement Housing unit, (Kebelo 9, Kefelegna 24), condition of ceiling and dividing wall between two units.
45. Kebele Resettlement, (Kebele 9, Kelelegna 24) - note wall condition

46. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 22, Kelelegna 16) - note wall condition.
47. Kolfe Resettlement Housing, (Kobele 9, Kotelegna 24). Note roof condition.

48. Wollo Seffer Low-Cost Housing, (Kobele 36, Kotelegna 18). House lacks elevated floors. As a result, the houses flood during the rainy season.
49. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 36, Kebele 18) - opening condition

50. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 20 Kebele 15) - Opening condition.
51. Kolfe Low-cost Housing, (Kebele 9, Kotelegna 24) - condition of kitchen equipment

52. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 20 Kotelegna 15) - ceiling condition.
53. (side), Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 19, Kelelegna 17) - kitchen condition
54. (below), Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 20, Kelelegna 15) - toilet condition
55. (side), Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 21, Kotelegno 12). The units were due to be rented to low income people, but almost all was rented to tenants in the higher income category.

56. (below), Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 19, Kotelegno 17). Note the built-in stove intended for low-income tenants.
57. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 20, Kefalegn 15). Here is a case where the tenant has constructed a kitchen (kitchen Beret) outside the main unit.

58. Low Cost Housing, (Kebele 19, Kefalegn 17). Here is a case where occasionally, a few tenants use an open space in their backyard for preparing food.
59. Low-Cost Housing unit, (Kebelo 19, Kefetegas 17). Exposed Water meter which usually ends up broken as animals graze the grass or children play in the area. Due to reluctance of the authority to correct the problem, tenants often have no water supply for months.

60. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebelo 19, Kefetegas 17). Note condition of water meter.
61. Wollo Seffer Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 36, Keleteguna 18). A typical case where the manhole for the sewage system is located in front of the toilet. Children and adults have fallen into it on several occasions. There are health hazards, too.

62. Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 36, Keleteguna 18).
63. Wollo Sefer Low-Cost Housing, (Kebele 36, Keferegas 18). Overflow of the sewer due to a broken sewer pipe.

64. Kolfe resettlement Housing, (Kebele 9, Keferegas 24). Overflow of the sewer due to a broken sewer pipe.
APPENDIX C

Proclamation No. 291 of 1986
A Proclamation To Provide For The Construction
And Use of Urban Houses
"Ethiopia Tikdem"

Whereas, it is found necessary to encourage the broad masses of urban
dwellers to construct their own dwellers to construct their own dwelling
houses and to organize themselves, more extensively, into housing
cooperatives;

Whereas, it is essential to regulate the use of urban houses and to make
their construction commensurate with existing economic realities by
prescribing appropriate standards;

4. Construction of Dwelling Houses
Dwelling houses may, in accordance with this Proclamation, be constructed
by the following:
a) the Government;
b) housing cooperatives;
c) urban dwellers’ associations and other mass organizations;
d) government and private organizations’ or
e) individuals.

5. Powers and responsibilities of Urban Administration
Any urban administration shall have the following powers and
responsibilities:
1 - to allot urban land and issue building permit in accordance with
standards prescribed by the Minister;
2 - to construct urban houses in accordance with directives issued by the
Minister;
3 - to give assistance to housing cooperatives;
4 - to encourage individuals in their endeavors to construct dwelling
houses;
5 - to ensure that the construction of houses is carried out in accordance
with the permit issued; and to take measures, as provided for in Article 7 of this Proclamation, in cases where the construction of houses does not conform with the permit.

8. Rights on an Urban House
   1 - Notwithstanding other laws to the contrary, any person shall have the following rights on an urban house he or it owns:
      a) to use;
      b) to transfer by succession;
      c) to mortgage;
      d) to sell, subject

10. Sale of Urban House
    3 - The Government may sell its urban house to any person; where the sale relates to a dwelling house, it shall be made in accordance with registration priorities.

    5 - The Minister may, in consultation with the appropriate government offices, form in urban centers committees for the determination of the price of urban houses and issue directives to same.

LEGAL NOTICE NO. 93 OF 1986
REGULATION TO PROVIDE FOR SALE
OF URBAN HOUSES

4. Conditions for the Sale of Urban Houses Any urban house:
   a) registered with Urban Dwellers Associations or a certificate of ownership has been issued for by the Ministry; or
   b) Lawfully constructed or under construction, with at least its foundation completed, ... may be offered for sale.

6. Determination of Price
   The price of a house to be bought of sold by the Government shall be determined by the Committee referred to in sub-article (5) of Article 10 of the Proclamation on the basis of specifications and bill of quantities as well as on the current cost of construction and the location of the house.
9. Payment

1. The ministry shall make immediate payment of the price of an urban house upon delivery to it of same.

2. The Ministry shall, upon selling an urban house, deliver such house to the buyer upon receipt of the full price there of.

LEGAL NOTICE NO. 93 OF 1966
REGULATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR STANDARDIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF DWELLING HOUSES.

4. Standards of Dwelling Houses
The following standards of construction of dwelling houses are prescribed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of House</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Size of House in square Meters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Houses for cooperatives or individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) RH - 17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) RH - 37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) RH - 54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) RH - 70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Row Houses for rent or sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) RH - 17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) RH - 19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) RH - 25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) RH - 50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prefabricated Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) PF - 1H (Type A)</td>
<td>14 - 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) PF - 1H (Type B)</td>
<td>17 - 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) PF - 1S (Studio)</td>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) PF - 1B</td>
<td>38 - 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) PF - 2B</td>
<td>46 - 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) PF - 3B</td>
<td>60 - 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non-Prefabricated Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) RHA - 45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) RHA - 55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) RHA - 70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Construction of Dwelling Houses

1. Any dwelling house shall be constructed only in accordance with the standards prescribed in Article 4 of these regulations.

3. The construction of dwelling houses shall, in as much as possible, be carried out by using locally produced materials and in such a way that minimizes foreign exchange components.

6. The Government shall construct dwelling houses and sell or rent same to housing cooperatives or individuals.

8. The Minister may allocate urban land up to 250 square meters by taking into consideration:

1. the size of the dwelling house;

2. the level of development of the urban center; and

3. the peculiarities of the surrounding.

LEGAL NOTICE NO. 94 OF 1986
REGULATIONS TO PROVIDE FOR CO-DWELLING

4. Permissibility of Co-Dwelling

1. Any person or family owning a dwelling house may allow a co-dweller therein.

2. Any person or family possessing a dwelling house on rent may allow a co-dweller therein.

3. No person or family shall be obligated to allow a co-dweller without his or its own initiative and free will.

5. Principle

1. Co-dwelling derives from a contract made between a principal dweller and a co-dweller.

2. Without prejudice of the other provisions of these Regulation, co-dwelling relations shall be governed by the contract mutually agreed upon by the parties.