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ABSTRACT

The study investigated effective management of markets and service provision by Lusaka City Council. The overall objective of this study was; To determine the extent of effective management of markets and service provision by Lusaka City Council.

The specific objectives were: To establish the extent of effective management of garbage from markets run by Lusaka City Council. To examine the extent of effective provision of toilet facilities and water supply to markets managed by Lusaka City Council. To determine the extent to which Lusaka City Council has been able to effectively manage fire outbreaks in markets. To determine constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in ensuring effective management of garbage, drainage systems, toilet facilities, supply of water, and fire outbreaks in markets under its jurisdiction.

The total sample size for this study was 264. 18 key informants were purposively selected from Lusaka City Council. Furthermore, 30 support staffs were also purposively selected from Lusaka City Council. Simple random sampling was used to select 216 marketeers. Both primary and secondary data was used for this research. Qualitative and quantitative data was also used in this study. Qualitative data was analysed by transcribing it into the major themes which emerged. Quantitative data was analysed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The study found out that Lusaka City Council (LCC) lacked capacity to manage market garbage, drainages and fire outbreaks. The Council did not adequately provide toilet facilities to markets. Some markets run by the Council do not even have toilet facilities. The study also found out that the Lusaka City Council has not done enough to ensure that markets are supplied with sufficient quantities of water. The study recommends the following; Procurement of garbage collection tools such as wheelie bins, skip bins as well as tipper trucks; sensitisation of market users on the importance of maintaining high levels of hygiene in markets; construction of more toilets in markets; and construction of boreholes in markets to act as reservoirs in the event that Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company ration the commodity. The study further recommends that earth excavated drainages must be stone patched.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Background
The management of markets in Zambia is in the hands of Local Authorities except in some cases where such management is left in the hands of the private sector or cooperatives. Therefore it was the aim of this study to highlight the main constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council (LCC) as a local authority in managing markets under its jurisdiction. The study focussed on; management of garbage and fire outbreaks in markets; management of drainages, provision of toilet facilities and water supply to markets. It should be noted that this was a case study of Lusaka City Council though three markets were closely examined for illustrative purposes. These markets are Old Soweto, Kaunda Square stage 1 and Chelston.

The mandate to manage and provide services to markets in Zambia has been given to Local Authorities. According to the Local Government Act of Zambia (1995), Councils are expected to offer among others the following services to their communities: Construction and maintenance of public roads, streets, sanitary lanes, bridges and water lines and removal of all obstacles; Establishment and maintenance of sanitation and drainage systems to facilitate the removal of refuse and effluent; Establishment and maintenance of fire fighting and prevention services in order to protect life, property and natural resources from damage by fire. In order to carry out these statutory functions, Councils have been given powers to generate or raise revenue from as many sources as possible with a view to enhancing service delivery. For example, a Council may impose market levies, fees and charges as a way of raising revenue (Government of Zambia 2007). These markets are found in most residential areas serving different people within the community. Councils can also create and collect revenues through powers vested in them to make by-laws (Local Government Act of Zambia: 1995).

Generally, most of the markets managed by Lusaka City Council are in a very poor state although there are some that are better than others. In other words the quality of these markets is very poor as they lack good drainage systems, toilet facilities, bins for garbage collection and supply of water to these markets is also poor. Examples of these markets are Old Soweto, Chibolya, Chifundo and Buseko.

There are, however, some markets managed by Lusaka City Council where although the market infrastructure is still poor but not to the exact of those in the first
category. In these markets, service provision to markets by LCC is poor as the Council has managed to provide certain services but not adequately and thus, the quality of infrastructure in these markets is poor. Examples of these markets are Kaunda Square stage 1, Kabwata Main, Kabwata Site and Service and Northmead. M.N. Mwinga (An assessment of tomato price variability in Lusaka and its effects on smallholder farmers: 2009) has noted that the condition of toilets in these markets is not conducive for public use as they are not regularly cleaned. Furthermore, these toilets do not even have running water, a condition which poses a serious health hazard to marketeers. Thus, whether in the first category or the second category, the quality of the markets managed by Lusaka City Council on the overall is poor. The exception to the rule are the markets which received some funding from the European Union as part of the latter’s pilot project on the construction of markets in Zambia. They were only ten of such markets out of close to a thousand markets that are run by local authorities throughout the country and they are confined only to three cities; five in Lusaka, three in Kitwe and two in Ndola. These isolated markets have had some modern infrastructure as a result of the assistance from this pilot European Union project. However as we shall see immediately after the intervention ended, some of them are experiencing gradual decline in the quality of the infrastructure as we shall see in chapters three, four and five in respect to Chelston market a scenario that suggests that the relatively high quality infrastructure at these markets could subsequently deteriorate to the level of the rest of the markets in the country.

As already established, powers of collecting market levies from marketeers have been given to local authorities (Markets and Bus Stations Act: 2007). The Act also states how the collected levies are supposed to be utilised. For example, Levies collected from markets are supposed to be used to pay for services provided by local authorities to markets. On the other hand, a notable feature of the above named markets in general is that though Lusaka City Council has been collecting levies from marketeers, the quality of services provided to the markets is poor and this presents a major source of conflict between the Council authorities and traders who do not see any justification in paying Council levies. According to a UN-HABITAT report (2010), traders are prepared to pay for waste collection when the charging system is transparent, services being provided are at locally acceptable prices and the quality of services is not poor. Thus, marketeers seem to be willing to contribute
towards the expenses of garbage collection but because of Local Authorities’ failure to adequately provide quality services to markets, they have since declined to contribute towards the expenses of garbage collection. Poor infrastructure has also led to compromises in the health and security standards present in these markets. It was noted by both local government officials and traders that most markets do not have facilities to store their goods after trading hours. According to N. Nkombo (2007), one of the Kitwe City Council officials explained that three quarters of traders in Chisokone B market had to keep their goods in the police camps, while some slept with the goods at night in the markets. This meant that these marketeers had to prepare food in markets making them prone to fire outbreaks. Some of the stalls were also made out of wood which made the market extra vulnerable to fires. In some markets, there was no lighting after dark. It is expected that, since these markets are public places, they should be provided with fire fighting facilities by the Local Authorities. This seemed not to be the case going by the number of fires which have gutted these markets.

It is also said that ‘water is life’. This statement underscores the value of water to human beings including those working in markets. However, it has been noted that some markets managed by local authorities including Lusaka City Council have been operating without adequate water. This has an impact on marketeers who spend the whole day selling their merchandise in these markets which are not adequately supplied with water. It was therefore, necessary to establish what Lusaka City Council (LCC) has been doing to ensure that markets are supplied with sufficient quantities of water. The study also aimed at determining what the Lusaka City Council, a local authority in Zambia has been doing to ensure that markets are effectively managed.

**Statement of the problem**

Despite Lusaka City Council collecting daily revenue from markets, delivery of services to markets has not been adequate (W. Kanchela and M. LaFleur, 2001). Lusaka City Council has been criticized for failing to adequately manage fire outbreaks from markets, a situation which has resulted in marketeers loosing property worth millions of kwacha. Markets such as Old Soweto and Kaunda Square Stage 1 which are run by Lusaka City Council have a poor waste management system (M.N. Mwiinga, 2009). This has led to situation where garbage in these markets has remained uncollected for several weeks. In addition, the drainage system
in these markets is poor and this has resulted in a situation where these markets become flooded with water and at the same time waste water failing to freely leave the market. Furthermore, provision of water supply to markets has also been poor and this is despite the fact that provision of adequate water is important in the process of maintaining high levels of hygiene standards in markets. The problem has also been exacerbated by poor provision of toilet facilities to markets (M.N. Mwinga, 2009). As a result of all this, these markets become unpleasant environment for trading especially during the rainy season. Poor hygiene standards have been a source of concern for many people who feel that markets are a breeding ground for diarrhoea diseases such as cholera (W. Kanchela and M. LaFleur, 2001). Thus, this study sought to answer among others, the following questions:

i) Why is the Lusaka City Council unable to keep clean the area under their jurisdiction

ii) What is the Council supposed to do to provide adequate sanitation facilities its residents?

Study objectives

General objective

To determine the extent of effective management of markets and service provision by Lusaka City Council.

Specific objectives

i) To establish the extent of effective management of garbage from markets run by Lusaka City Council.

ii) To examine the extent of effective provision of toilet facilities and water supply to markets managed by Lusaka City Council.

iii) To determine the extent to which Lusaka City Council has been able to effectively manage fire outbreaks in markets.

iv) To determine constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in ensuring effective management of garbage, drainage systems, toilet facilities, supply of water, and fire outbreaks in markets under its jurisdiction.

Significance of the study

There are a number of reasons that had necessitated this study. One such reason was lack of clear explanation about the poor state of some markets run by Councils especially that they are a source of most fresh fruits and vegetables consumed by
local people in the City of Lusaka. The second reason was the existence of knowledge gaps in local government literature regarding services provided by Councils to markets. Therefore, the poor state in which most of these markets are especially during the rainy season was the main reason for conducting this study.

It was expected that results of this study would be beneficial to policy makers and workers in local government administration. Thus, the results obtained will enable Lusaka City Council to come up with strategies to improve service delivery to markets. Furthermore, workers at Lusaka City Council will be equipped with the right knowledge to enable them provide quality services to markets. The information obtained will provide insights to those wishing to research more on the same topic.

**Conceptual framework**

The conceptual framework used in this study is based on factors which if taken into consideration would result in enhanced sanitary conditions in markets managed by Lusaka City Council.

*Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework for the management of markets by a Local Council*

(Source: Primary Data)

As can be seen in figure 1.1, enhanced sanitary conditions in markets is dependent on a number of factors which among others are the following: better management of garbage; fire outbreaks; drainages; supply of water and provision of
toilet facilities to markets. It is expected that if these factors are taken into consideration by relevant policy makers, sanitary conditions in markets will improve whilst at the same time fire outbreaks will be reduced.

The UN-HABITAT (2010:35) defines solid waste as ‘wastes generated by households, and wastes of a similar nature generated by commercial and industrial premises, by institutions such as schools, hospitals, care homes and prisons, and from public places such as streets, markets, slaughter houses, public toilets, bus stops, parks, and gardens’. This definition includes most commercial and business wastes as municipal solid waste, with the exception of industrial process and other hazardous wastes. Solid waste management is the process of handling and disposal of organic and hazardous solid waste which, if unattended appropriately, can pose public health risks to the affected population and can have a negative impact on the environment (Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response). The term solid waste management is used herein to with reference to garbage or waste generated by market users that is both buyers and sellers in a market.

Therefore, garbage management relates to a system put in place to ensure that garbage is collected on time in markets. Such a system is composed of three stages. In the first stage, garbage is collected and placed in wheelie bins and this is the primary garbage collection point. The second stage involves collection of garbage from the wheelie bins to the skip bins which are usually placed outside a market. The skip bins constitute what is known as secondary garbage collection points. From this point, garbage is collected to the final dumping site which is a landfill and this is the third and final stage of the garbage management system. According to a report by the European Business and Technology Centre, (Snapshot: Waste Management in India: 2011), Solid waste management (SWM) has three basic components, namely, collection, transportation and disposal. The objective of Solid Waste Management is to reduce the quantity of solid waste disposed off on land by recovery of materials and energy from solid waste in a cost effective and environment friendly manner.

Therefore, it was the objective of this study to determine whether there was anything that has been put in place by the Lusaka City Council to ensure that garbage generated in markets is collected timely.
Management of fire outbreaks is another concept that has been used in this study. This relates to processes where fire outbreaks in markets are properly handled by relevant authorities. It relates to measures taken to ensure that fire outbreaks in markets are prevented. Urban fire is one of the most disturbing problems not only for developing countries but also for developed countries and, in Ghana very large amount of property and lives are unfortunately destroyed by fire annually. It was against this background that the Ghana National Fire Service (GNFS) was established to control fire outbreaks and, since its inception, it has embarked on programs and activities to educate the public on fire safety and prevention measures while fire stations were established in the major cities (E.K. Forkuo and J.A. Quaye-Ballard: 2013). Thus, it was the objective of this study to establish whether the Lusaka City Council was able to adequately provide the above mentioned service to markets under its jurisdictions.

A Council is also expected to construct drainages in markets in order to avoid floods. At the same time, a Council is mandated to ensure that the constructed drainages are maintained to acceptable standards. Most drainage systems in markets seem to be in a deplorable state and this has resulted into a situation where these markets are flooded during the rainy season. Thus in this study, drainage management referred to a situation where the Local Authority is able to regularly maintain market drainages to acceptable standards. Therefore, this study attempted to establish why there are poor drainages in some markets and how this had affected both marketeers and buyers.

Supply of water to markets in this study simply relates to a situation where local authorities have ensured that markets have adequate quantities of water. In extreme situations, there may not be sufficient water available to meet basic needs and in these cases supplying a survival level of safe drinking water is of critical importance. In most cases, the main health problems are caused by poor hygiene due to insufficient water and by the consumption of contaminated water. Therefore, it was the aim of this study to show whether marketeers have access to sufficient quantities of water for drinking and personal hygiene. In addition, an attempt was made to establish whether water taps are sufficiently close to marketeers.

In recent years, the issue of Public toilets has evolved from being an embarrassing subject to one that is gaining widespread awareness and discussion. Anyone, who has been in an overcrowded or uncomfortable public toilet, will value
a good toilet design. A well-designed public toilet has to be: Clean and dry, well ventilated, easy to maintain and handicap friendly. In addition to this, all public toilets should be fitted with: Waste bins inside each male and female toilet, either paper towel dispenser or hand dryer, directly above or in close proximity to the washbasin, Sanitary disposal bins in female toilets, Suitable air fresheners to promote a fragrant, pleasing environment (Restroom Association and National Environment Agency: 1999). Thus, cleaners of public toilets should be trained in the proper usage of specific cleaning detergents and equipment for different types of toilets, e.g., tiles, mirrors, stainless steel etc. In this study public toilets relate to places where one is obliged to help himself or herself (i.e., urinating or defecating) in unfamiliar surroundings among the strangers of the same sex. A very good example of a public toilet is a toilet in a market. Thus, an attempt was made to establish the status of existing toilets in markets and whether the toilets were enough to cater for all market users. Frequency of cleaning these toilets was also determined in this study. Furthermore, this study has established whether toilets in markets are fitted with waste bins, toilet tissue, and soap for hand washing as well as suitable air fresheners to promote a fragrant pleasing environment.

**Summary of the Conceptual framework**

Hence, the conceptual framework used in this study mainly focussed on factors that have had a negative effect on the management of markets by the Lusaka City Council. Particular attention was on factors that have contributed to poor service provision in markets by Lusaka City Council in the following areas: (a) In the area of waste management and sanitary administration, (b) provision of fire fighting facilities to markets (c) Construction and maintenance of the drainage system at Soweto, Chelston and Kaunda Square markets (d) supply of water to markets and (e) provision of toilet facilities to markets. The study focussed on factors that have contributed to poor provision of these services in markets run by Lusaka City Council.

**Literature review**

Markets play an important role in the development of any nation and it is for this reason that local authorities should take a keen interest in ensuring that markets are well managed and serviced.
Literature reviewed in this study was at global and local level. The study begins by reviewing literature from the local researchers.

There are some scholars who have written on the manner in which local authorities have been managing markets. Works done by such scholars as; N. Nkombo (2007), Lolojih (2008), N.M. Mutungwa (2011) and G.M. Pelekamoyo (1977), give us knowledge on how markets have been managed in the past.

N. Nkombo (Time for a New Deal: Social dialogue and the informal economy in Zambia: 2007) argues that poor maintenance and management of markets, insufficient trading space, poor market infrastructure and poor security are the main problems identified by the majority of marketeers interviewed in his research project. Most respondents indicated that the markets they trade in are poorly serviced and managed despite marketeers regularly paying market levies to the local authorities. Most traders interviewed noted that facilities such as provision of water, shelter, toilets, cleaning, and security remain critical problems in the markets.

It should however be noted that poor maintenance is not a feature of all markets. According to N. Nkombo (2007), in Chisokone B market in Kitwe, the Council and traders established a task force to audit the total revenue that local authorities collect in levies. Collections were compared and it appeared that the traders were collecting significantly larger amounts of levies than the Council. For example, in 2005, it was agreed to set up a joint committee of Zambia National Marketeers Association (ZANAMA) and local authorities that would undertake a thorough assessment of the revenue collected in the markets under the old levy. This was then used to help determine the new levy. Both ZANAMA and the local authorities subsequently collected levies and ZANAMA’s working hypothesis was that the total revenue collected by the marketeers would be higher than what would be remitted to the Council authorities by the officers normally collecting levies in the markets. Whereas ZANAMA was able to collect ZMK 11,000,000 per month in 2 markets, Council officers only declared ZMK 4,600,000 to the local authorities per month in 26 markets. This confirmed ZANAMA’s hypothesis that a lot of revenue collected from marketeers was being pocketed by Council officials. As a result of this exercise, a number of local government officers lost their jobs. They thus found that officers from the local authorities had engaged in a practice of under declaring their collections from the markets. This practice has undisputedly robbed traders of service provision.
N. Nkombo (2007) has shown the main problems identified by marketeers in his research and these are poor maintenance and management of markets, insufficient trading space, poor market infrastructure and poor security. However, N. Nkombo (2007) seemed not to focus on the constraints which local authorities faced in providing services to marketeers. For example, N. Nkombo (2007) did not show or give reasons as to why Council officials under declared their revenue collections from markets and the accompanying effects on the Council's ability to provide services to markets. Furthermore, N. Nkombo (2007) did not show where the revenue collected by Council officials was expended on. He did not mention whether there was anything which the local authority was doing to improve service delivery in markets. It should also be noted that the change of government is usually accompanied by policy change. Therefore, it was expected that the coming of the Patriotic Front (PF) government into office might have been accompanied by policy change in terms of how local authorities are expected to manage markets. This research sought to fill these gaps by focussing on the constraints which local authorities are facing in providing services to marketeers. The study also focussed on some of the projects onto which revenue collected from the markets has been expended on. Furthermore, the study determined whether, there is anything which the Council was doing to improve service delivery in markets. However, this study used Nkombo's study to establish whether there was anything which Lusaka City Council had done to improve revenue collection in the selected markets.

In his PhD thesis (Local Government Administration and Service Delivery in the Third Republic: 2008), P.K. Lolojih noted that the extension and construction of new markets in Lusaka had resulted in increased generation of waste to levels that had clearly out-stripped the local authority’s capacity to manage efficiently and effectively. Lolojih (2008) further noted that markets had been politicised and this had affected revenue collection by the local authorities. Lolojih (2008) made special reference of the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) as having been in the forefront in collecting revenue from markets. Lolojih (2008) also asserted that business enterprises that are located in close proximity to markets and other trading areas, where the generation of solid waste is relatively high, had a tendency to exercise corporate social responsibility through helping the local authority to collect and dispose garbage. Lolojih cited Saro Agro-Equipment, located along Los Angeles road opposite Soweto market (a very high generator of solid waste), as one company
which collected and disposed its own garbage from the market. Lolojih (2008) further pointed out that some business houses had been assisting the local authority on voluntary basis with fire services and maintenance of street lighting equipment.

In his Masters Dissertation, N. M. Mutungwa (Fiscal decentralisation and service delivery: 2011), noted that one of the responsibilities of the Lusaka City Council is the management of waste which was done through the Councils Waste Management Unit. The Council collected garbage from bins around the City where they get filled up with refuse dumped by local residents. Local residents were in turn expected to contribute towards a subsidised charge of K200, 000.00 per bin. On a monthly basis, communities paid K15, 000.00 per household for dumping refuse in a Council bin. There were also Community Based Enterprises (CBEs) that moved from one house to another collecting garbage and dumping it in Council bins. These organisations demanded K20, 000.00 per household on a monthly basis (Ibid). N.M. Mutungwa (2011) also cited the Munali Ward Community Based Enterprise and the Market Advisory Committee (MAC) such as the Chigwirizano Marketeers Cooperative, as some of the private organisations engaged in the management of waste in Lusaka. It should however, be noted that, even after making payments to the Council, collection of garbage by the Council tended to be delayed. This had resulted in residents throwing their refuse on the ground, a situation which poses serious health hazards. Furthermore, the Council had no predetermined schedule for collecting refuse in townships though it had a regular formal collection service for some shopping centres’, hotels, hospitals, government buildings and markets.

Lolojih’s contribution to this body of knowledge deserves acknowledgement. The issues brought out by Lolojih were of great importance to this study as they bordered on the causes of poor service delivery by local authorities. Though this was the case, Lolojih’s study was more or less concerned with providing a broad understanding of how local authorities performed during the period under review (1991-2001). Though he talked of issues related to market management, he did not really bring out the intricacies or major issues of services provided by local authorities particularly to markets. In addition to that, Lolojih did not mention whether the business community had been offering voluntary services to markets or not. Though this was the case, this author intended to adopt the methodology used by Lolojih in his study. This study also used Lolojihs study to establish whether or not business houses have been offering voluntary services to markets.
Mutungwa’s work did not deal with the constraints faced by local authorities in managing waste in markets. Mutungwa took a general analysis of waste management as a service offered by Lusaka City Council. This study focussed on the difficulties encountered by the Council in managing waste in markets. On the other hand, Mutungwa’s study has helped in understanding how the Council manages wastes in the City as a whole. Mutungwa’s study also focussed on the construction and maintenance of roads and drainages in Lusaka. He didn’t focus on the status of drainages in markets. Thus, this study attempted to fill this knowledge gap by focussing on factors accounting for poor maintenance of the drainage system by Lusaka City Council in the selected markets.

There are still some scholars who have written extensively on the informal sector but not on how local authorities provide services to markets in particular. Among these scholars are the following: P.K. Ndhlovu (2011), T.K. Hansen (2010), E.P. Scott (1982), W. Tordoff (1980), G.M. Pelekamoyo (1977) and E. Sibanda (2010).

P.K. Ndhlovu (Street vending in Zambia, 2011) stated that, local authorities were responsible for the management of all markets except for private markets which were usually run in partnership with the local authority. Regarding the issue of licences and permits, the Market and Bus Stations Act of 2007 states that, a local authority may issue licences or permits to pedlars, hawkers and marketeers or any other category of licence as may be prescribed for the purpose of operating in a market or market street (Government of Zambia, 2007). P.K. Ndhlovu further noted that, the local authority charged K100, 000.00 per year for a hawker and peddler license and K50, 000.00 per year for renewal of tenancy agreement for all traders in the Council markets. They also charged health and safety licences for traders engaged in businesses such as saloons, restaurants and butcheries. Furthermore, local government provided market infrastructure so that traders in the informal economy can trade in a good and secure environment to achieve order in the city. The local government also sets rules and regulations to guide traders and also collected revenue from traders.

As noted above, Ndhlovu’s work was of great importance to understanding the role played by the informal sector in the development of any nation. However, it was very clear from the study carried out by P.K. Ndhlovu (2011) that he took a general view of the management of markets by local authorities. For example, he
talked of the role of local authorities in constructing markets as well as their (Local Authorities) role in issuing licences to marketeers. He was not concerned with the services provided by Councils to markets. He also did not make any mention of the reasons behind the piles of garbage in markets. P.K. Ndlovu did not mention how the presence of political parties affected the provision of services by local authorities as these were not his areas of concern. These are gaps which this study intended to fill. Though this was the case, Ndlovu’s study was used to show how monies collected by local authorities through issuance of licences were utilised by local authorities or whether the collected monies were enough to contribute to effective service provision to markets by the local authority.

Another notable scholar who has contributed to this subject is T.K. Hansen (Changing Youth Dynamics in Lusaka’s Informal Economy in the Context of Economic Liberalization, 2010). T.K. Hansen (2010) noted that markets are strategic places for party recruitment; hence their management has been a target of political maneuver. For example, during the Kaunda regime the ruling party United National Independence Party (UNIP) usurped power under the Markets Act, often through the Co-operative Societies, in this way controlled or took control through its Youth Wing, of the allocation of stands in many markets. UNIP membership became a prerequisite for access to a stand, while stand-holders paid fees or levies to the party. In the open economy era, local authorities have begun to contract private firms to manage designated markets. As noted in T.K. Hansen (2010) when President Mwanawasa introduced Market Boards in 2005, he suggested that this would hasten development in Local Authorities and help them control street vending. In line with the externally mandated government policy on decentralization, such boards were expected to represent marketeers, consumer organizations, local government, commuters’ associations, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. T.K. Hansen (2010) further argued that the establishment of boards might serve to depoliticize the management of markets, and perhaps lessen the persistent wrangles between Councils, Co-operatives and marketeers’ Associations, the Ministry, and Parties. But this was not the outcome.

Hansen’s study showed that political parties have been in markets from the time the UNIP government was in power. Furthermore, T.K. Hansen (2010) showed how markets have been managed throughout the years. Though this was the case T.K. Hansen (2010) did not focus on the causes of piles of garbage in markets.
Furthermore, Hansen’s study did not show where the levy collected in markets was expended on. In addition to that, Hansen did not show whether the revenue collected could adequately be used to provide services to markets by the local authorities. Therefore, this study made an attempt to fill these gaps by focussing on the causes of piles of garbage in markets. It also showed where market levies are expended on by Lusaka City Council. Attempts were made to find out whether or not there are some projects in markets on which revenue collected from the markets has been expended on. On the other hand, Hansen’s study was used to show whether Market Boards have been effective in the management of markets.

According to E.P. Scott (Lusaka’s Informal Sector in National Economic Development, 1985), markets in the pre independence era were authorized under a single national ordinance issued by the then governor of Northern Rhodesia, and this ordinance was called the "Market Ordinance of 1937." In Lusaka, authorized markets were controlled by the City Council and were listed in the official gazette. They had stalls, public facilities, and scales, and they enjoyed the sanction of government. The market ordinance was passed into law on 24 December 1937 and its objective was to provide for the establishment and management of markets. Scott (1985) further laments that the Act contained many provisions such as empowering the minister or a local authority by law to; (a) establish markets, (b) provide necessary facilities (c) appoint inspectors and (e) regulate their use. In addition to these operational powers, fiscal powers were also granted. The Act specified that all Stallings, rents, and so forth collected from market leases were to go into the general fund of the local authority. Essentially, the amended Act empowered the City Council to control all aspects of market operations, ranging from the extraction of City revenues to sanctioning the activities of marketeers.

Scott’s purpose in his article was to clarify government reform policies regarding Lusaka’s informal sector. His point of emphasis was on the official role non-governmental institutions and artisanal occupations are expected to play in national economic development. It was therefore important to establish the various services provided by local authorities in markets and this was the thesis of this study.

W. Tordoff (Administration in Zambia, 1980) has stressed that, Councils exist mainly for the provision of services and this excludes the most important services of health, education and policing. Furthermore, Councils are expected to collect refuse, light up streets and manage markets. During the late 1970s, Councils
were heavily involved in the brewing and selling of traditional beer. Therefore, liquor undertakings were an important source of revenue for most Councils in Zambia. However, since around 1970 there had been a rapid decline in profits and in Lusaka, for example, there was persistent losses on the liquor undertakings. Probably, this has an adverse impact on service delivery within the city.

Tordoff’s study highlighted the various types of services provided by local authorities in Zambia especially in the Second Republic. However, considering the fact that time has passed since Second Republic, one would expect that the demand for better services has increased. It was for this reason that, this study was undertaken to consider the types of services offered by the Council to markets. Furthermore, Tordoff’s work did not focus on services provided by local authorities to markets and this was the gap which this author intended to fill. On the other hand, Tordoff’s revelations were of great help to this study as it has shown how revenue collected by Councils affected the Council’s capacity to adequately provide services.

In his Masters’ dissertation G.M. Pelekamoyo (Local autonomy and central control in Zambian urban authorities, 1977), observed that trading undertakings formed sources of revenue for urban local authorities. These undertakings include water, markets, licensing, swimming baths, liquor, shops for rentals and others. Revenue is accrued to local authorities on the basis of levying charges on the user or consumer of these services. Pelekamoyo further noted that one of the factors contributing to downward trend of these undertakings is mismanagement and dishonesty of some members of staff in local authorities. He cited the 1973 incident where the Lusaka City Council dismissed eight of its top officers for alleged dishonesty dealings in their work.

The relevance of Pelekamoyos’ work to this study could not be overemphasised. His study showed that trading undertakings formed the much needed sources of revenue for urban local authorities including Lusaka City Council. On the contrary the study by Pelekamoyo focussed on the nature of local government in Commonwealth Africa as reflected in Zambian urban authorities. It examined the local authority functions, sources of revenue and central control. Thus, it is clear from his study that there was need for a study which would pay particular attention to the manner in which Council run markets were being managed, hence the importance of this study. However, this study used Pelekamoyos’ study to examine
how the Lusaka City Council has been expending trading undertakings from markets with special reference to the market levy.

A study was conducted by E. Sibanda (Solid Waste Management: How effective is the legal framework in counteracting the effects of solid waste management in Zambia? A Case of Lusaka, 2010) on how waste management in Zambia was regulated within the broader framework of the Environmental Protection and Pollution Control Act (EPPCA). The study by Sibanda revealed that the EPPCA together with the Waste Management Regulations of 1993; Statutory Instrument (SI) No. 71 and the Hazardous Waste Management Regulations (SI No. 125 of 2001) provided for specific procedures and practices for waste generation, storage, transportation and final disposal. In addition, there was a Public Health Act of 1930 and the Local Government Act of 1991. Sibanda deduced that, the existing waste management legislation although comprehensive for most types of solid waste, it was generally not enforced. Furthermore, Sibanda identified different types of waste and these included among others the following: Domestic waste, comprising mainly of waste generated from households; commercial waste, waste generated from commercial and business houses; industrial waste, waste generated from various industries such as manufacturing, refining, chemicals and mining; hazardous waste, a type of waste with such characteristics as flammability, irritability, ignitability, corrosivity and toxicity; health care waste, waste generated from the health sector.

It is important to recognise Sibandas’ research as it helps us understand the broader framework through which waste management is regulated. Sibanda highlighted a number of legislations which were being used in a quest to manage waste in Lusaka City. It was however, imperative to note that the study by Sibanda was aimed at determining how waste management in Lusaka was being regulated. It was not the aim of Sibandas’ study to focus on the constraints faced by Lusaka City Council when managing waste in markets and this was the gap filled by this study. However, the study by Sibanda was used in this research to ascertain the extent to which the Lusaka City Council has enforced the existing legislation on waste management.

There are other scholars who have written on markets but not necessarily on the subject under discussion. Among these are M.N. Mwiinga (2009) and M. Hichaambwa and D. Tschirley (2010).
M.N. Mwiinga (An assessment of tomato price variability in Lusaka and its effects on smallholder farmers, 2009) discussed the structure and operation of the tomato subsector in Lusaka. Furthermore, he established the level of price variability for tomatoes in Lusaka’s Soweto market, and the impact of tomato price variability on returns to tomato production.

M. Hichaambwa and D. Tschirley (How are vegetables marketed into Lusaka? The Structure of Lusaka’s fresh produce marketing system and implications for investment priorities, 2010), noted that Soweto was by far the largest retail or wholesale market in Lusaka. Yet nearly all wholesaling took place in an uncovered dirt field at one end of the market complex with no dedicated entry and exit points, very limited storage capacity, and no cold storage. Hichaambwa and Tschirley (2010) further lamented that the Urban Markets Development Program, funded by the EU, made substantial investments in several retail markets of the City, including Soweto, but had ended without making any improvements in this wholesaling area.

The study conducted by Mwiinga (2009) did not bring out issues to do with service provision to markets. Mwiinga’s study only focussed on the structure and operation of one market subsector (Tomato). Similarly, a study conducted by M. Hichaambwa and D. Tschirley (2010) concerned itself with the marketing of vegetables in markets. Furthermore, Hichaambwa and Tschirley had not given any reason as to why wholesaling activities at Soweto market took place in an uncovered dirt field. It can therefore, be noted that there was need to carry out a study to establish constraints faced by the Council in providing services to markets and this is what this study established.

As a way of summarizing local literature, it can be noted that though some scholars have written on the subject under discussion, there still remained some gaps which needed to be filled. Literature reviewed from Zambia, did not focus on effective management of markets and service provision by local authorities. Hence, this study was able to focus on effective management of markets and service provision by local authorities.

According to G.B. King and A.N. Pearce (The Contentiousness of Markets: Politics, Social Movements, and Institutional Change in Markets, 2010), for markets to survive, they must be able to connect people and organizations, as well as satisfy the needs that each brings to the exchange. King and Pearce (2010) emphasized the role that contentiousness plays in bringing institutional change and innovation to
markets. Markets are inherently political, both because of their ties to the regulatory functions of the state and because markets are contested by actors who are dissatisfied with market outcomes and who use the market as a platform for social change. However, the fact that markets tend to centralize resources and power, markets frequently become locations of contestation and disruption. One need only turn on the evening news to see the contentiousness of markets. Markets are at the center of controversial issues such as exploitation of child labor, discrimination, and health care inequities. According to King and Pearce (2010), Markets are dominated by powerful incumbents that benefit greatly from current market arrangements and are constituted by categories and institutional logics that legitimate the status quo. Incumbents resist efforts to change market conditions in as much as they benefit from current arrangements.

This work by King and Pearce (2010) gave insight on the existence of politics in markets. It helped us understand that markets are dominated by powerful incumbents who greatly benefit from market arrangements. However, it should be made clear that their area of concern was not on factors leading to poor service provision by local authorities to markets and this was the gap which this study intended to fill. On the other hand, this work done by King and Pearce was used to assess whether or not the presence of politics in markets has an adverse effect on the Councils ability to adequately provide services to markets.

A study was conducted by R.O. Nyamori (Construction and effects of markets in a local authority in New Zealand, 2009). The purpose of this study was to make intelligible the rationalities and mechanisms through which markets had been proffered as alternatives or complements to traditional welfare based provision and the effect of this development on the subjectivity of workers. The research involved collection of archival data, personal encounters and in-depth interviews with managers, staff and elected representatives at a local authority in New Zealand. The findings of the study were that, the mandatory changes required by legislation were associated with efforts to constitute local authority workers as business-like subjects through disciplinary mechanisms and technologies of the self. While markets had permeated this local authority, with some managers and staff claiming to work in a business-like manner and transact with each other as customers, these discourses had not vanquished the traditional concern of working for one organisation to serve the community.
Nyamori’s study was of great importance to our study in that it helped this researcher understand that local authorities needed to work as entrepreneurs if they were to be effective in providing services to communities. On the other hand, Nyamori’s study did not focus on the factors accounting for poor service delivery by local authorities in markets and this was the main objective of this research. Furthermore, Nyamori did not collect data from marketeers to determine the extent to which marketeers were satisfied with services provided by local authorities in New Zealand. This researcher on the other hand, collected data from marketeers to determine the extent to which they were satisfied with services provided by local authorities to markets. It should be pointed out that despite these knowledge gaps in Nyamori’s study, this researcher used his study to establish the extent to which entrepreneurial spirit was being promoted among workers at Lusaka City Council.

A study was conducted by A. H. M. M. Sinha and I. Enayetullah (Waste Concern and World Wide Recycling: Financing Dhaka Market Composting with Public–Private Partnerships and Carbon Credits, 2010) on waste management systems in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The study revealed that Household and market refuse were taken to a community based composting plant where it was turned into organic fertilizer. To ensure utilization of the fertilizer and sustainability of the system, the study revealed that waste management companies assisted communities to market the product by contacting and negotiating with fertilizer companies to purchase and nationally market the compost by product or bio-fertilizers.

Sinha and Enayetullah’s study provided useful insights on how market waste was being managed in Bangladesh. It showed the important role played by the private sector in the management of market waste and how this could be of benefit to local communities. Regardless of all this, Sinha and Enayetullah’s study was not concerned with factors accounting for poor service provision by local authorities in markets and this was the gap which this study intended to fill. However, this study used Sinha and Enayetullah’s study to establish whether the local authorities have partnered with the private sector to manage waste in markets.

Literature reviewed from outside Zambia has not really shown the extent of effective management of markets and service provision by local authorities. A study conducted by King and Pearce (2010) mainly focussed on the role that contentiousness plays in bringing institutional change and innovation to markets. Reviewed literature also showed that in some countries, local authorities had
engaged the private companies to manage waste in markets and this was the point stressed by Sinha and Enayetullah (2010). Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn that, there was need to institute a study which would focus on the extent of effective management of markets and service provision by local authorities to markets. This knowledge gap was filled by this study.

**Methodology**

**Research design**

This research used a mixed method of research design which combined both the descriptive and explanatory designs. The descriptive design involved obtaining in depth understanding of services offered by Lusaka City Council to the selected markets. The explanatory design was used to analyse a cause-effect relationship between identified variables and their effect on service delivery. This research used a mixed method of research design because the two methods complement each other thereby maximizing on the benefits of each design.

**Data collection**

Data for this study was collected between Monday 23rd December 2013 and Friday 31st January 2014. The instruments used in the data collection exercise were interview guides and structured questionnaires. Structured questionnaires which combined both open and closed ended questions were used to collect qualitative and quantitative data from selected staff at Lusaka City Council and marketeers from the selected markets (The selected markets were; Kaunda Square Stage 1, Chelston and Old Soweto ). These questionnaires were administered, by the researcher, to staff at Lusaka City Council as well as marketeers in the selected markets. Interview guides were used to collect qualitative data from key informants, that is to say senior appointed officials of Lusaka City Council, Councilors and Market Committee Members

**Sampling**

The total sample size that was considered for this study was 264. This composition was as follows:

(a) The key informants were eighteen (18) and this was composed of:

i) Six senior appointed officials from Lusaka City Council. The composition of the six senior officials was as follows: 
Deputy Director of Housing and
Social Services; Deputy Chief Fire Officer, for Fire Brigade Unit of LCC; Manager, for Waste Management Unit; Assistant Markets Manager, for Finance (i.e. under Markets Unit of the Council); Senior Civil Engineer, who was under Engineering Services; and the Senior Administrative Officer who was under the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council.

ii) Three Councilors who were also from Lusaka City Council (the three Councilors were from the three Wards were the markets are located) and

iii) Nine Market Advisory Committee (MAC) representatives from the selected markets (i.e. nine market representatives from each market).

(b) 30 support staff of Lusaka City Council were selected for interviews. This consisted of the following;

i) 15 support staff were purposively selected from Old Soweto, Chelston and Kaunda Square Stage 1 markets (i.e. five Lusaka City Council support staff operating directly from these markets were selected from each of the markets mentioned above).

ii) The remaining 15 support staff were selected from the departments of Engineering services and Public Health.

(c) 216 marketeers were interviewed from the following markets;

i) 47 marketeers from Chelston market

ii) 50 marketeers from Kaunda Square stage 1 market and

iii) 119 marketeers from Old Soweto market.

As noted above, there is a difference in terms of numbers of interviewed marketeers from the selected markets. This researcher interviewed 50 out of 300 marketeers from Chelston market. During questionnaire editing, that is a process which is usually undertaken after data collection, three questionnaires were discarded because 50% of the questions were not answered. Therefore, instead of analysing 50 questionnaires, we analysed 47 questionnaires which were accurately completed by the marketeers at Chelston market. With regards to Kaunda Square Stage 1 market, a market which also has 300 marketeers, it was possible to analyse all the 50 questionnaires collected from the marketeers because the questionnaires were accurately completed. On the other hand, this researcher interviewed 120 marketeers out of a total population of 687 marketeers. When editing this batch of questionnaires, it was observed that one of the questionnaires lacked completeness as
50% of the questions were not answered. Thus it was discarded. It can therefore, be stated that selection of marketeers from markets was based on the size of markets. As Ghosh B.N. (Scientific Method and Social Research; 2011:237) stated ‘if the population of the universe is homogeneous, a small size of the sample may serve the purpose’. He further noted that the sample must be small enough to avoid unnecessary expenditure and large enough to avoid sample error. Hence, a small sample was selected from small markets such as Chelston and Kaunda Square Stage 1 while the sample size for Old Soweto was slightly bigger than that of Chelston and Kaunda Square because Old Soweto is slightly bigger than the two mentioned markets. Table 1.1 is a summary of respondents who took part in this study and the kind of data collected from them.

**Table 1.1: Summary of respondents and kind of data collected from them**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Kind of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Appointed Officials from Lusaka City Council</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Councilors from Lusaka City Council</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Market Committee Members (Three Committee Members from each of the selected markets i.e Old Soweto, Chelston and Kaunda Square Stage 1)</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Support staff from Lusaka City Council</td>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Marketeers from Chelston market</td>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Marketeers from Kaunda Square stage 1 market</td>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Marketeers from Old Soweto market</td>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Primary Data)

With regards to the sampling techniques used in this study, purposive sampling was used to select key informants and support staff of Lusaka City Council. This
type of sampling subjectively determined what type of sample was representative of
the population. Key informants, on the other hand, were conveniently sampled as
they were easily and readily accessible in their offices at Lusaka City Council.
Simple random sampling was used to select 216 marketeers from Chelston, Kaunda
Square Stage 1 and Old Soweto markets. This method gave an equal chance to each
marketeer to be included in the sample. Thus, a total of 264 was the sample size used
in this study.

Data Analysis
Qualitative data was analyzed using the narrative technique of data analysis. This
was done to help the researcher in the precise measurement and reporting of some
characteristics or phenomena under study. The Statistical Package for Social
Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft excel were used to analyse the quantitative data
obtained from the respondents.

Ethical Considerations
Ethical issues were considered when carrying out the study. For example, informed
consent was employed in which the participants were told about the study.
Confidentiality was employed in which the information collected was strictly used
for research purposes only. Furthermore, participants were assured of their rights to
decline to answer questions which they felt uncomfortable with in the process of the
interview.

Organization of the dissertation
This dissertation is divided into six chapters. The First Chapter is composed of an
introduction to the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study,
significance of the study, conceptual framework, literature review and methodology
of the study. The Second Chapter is a background to the management of markets in
Lusaka. The Third Chapter is on management of garbage in markets. The Fourth
Chapter is on management of drainages, toilets and supply of water to markets.
Chapter Five is on management of fire outbreaks in markets while Chapter six
presents the conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

BACKGROUND TO THE MANAGEMENT OF MARKETS IN LUSAKA

Introduction
Lusaka City is located in South Central Zambia on a plateau at 1280m (4200 ft) in altitude (UN-HABITAT: 2007). The City centre lies around Cairo Road, around which lie the New City Market, Kamwala Market, as well as Old and New Soweto markets respectively which are the major shopping areas. Further east lies the government area, around the Cathedral Hill and Ridgeway areas. Other suburbs include Elizabetha Villa, Fairview, Chelston, Kabulonga, Kabwata, which is home to the Kabwata Cultural Centre, Madras, Manda Hill which is another major shopping area, Northmead, Olympia Park, Rhodes Park, Roma, Thorn Park and Woodlands. The objective of this chapter is to give an overview of Lusaka City Council and how markets have been managed in Zambia. To achieve this objective, this chapter is divided into the following sections:

The first section is an introduction. The second section is an overview of Lusaka City Council. This section will focus on the management model operating at Lusaka City Council. The third section is a discussion on the development and management of Council run markets. This section will also look at the various types of informal sector markets in Lusaka. It will further focus on how markets have been managed by the Lusaka City Council that is to say management of a market by a Management Board, a Local Authority or a Cooperative. The next section in this chapter is on financial regulations governing the operations of Council run markets. Focus in this section is on how the Council has been managing funds which are under its jurisdictions. Finally a conclusion will be given. The study now gives an overview of Lusaka City Council.

Overview of Lusaka City Council
Markets in Lusaka fall under the jurisdiction of Lusaka City Council. Therefore, it is necessary to have an overview of Lusaka City Council. Lusaka being the capital of Zambia is the economic, cultural and transportation centre of the nation. It is the seat of government and home to all foreign missions in the country. At district level, the central government representative is the District Commissioner, appointed by the Office of the President, who is the most senior civil servant. The 1991 Local
Government Act and the Local Government Elections Act, along with the relevant amendments, provide the institutional frameworks for the local authority’s administration of Lusaka and for the holding of local elections (UN-HABITAT: 2007).

According to Lolojih (2008), the administration of local Councils during the post–independence period has been guided by three major reforms namely, the 1965 Local Government Act; the 1980 Local Administration Act; and the 1991 Local Government Act. This system of local government was adopted from Zambia’s colonial master Britain, and was considered suitable for the multiparty political system that Zambia embraced at independence. Lolojih (2008) further noted that, the enactment of a new Local Government Act (the Local Government Act of 1991) under the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD) in December 1991 resulted in many notable changes which among others saw the re-introduction of representative local government based on universal adult suffrage. The 1991 Local government Act empowered the responsible minister to establish in any district a City Council, Municipal Council and District Council.

Lusaka City Council consists of 7 elected members of parliament, 1 from each constituency, and 33 Councillors, 1 from each ward. Councillors are elected every five years to run the affairs of the City through the Lusaka City Council, on behalf of the residents of the City. Like all Councillors in Zambia, Lusaka City Councillors are part-time officials. There is a Mayor and Deputy Mayor at Lusaka City Council. Councillors constitute the legislative wing of the Council. In other words, Councillors at Lusaka City Council are responsible for policy making and supervising the implementation of the policies. The executive structure of Lusaka City Council is composed of eight departments namely: City Planning, Public Health, Housing and Social Services, Legal Services, Administration, Finance, Engineering, and Valuation and Real Estate Management. The town clerk, who is the principal officer, heads the executive structure. Local government means representative local authorities that perform functions and provide services that have been transferred from the central government by law. Full-time employees of the Council assist with the daily management of the affairs of the City. These appointed officials headed by the town clerk are responsible for rendering technical advice to Councillors as well as implementing policies (Lolojih:2008). Figure 2.1 shows the organisational chart for Lusaka City Council.
Figure 2.1: Existing Organizational Chart of Lusaka City Council.

(Source: Lusaka City Council)
Apart from being a policy making body for the City, Lusaka City Council is also a corporate body which means that, it has powers to sue and can also be sued. Although the Council is a corporate body and is expected to manage the affairs of the City independently, it merely operates as an agent of the central government, which has delegated functions relating to provision of services to the residents of the City under the Local Government Act CAP 281.

Thus, it is evident that the local government management model operating at Lusaka City Council is a Councillor-Committee model. Under this model Lusaka City Council is controlled by elected Councillors and utilises the committee system as noted in figure 2.1. Lolojih (2008) has identified the following existing committees at Lusaka City Council: Finance and General Purposes; Establishments; Plans, Works and Development; and Housing, Licensing, Public Health and Social Services. According to Lolojih (2008), there is no political executive in such a model as membership of committees has to reflect all the political parties represented in the Council. It should be mentioned that the committee overseeing the management of Council run markets at Lusaka City Council is the Housing, Licensing, Public Health and Social Services Committee. Figure 2.1 above shows that this committee is composed of mainly two departments which are Housing and Social Services and Public Health.

**Development and management of Council run markets**

The preceding section has given an overview of Lusaka City Council. The aim of this section is to show how Council markets have developed in Zambia. In addition to that, this section will also focus on the management of Council run markets.

According to Hansen (2010) streets and markets in Lusaka are among the most important sources for non-formal employment. During the 1990s, privatization of the economy and retrenchment of the civil service pushed many adults into the informal economy. The presence of adults in the more lucrative jobs limits young people’s entry to low-level jobs that offer few prospects for upward mobility and provide few skills that might lead to the acquisition of higher qualifications. Hansen (2010), further notes that young women and men from poor backgrounds have fewer economic options in today’s transformed urban space than their parents’ generation enjoyed. Adult stand-holders hire young women and men as workers for a pittance.
Plenty of young men work on the streets, selling anything from foodstuffs and hardware to copycat tapes and videos.

There are basically two kinds of informal sector markets in Lusaka as identified by E.P. Scott (1985). The first comprises those unauthorised markets that grew up in response to demand for processed and unprocessed food, cloth, and crafts on sites in the City Centre and in high density squatter settlements. These unauthorised markets were similar to village and roadside markets and they existed without government sanction (E.P Scott, 1985). The first unauthorised markets were located near the main railway line that linked Lusaka with the Copperbelt to the north and the European commercial farms to the south. These markets mainly served travellers and the traders were men who had left their village homes in search of wage labour. Scot (1985) further laments that the second wave of unauthorised markets was similar to the Railside markets but that these sprang up at intersections of major thoroughfares, at large bus terminals, near large retail shops and adjacent to government buildings. These sites are all near the Central Business District (CBD) and sellers specialised in convenience goods, especially household goods, cloth, and cooked food. Still there is a third group of unauthorised markets which developed in the rapidly growing, but racially uniform, squatter settlements. These settlements are located near the Central City. They developed as free housing provided by industries whose products were destined for the mines on the Copperbelt. As the squatter settlements grew, usually on the edge away from the City and some distance from the convenience markets near the City Centre, additional squatter markets were built. As a result of all this expansion in squatter settlements, today nearly all of these large, high-density areas have their own markets.

The second type of informal-sector market as defined by E.P. Scot (1985:78) is called “authorised” markets. These markets were authorised under a single national ordinance called the ‘Market Ordinance of 1937’. In Lusaka authorised market were controlled by the City Council and were listed in the official government gazette. These markets had stalls, public facilities, and scales and they enjoyed the sanction of government.

According to Hansen (2010), in the late 1990s Lusaka had about 40 designated City markets and 54 designated township markets. 17 Proliferating and growing in size, these markets diversified their commodity base, service activities, and participants, including more adult persons retrenched from formal jobs and
young people out of school, especially young men. Among these markets was Lusaka’s largest, Soweto, which developed in the late 1970s at the edge of the light industrial area on privately owned land as a centre of the produce trade for peri-urban farmers. This market begun informally and illegally, but soon featured the Capital’s largest auto parts section plus the standard trades in small-scale manufacture, repair, and services. Over the years, the market grew rapidly. Toward the end of 1994, traders in Soweto’s outside section and part of the built-up interior market were relocated to yield space for the construction of a new market. Some traders went farther out on the open field, establishing stands underneath tall pylons carrying power cables. Others moved on to Kamwala, Lusaka’s oldest market built during the colonial period, where many set themselves up on the open field outside the built-up market, next to the railway tracks (Hansen, 2010). The 1997 opening of a new market at Soweto, called City Market, did little to halt these processes. Many stand-holders who had fought to be allotted space in the new market soon gave up their stands, complaining of lack of customers and high fees.

Markets in Zambia are a state property. The Markets Act empowers the minister of Local Government and Housing to delegate development and management of markets to local authorities (District, Municipal, and City Councils). In the past, markets were managed either by Councils or authorized Co-operative societies. Stand-holders paid levy to the Council, rent to the Co-operative society, and daily market fees. Many also paid fees to funeral societies, football associations, and security guards. According to the Markets and Bus Stations Act (2007), the Minister or a Local Authority, with the approval of the minister may establish markets and bus stations. The Act further states that a local authority may enter into Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), with the approval of the minister given in writing. With regards to control and management of markets, there are basically two ways by which markets can be managed. According to the Markets and Bus Stations Act (2007), a market can be managed by:

a) a Local Authority in that area; or

b) a Management Board.

Management of markets by a local authority: These are markets which are fully managed by local authorities. In other words, management of such markets is the sole responsibility of the local authority. With regards to Lusaka City Council, there are currently 26 markets under the jurisdiction of the Markets Unit of the
Council. Furthermore, as already established, the quality of services provided to these markets by Lusaka City Council has generally been very poor though there are other markets which are better managed. In other words, as is the trend at national level, markets managed by the Markets Unit of Lusaka City Council have poor infrastructure and these are not conducive for trading due to the unhygienic state in which they are. Provision of services to these markets by the Lusaka City Council has also been very poor. These markets are Buseko, Bwafano, Old Soweto, Chibolya, Chingwere, Chifundo, Railside, Sekelela, Sikota Wina, and Tigwirizane. However, of the twenty-six (26) markets under the jurisdiction of Lusaka City Council, there are other markets which are not adequately managed by Lusaka City Council. These markets though being poorly managed by the Council are relatively better than the ones listed above. Examples of these markets include Chachacha, Kaunda Square stage one, Kabwata Main, and Kabwata Site and Service. Others are Longacres, Luburma, Lumumba Roadside, Matero, Mwamba Luchembe, Northmead and Woodlands. As will be shown in chapters three, four and five in relation to Kaunda Square stage 1 market, the distinguishing factor in these markets is that, the market infrastructure is not as poor as that of markets mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph. For example, these markets have ablution blocks which are not effectively functioning simply because of broken toilet sinks and dilapidated water infrastructure.

On the other hand, of all the markets in Zambia, which are managed by local authorities, only ten (10) markets have modern infrastructure equipped with facilities such as cold rooms, drainages and flushing toilets. These modern markets are only in Lusaka and Copperbelt provinces and were part of the European Union’s Urban Markets Development Programme which started in 2002. The implementation of the 8th and 9th European Development Fund for Urban Markets Development Programme which amounted to EU: € 21.2 million came to an end in 2010. Initially, eight (8) markets were selected to be part of the programme, three in Lusaka, three in Kitwe and two in Ndola (Co-operation between the European Union and the Republic of Zambia, 2011). K6.7 billion was set aside for construction of three (3) Lusaka markets while the other monies were used to construct markets in Kitwe and Ndola. Upon completion of the three markets in Lusaka, monies which remained were used to construct two (2) more modern markets. Thus, a total of five (5) markets in Lusaka were constructed with assistance from the European Union under
the Urban Markets Development Programme and these markets are; New Soweto, Chilenge, Libala, Chelston and Nyumba Yanga. (Zambia Daily Mail, April 7 2000). This was a pilot project which was aimed at improving market infrastructure in Ndola, Kitwe and Lusaka. Thus, the European Union constructed these modern markets and ensured that they are supplied with water, they have drainage systems and adequate ablution blocks. However, as we shall see in chapters three, four and five, in respect to Chelston market, the relatively high quality infrastructure at this market is subsequently deteriorating to the level of the rest of the markets in the country.

With regards to Lusaka province, management of Council run markets fall under the Department of Housing and Social Services of Lusaka City Council as shown in figure 2.2. This department is headed by the Director who is assisted by two Assistant Directors (One is responsible for Social Services whilst the other one is responsible for Informal Improvement). The main objective of this department is to organize and mobilize communities and facilitate stakeholder participation in community development for effective social service delivery and utilization, provision of vocational and skills training, recreation and development of amenities in the City. One of the key functions of this department has to do with the management and control of market infrastructure and amenities in the City. Furthermore, it should be noted that Council run markets at Lusaka City Council, are managed by a Markets Manager who is the head of the Markets Unit, a unit falling under the Department of Housing and Social Services. The Markets Manager is assisted by two (2) Assistant Markets Managers; one (1) for Administration and the other one (1) for Finance. The Markets Manager reports to the Director of Housing and Social Services. This establishment is clearly seen in figure 2.2. It should be noted that the market Master, Council cashiers and the general workers as shown in figure 2.2 are stationed in markets. General workers have been stationed in markets to regularly clean the markets. The Council has appointed a Market Master to be in charge of the operations of the market. The Market Master is expected to ensure that high levels of hygiene are maintained in markets. He/she reports to the Assistant Administrative Markets Manager, at Lusaka City Council. The Market Master also supervises Cashiers and general workers who are stationed in the market. It is the duty of general workers to sweep the market, collect garbage from the market and ensure that toilets are cleaned. Figure 2.2 shows the staff establishment of the
Markets Unit which is under the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council.

Figure 2.2: Staff establishment of the Markets Unit falling under the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council.

In an effort to effectively manage markets, Lusaka City Council has established what are known as Market Advisory Committees (MACs). These committees are made up of a Ward Councillor in the area in which the market is situated; Market Master representing the local authority (i.e. Lusaka City Council) in which the market is situated, he/she is the Secretary of the committee; and three persons representing the marketeers in the market. These persons are elected by the marketeers. This committee is responsible for formulation of policies and guidelines.
for the maintenance and management of a particular market. The committee is also responsible for ensuring that services such as water, sanitation, security, electricity and refuse collection are provided to the market.

Management of markets by a Management Board: According to the Markets and Bus stations Act (2007), the minister may, in consultation with the local authority in whose area the market is situated, establish a management board for any market. A very good example of a market which is run by a management board is City Market which was opened in August 1997. It was the first market to be managed by a private company.

In an effort to lessen political involvement, the Minister of Local Government and Housing in 2004 removed the control of bus stations from organized groups of transporters with political affiliations. Similar plans were announced for the markets. With the ministry in charge, the door was wide open for private sector participation in the administration of markets. When President Mwanawasa introduced such an approach in 2005, he suggested that it would hasten development in Local Authorities (T.K. Hansen, 2010). The idea of establishing boards was not new but had already been introduced in the late 1990s in the management model that was part of an EU’s market rehabilitation project in Lusaka and the Copperbelt. In line with the externally mandated government policy on decentralization, such boards were expected to represent Marketeers, Consumer Organizations, Local Government, Commuters’ Associations, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Aimed at including a variety of stakeholders and empowering them through market governance, the establishment of boards might serve to depoliticize the management of markets, and perhaps lessen the persistent wrangles between Councils, Co-operatives and Marketeers’ Associations, the Ministry, and Political Parties.

In November 2006, the then Local Government Minister (Sylvia Masebo) dissolved the management boards in markets and bus stations. Toward the end of 2008, the new Markets and Bus Stations Act (No 7) of 2007 went into effect. Board membership was based on party allegiance and special interests with cadres, political factions, committees, and associations collecting or soliciting levies (the PF at City Market and the MMD at Kamwala). Once again, the local authority, that is the ministry, took charge of the management of markets in its usual top-down manner. No doubt, the backdrop for this particular action included major clashes at several
Lusaka markets between political cadres of different parties in the wake of the 2006 elections (T.K. Hansen: 2010).

The established management boards consist of not less than eight and not more than eleven members appointed by the minister (Markets and Bus Stations Act of 2007). The board members include: one person, representing the ministry responsible for local government and housing; three persons representing the marketeers in the market, elected by the marketeers; one person representing the local authority in which the market is situated; one consumer from an association relevant to markets in the area in which the market is situated, and finally, one person from the community in the area in which the market is situated. It is important to note that, a Councillor automatically becomes chairperson of the Market Advisory Committee, in markets where management is the sole responsibility of the Council. On the other hand, for markets which are being managed by a board, the minister of local government and housing has been mandated to appoint the Chairperson and Vice-chairperson of the board. The Chairperson and Vice-chairpersons are appointed among the board members.

The tenure of office of board members is a period of three years from the date of appointment and may be re-appointed for a further three years. The office of a board member can only become vacant if the board member has died, is adjudged bankrupt or if the member is absent from three consecutive meetings of the management board of which he/she has had notice, without the prior approval of the management board. In addition, the Markets Act (2007) also stipulates other conditions on which the office of a board member can become vacant. It states that the office can become vacant upon the expiry of one month’s notice of the member’s intention to resign from office, given by the member in writing to the Minister of Local Government. If the member becomes mentally or physically incapable of performing the duties of a member of the management board, his office can also become vacant.

According to the Markets Act (2007), the functions of the market management board are numerous. They include among others the following: (a) formulate policies and guidelines for the maintenance and management of a particular market, group of markets under a management board; (b) present to the minister, for approval, an annual update of the business plan for the market; (c) provide services such as, water, sanitation, security, electricity and refuse collection,
to market users; (d) maintain all buildings and infrastructure such as drainage, roads and fencing of the market; (e) provide secure trading places for traders and adequate parking for buses, taxis and other motor vehicles; (f) prevent vending and illegal trading in the market; (g) establish and implement adequate measures to ensure protection of the property of the market; (h) ensure that the annual accounts are audited; (i) pay taxes, if any, pursuant to the Laws of Zambia; (j) generate revenue to pay for the services to be supplied to marketeers at an affordable price; (k) assist marketeers with business development; (l) promote community involvement in market operations; (m) create awareness and disseminate information on health and sanitation; (n) source funding for further development of the market; (o) ensure that stakeholders in the market are kept informed about developments in the market; (p) submit to arbitration or otherwise settle any claim or dispute relating to the market; and (q) do all such things as are necessary or conducive to achieving the objectives of the market.

The Markets Act (2007) also mandates the management board to submit to the local authority in whose area the market is situated its business plan for the market covering an initial period of five years and the local authority consequently submits the business plan to the Minister for approval. It is imperative to note that this business plan is critically analysed by the local authority and recommendations made before it is submitted to the Minister for approval. If the Minister is satisfied with the business plan he/she approves it. Once the business plan has been approved by the Minister, the local authority enters into a management lease with the relevant market management board. On the other hand, the local authority will only enter into management lease upon ensuring that it has paid and settled all liabilities and obligations in respect of the market. Such payment may include, retirement of staff not required by the market management board, utility bills and refuse collection charges. The management lease is usually for a period of three years and is subject to renewal.

The management board has the powers to appoint a manager who is the Chief Executive Officer and such other staff as are necessary for the effective and efficient management of the market. Thus, the functions of the management board are executed by the manager and his staff, in accordance with the policy and direction and guidelines of the board. The management team (i.e. manager and other staff appointed by the management board) on an annual basis or when directed by the
management board, submit progress reports to the board on activities carried out by the management team and the manner in which the affairs of the market have been managed. Another way through which the functions of a management board are executed is through a committee of a management board. Thus, functions of a management board may be delegated to the committee for execution. The committee of a management board is made up of persons who are or are not members of a management board and they usually hold office for a period determined by a management board.

Preceding paragraphs have shown that a market can either be managed by a local authority or a management board as stipulated in the Markets Act of 2007. Still there are some markets which are managed by Cooperatives and this is the focus of the discussion which follows.

*Markets managed by Cooperatives:* As already stated, it is important to note that there are a number of markets in Lusaka which are not managed by the local authority. Majority of these are Cooperative markets. Typical examples of Cooperative markets in Lusaka among others include; Kalingalinga market, Mtendere market, Kaunda Square Stage two market, Ng’ombe market to mention but a few. These markets are found in most residential areas targeting different classes of people within the community as they provide markets outlets for the larger, medium and small producers.

E.P. Scot (1985) has also noted that after independence, market leaders welcomed the Cooperative movement as a hopeful strategy for Community-Based Development. They also saw Cooperatives as a way of regaining much of the autonomy markets enjoyed under the colonial administration. More importantly Cooperative status automatically bestowed the *authorised* status on markets and marketeers, though not officially recognised by the Lusaka City Council.

In a Cooperative market, there is a Market Board which is responsible for managing the market. Thus, marketeers not only learn first-hand the principles of democracy but also put the knowledge to practice through voting their Board Members, continued monitoring of the performance of their leaders as well as ensuring that transparency and accountability among them is upheld. It’s through these Cooperatives that they can collectively strengthen their voices and hold policymakers accountable in the set obligations. Through various programs such as development programs, capacity building programs, cooperative members learn to
improve their relationships in respect of ensuring the effectiveness of their Cooperatives as well as serving their needs. Support from members of Cooperatives coupled with capacity building, motivates and contribute to community development initiatives. Cooperatives thus give communities an understanding of what community development involves and the role of various stakeholders in development, there by promoting development.

**Financial Regulations governing operations of Council markets in Zambia**

The objective of this section is to discuss financial regulations that govern the operations of Council markets. It is necessary to understand how markets are financed as this is key to effective management and provision of services to markets.

In order to operate effectively, Local Authorities in Zambia have a special fund where all monies paid to a local authority are deposited. The moneys paid into this special fund include such fees and rentals paid by management boards to a local authority and any moneys received by way of grants or donations from any source in Zambia and, subject to the approval of the minister of local government and housing, if the money is from any source outside Zambia. According to the Markets Act (2007), moneys from the special fund can be used for the development, management, maintenance and servicing of markets which are not under the management of a management board. Secondly, on the recommendations of the minister of local government, the local authority may approve that the moneys from a special fund be used for the better administration of markets. Therefore, it can be seen that markets which are solely run by the Lusaka City Council are dependent on monies from this special fund if they are to develop.

On the contrary, funds of a management board consist of moneys which have been appropriated by the Zambian parliament for purposes of the board. Management boards are also funded by collections from market fees, stallage, rent and other income from activities undertaken by the board. It should be noted that markets managed by a board do not benefit from the special fund of a local authority. In addition to the above sources of funding markets under a management board, moneys are paid to the board by way of grants or donations from any source within or outside Zambia. Though this is the case, it should be mentioned that grants or donations from a source other than the government needs the approval of the minister.
The Markets Act (2007) also stipulates conditions under which funds of a management board are to be used. For example, salaries and gratuities of staff engaged by the board are paid from these funds. Also paid from these funds are allowances for the members of the board for attendance at meetings of the board, as determined by the minister and taking into account the size and operation of the market. Maintenance, management and development of the market incurred by the board are also paid from the fund. The management board is also mandated to pay lease fees to local authorities and these fees are also paid from the management fund.

By-laws governing the operations of markets in Zambia: As already mentioned, the Minister of local government in consultation with a local authority has the power to establish markets. At the same time the minister of local government has the powers to make regulations and a local authority may make by-laws for the better management of markets. Therefore, regulations and by-laws which may be made as cited in the Markets Act (2007) may among others include the following: (a) regulating the use of markets and buildings, keeping order, preventing obstructions and maintaining cleanliness in the market premises; (b) enabling the local authority to determine by resolution, stallage, rent, tolls or levies and fees for inspection of produce and providing for the collection; (c) enabling the local authority to determine by resolution the days and hours during each day on which a market may be held and preventing the sale and purchase of goods in the markets on any days or at any hours except those determined; (d) the issue and revocation of licences or permits for the marketeers and other licences required for operations at the market; (e) regulating services within the market; (f) regulating parking areas within the market; (g) enabling the local authority to prohibit and control the development or erection of buildings in a market area in the interest of public health, public safety and the orderly development of a market; (h) the demolition of buildings in a market which do not conform to plans and specifications of the buildings approved by the local authority and are a danger to public health or public safety; (i) the establishment and maintenance of sanitary conveniences and services and ablution facilities; (j) the removal and destruction of all kinds of refuse and effluent; (k) the establishment and maintenance of drains, sewers and works for the disposal of sewage and refuse; and (l) prescribing measures for the prevention of pollution of water.
Conclusion
This chapter has given an overview of the existing structure and operations of Lusaka City Council. This structure can be divided into two: (a) there is a Legislative wing composed of the Mayor and Councillors; and (b) the Executive wing which is led by the Town Clerk assisted by Directors and other support staffs.

It has been revealed that management of markets at Lusaka City Council is the responsibility of the Markets Unit which is under the leadership of the Director of Housing and Social Services. It has also been established that markets are managed either by the Council or by a Management Board as outlined in the Markets Act of 2007. Still there are some markets which are managed by Cooperatives.

Furthermore, as will be shown in the chapters which follow (i.e. chapters three, four and five, the infrastructure in markets belt by the European Union which are now being managed by the Lusaka City Council, is slowly being broken down and this shows that there is management failure with regards to how these markets are expected to be managed. Thus, it is expected that at some point these markets will be like any other market in Zambia. This means that these markets (i.e. markets belt with assistance from the European Union) will be in a poor state just like the other markets which are not in good condition for trading.

This study has also shown that, there is a very strong legal framework governing the operations of markets in Zambia. Regardless of this fact, it seems as if very little is being done to ensure that these by-laws are enforced and this is evidenced by the poor state in which some Council run markets are. Sanitary conditions in markets which were not belt by the European Union are very poor; marketeers do not conform to set standards when erecting stalls, some markets don’t even have the necessary ablution facilities and countless problems which markets in Lusaka are facing.
CHAPTER THREE

MANAGEMENT OF GARBAGE IN MARKETS

Introduction
The Lusaka City Council is mandated to manage markets in its vicinity. In an effort to manage markets, local authorities are also expected to manage garbage found within the markets. Chapter two of this study focussed on the management of markets in general. On the other hand, this chapter is aimed at specifically focusing on the management of garbage in markets as poor collection of garbage from markets may lead to disease outbreaks thereby leading to poor sanitation standards in markets. To achieve this objective, this chapter is divided into five sections including this introduction.

The second section focuses on garbage management system instituted by the Lusaka City Council. In other words, this section will show the garbage management programme which has been instituted by the Lusaka City Council in markets. Garbage in markets is either collected from a primary garbage collection point or a secondary garbage collection point. A primary garbage collection point relates to a garbage collection point which has been established inside the market. Usually wheelie bins are used for collecting garbage from the primary garbage collection point. A secondary garbage collection point on the other hand is a garbage collection point which is set up outside the market. Skip bins are used for garbage collection purposes at the secondary garbage collection point. It is the aim of this section to show the extent of garbage collection from these points. This section will also show how uncollected garbage has affected the business conducted by marketeers in markets of Lusaka.

The third section in this chapter discusses performance of Lusaka City Council with regards to garbage collection in markets. This will largely be done by discussing the satisfaction levels of marketeers on the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management in markets.

The objective of the fourth section in this chapter is to discuss the major constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in managing garbage from markets in the City. Since management of garbage is financed directly from the levies collected from the markets, this section will therefore show some of the problems encountered
by the local authority in the process of collecting levies from marketeers in markets of Lusaka.

The last section shall be a conclusion of this chapter. This researcher will now focus at garbage management system in markets run by the Lusaka City Council.

**Garbage management system in markets**

In this section focus is on the role played by the Lusaka City Council in managing garbage in markets.

Markets management at Lusaka City Council fall under the Department of Housing and Social Services and the primary role of this department with regards to garbage management in the markets of Lusaka City is that of facilitation. In other words garbage management in the City of Lusaka falls under Waste Management Unit of Lusaka City Council. Thus, to effectively play this role of facilitation, the Department of Housing and Social Services has employed general workers to clean and collect garbage in Council run markets throughout the City and dump the garbage in designated garbage collection points. For example, according to the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council, 11 general workers out of the 12 general workers that are needed have been employed to clean and collect garbage from Old Soweto while six general workers have been employed and stationed at Chelston market so that they could also clean and collect garbage from Chelston market. Marketeers were asked to state whether or not they saw Council staff collecting garbage from the markets which were closely examined. This study has shown that some marketeers interviewed were of the view that Lusaka City Council support staffs are responsible for garbage collection from markets. Majority (92.1%) of all marketeers interviewed said that Lusaka City Council support staffs are responsible for garbage collection in markets run by the Council. Probably these marketeers have seen Council employees collecting garbage from markets. 6.5% said that marketeers themselves are responsible for garbage collection from markets while 1.4% said that Private Organisations were responsible for garbage collection from markets.

The study further revealed that the Councils’ Department of Housing and Social Services has a programme on garbage management in the markets of Lusaka City. In the case of Kaunda Square stage 1 market for example, the Munali Ward 33
Councillor said that, ‘there is a rota which is followed with regards to garbage management in markets. Each market in a particular ward is given a day in a month when garbage is collected from the secondary collection point to the final dumping site’ (Interview with the Munali Ward 33 Councillor on 08/01/2014). The Market Advisory Committee member for Kaunda Square stage 1 market also echoed that the Council was responsible for garbage management in the market (Interview with the Market Advisory Committee member on 09/01/2014). The study now discusses the nature of the garbage management programme at Lusaka City Council.

The nature of this activity as revealed by the Market Master for Chelston market is such that, garbage from markets is collected from two main points and these are primary garbage collection points and secondary garbage collection points (Interview with the Market Master for Chelston market on 23/01/2014). As already established, a primary garbage collection point is simply a point inside the market where garbage is initially dumped en route to the secondary garbage collection point. In other words, a primary garbage collection point relates to wheelie bins placed in strategic places of the markets where market users can throw their garbage (See Appendix F, photo number 5 for a Wheelie bin). General workers employed by the Council to clean markets also throw garbage into these bins after sweeping the markets as noted by the Chelston Market Master. According to the manager for Waste Management Unit, Council general workers do the collection of garbage from the primary garbage collection points to the secondary garbage collection points if there are no Community Based Enterprises (CBEs) operating in the area where the market is located and he cited Old Soweto market as a case in point. On the other hand, if the market is situated in a locality where there is a Community Based Enterprise (CBE) assigned to collect garbage; it is the responsibility of the CBE to collect garbage from the primary garbage collection point to the secondary garbage collection point (Interview with the Manager-Waste Management Unit on 14/01/2014). Once garbage is collected from a primary collection point in a market, it is transported to a secondary garbage collection point which is usually a point outside the market where skip bins are found (See Appendix F, photo number 17 for a skip bin).

The collection of garbage from the primary collection point in a market is done using wheelie bins. It was revealed by the Market Master for Chelston market, that collection of market garbage from the primary garbage collection point in most
markets is done using wheelie bins placed in the markets while collection of garbage from the secondary collection point is done using skip bins managed by Lusaka City Council through Waste Management Unit (Interview with the Market Master for Chelston market on 23/01/2014). For example, she revealed that Chelston market has wheelie bins for primary garbage collection. This was acknowledged by marketeers from Chelston market; all (100%) indicated that the Council had placed wheelie bins for primary garbage collection inside the market. With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 market, another market closely examined in this study, the Market Master for this market revealed that the Council had placed bins in the market for primary garbage collection. This is supported by responses obtained from marketeers interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market, majority (94.0%) said that the Council has placed wheelie bins for garbage collection in the market, 4.0% said that there were no wheelie bins for primary garbage collection in the market while 2.0% did not give a response to the question which was asked.

Unlike Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1 market where the Council has placed wheelie bins for primary garbage collection, the Market Master for Old Soweto said that the Council has not placed wheelie bins for primary garbage collection at the market (Interview with the Market Master for Old Soweto market on 03/01/2014). This was confirmed by the marketeers interviewed at Old Soweto market. 89.9% of those interviewed were of the view that the Council did not place wheelie bins for primary garbage collection at the market while 10.1% said that the council had placed wheelie bins in the market for primary garbage collection purposes. These results are similar to those of a study conducted by T.H. Gadaga etal (2004). Results of his study showed that Old Soweto market had no refuse bins and that garbage was piled around the working place every day, resulting in a repulsive stench being emitted. It is therefore, not surprising that, Old Soweto is one of the markets in Lusaka, facing garbage management constraints. It was for this reason that this researcher asked the Councillor for Harry Mwaanga Nkumbula, Kanyama Ward 11 over what he had done to ensure that management of garbage at Old Soweto market was improved. The Councillor said that, he had engaged private organizations such as Maher Investments, Uniturtle Zambia, Zambezi Drilling and SARO Agro Equipment which are within Kanyama Ward 11. These Companies have helped refuel Council trucks so that garbage is collected from the market. Though
these Organizations have been engaged, garbage was found to be piled up outside Old Soweto markets secondary garbage collection point.

As already alluded to, once garbage is collected from the primary collection point it is transported to the secondary garbage collection point. Collection of garbage from the secondary collection point is done through hooklift trucks, skiplift trucks and tractor trailers depending on waste amounts and distance to the disposal site. However, intermediate storage of garbage at the secondary garbage collection point is depended on the means for secondary garbage collection and included containers and skip bins. Once the skip bin outside the market was full, the Waste Management Unit transported the garbage to the final dumpsite which is Chingwere landfill for disposal though this was not done on time due to numerous constraints faced by the Local Authority (Lusaka City Council) which will be highlighted in the next section of this chapter.

This study has revealed that collection of garbage in markets is usually delayed at secondary garbage collection points. According to the Market Master for Old Soweto, collection of garbage from the market is usually delayed at the secondary garbage collection point which is directly managed by the Waste Management Unit of the Council. The Council official further said that Waste Management Unit was supposed to collect garbage from the secondary garbage collection point four times in a week but that they had not been consistent (Interview with the Market Master for Old Soweto on 03/01/2014). This concern was also raised by the Market Advisory Committee member for Kaunda Square stage 1 market who felt that Waste Management Unit of the Council had not effectively managed garbage at the secondary garbage collection point (Interview with the Market Advisory Committee member for Kaunda Square stage 1 market on 09/01/2014). However, it should be noted that, unlike the other markets run by Lusaka City Council, where problems start to emerge from the secondary garbage collection point, the situation is different at Old Soweto market as this market does not have wheelie bins for primary garbage collection. Thus, there is increased indiscriminate disposal of garbage at Old Soweto market compared to the other markets.

This researcher also observed that all the three markets which were closely examined in this study had piles of garbage which had not been collected from the secondary garbage collection point in the market. In other words it seems like it took
a lot of time for Waste Management Unit to collect garbage from this point to the final dumping site which is Chingwere landfill. This was also confirmed by responses obtained from marketeers who were asked to state the frequency of garbage collection from markets. Marketeers who were interviewed seemed not to be aware of how often garbage was being collected from the secondary garbage collection point in a week. 19.9% said that garbage was collected twice in a week while the other 19.9% stated that there were no specific days when garbage was collected from the secondary garbage collection point. 14.4% said that collection of garbage from the secondary collection point was done once weekly, 12.9% said that it was done five times weekly, 8.8% were of the view that it was done three times weekly while 6.5% said that it was done six times weekly. Results also showed that 3.7% of marketeers interviewed were of the view that garbage collection was done every day, 4.2% said that it was done four times weekly. The question was not applicable to 8.8% of marketeers interviewed while 0.9% did not give a response. Support staffs of Lusaka City Council also seemed not to be sure of how often the Waste Management Unit collected garbage from markets. It was observed that, 46.7% of Lusaka City Council support staffs who were interviewed were not sure, 10.0% said that collection of garbage was done once weekly, 6.7% said it was done six times weekly, 20.0% said it was done ten times weekly while 16.7% said that collection of garbage was done twice weekly. The support staffs were of the view that collection of garbage in markets depended on the availability of fuel. In other words the Council had no specific days of garbage collection from markets.

Collection of garbage in markets was either done by the Private Companies such as Cleanfast, Citimop etc. or Community Based Enterprises (CBEs) such as Mumana A which was in Kaunda Square stage 1. If Private Companies and CBEs were not present in a particular area, it became the responsibility of the Council general workers to collect garbage from the primary collection point in the market to the secondary garbage collection point outside the market. The manager for Waste Management Unit stated that before the formation of Community Based Enterprises (CBEs), community members formed Community Based Organisations (CBOs) which operated on a voluntary basis (Interview with the Manager for Waste Management Unit at Lusaka City Council on 09/01/2014). However this was not sustainable due to the high turnover of membership and low commitment of the CBOs. Therefore, Community Based Enterprises (CBEs) had to be formed and have
continued to be used and operate like profit-making organizations. This has improved on the sustainability of primary collection of garbage in markets in the peri-urban areas of Lusaka. Therefore at the time of this study, Lusaka City Council had sub-contracted some CBEs to collect garbage from selected markets of Lusaka especially those in peri-urban areas. For example, it was revealed by the Munali Ward 33 Councillor that a CBE known as Mumana A was responsible for the management of garbage at Kaunda Square stage 1 market (Interview with the Munali Ward 33 councillor on 08/01/2014). The Munali ward 33 Councillor further stated that Central government and other private organizations had aided Market Advisory Committees in an effort to resolve the garbage problem in markets run by the Lusaka City Council. He also revealed that, Central government had released funds amounting to K30, 000 per ward, for hire of hook trucks to transport garbage to Chingwere dumping site. The Councillor further said that in an effort to effectively manage market garbage, the Market Advisory Committee at Kaunda Square Stage 1, had tried to engage private companies such as Top Motors Zambia and Hybrid Poultry which are both within Munali Ward 33, but these companies have not responded to this important cause.

Unlike Kaunda Square stage 1 market where a CBE called Mumana A has been engaged by the Lusaka City Council to collect garbage from this market, there are some markets in Lusaka where the Lusaka City Council has not engaged Community Based Enterprises (CBEs) or Private Companies to collect garbage from markets and examples of such markets are Chelston and Old Soweto markets. The fact that there are no Private Companies or CBEs to collect garbage from Old Soweto and Chelston markets means that the responsibility of collecting garbage from these markets has been given to general workers employed by the Council. Furthermore, it was revealed by an Officer from the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council that, the Council has not engaged a CBE to be in charge of garbage collection at Chelston market, but instead employed six (6) general workers whose sole responsibility is to clean the market and collect garbage from the primary garbage collection points (wheelie bins) located inside the market to the secondary garbage collection point (skip bin) located outside the market (Interview with the Senior Administrative Officer on 07/01/2014). Thus, it is the responsibility of Council general workers to collect garbage from the primary collection point to the secondary collection point of the markets where CBEs were
not engaged while in markets such as Kaunda square stage 1 where a CBE known as Mumana A has been engaged, Council general workers are responsible for sweeping the market and ensuring that garbage is disposed in the wheelie bins placed in different parts of the market. According to the Market Master (Interview with the Market Master on 13/12/2013) for Chelston market, Lusaka City Council has placed about 10 wheelie bins around the market where marketeers throw their garbage. The Chelston Market Master further said that Waste Management Unit was mandated to collect the skip bins which are placed at the secondary garbage collection point twice in a week. However, this was not the case and has resulted in garbage being piled up at the secondary garbage collection point as observed by this researcher. This researcher observed that there was no difference in terms of appearance of the Chelston skip bins and that of Kaunda Square stage 1 market. In both markets, skip bins had not been collected for over four weeks at the time of the study. It is, therefore, clear from the data collected that, garbage management problems in these markets, rose from the secondary garbage collection points, points which in many cases were directly handled by the Waste Management Unit of the Council.

As already stated, Old Soweto market is another example of a market run by the Lusaka City Council where the Local authority has not engaged CBEs to manage garbage. Thus, like Chelston market, Lusaka City Council has employed ten (10) general workers to clean and collect garbage from the market. In addition, two (2) cashiers had been recruited to collect market levies. It should be stated that, these general workers who have been employed by the Council to work from this (Chelston) market were responsible for collecting garbage from the primary garbage collection points and transport the garbage to the secondary garbage collection point. What this means is that failure by the Waste Management Unit to transport the garbage to Chingwere landfill has an effect on the business conducted by marketeers.

It appears like the presence of uncollected garbage in markets of Lusaka has a negative effect on marketeers as buyers tend to shun dirty market surroundings thereby resulting in fewer sales on the part of marketeers. The Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 market revealed that buyers prefer buying from a market which is in hygienic condition. Results collected from the three (3) markets examined in this study have also shown that the presence of uncollected garbage has an effect on the businesses conducted by marketeers. For example, 64.3% of all marketeers interviewed in this study said that their sales reduced due to the presence
of uncollected garbage, 1.4% said that their sales increased, the question was not applicable to 33.3% of marketeers interviewed while 0.9% decided not to respond to the question which was asked. Thus, it is very clear from these results that the presence of uncollected garbage in markets of Lusaka has had a negative effect on the business conducted by marketeers and it is for this reason that this researcher asked marketeers to state how they felt Lusaka City Council had performed in the area of garbage collection in markets.

**Performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of Garbage management**

This section discusses performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management in markets. This will be done by looking at the satisfactory levels of marketeers with regards to the performance of the Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage collection from markets. As will be shown, marketeers from Kaunda Square stage 1 and Chelston market seemed to be satisfied with the way the Council had been managing garbage from markets and this could be attributed to the wheelie bins placed inside these markets for primary garbage collection. On the other hand, marketeers interviewed from Old Soweto market seemed to be dissatisfied with the performance of the Council in the area of garbage management as will be shown in this section.

Results obtained from all the marketeers interviewed in all the three (3) markets showed that 63.8% of all marketeers seemed to be satisfied with the performance of Lusaka City Council when it comes to garbage collection from markets, 34.3% were dissatisfied while 1.9% did not respond to the question which was asked. An attempt was made to examine closely each of the three (3) markets with a view of establishing the levels of satisfaction from individual markets. In other words, the objective was to determine which market was better managed by the Council in so far as the issue of garbage management in markets is concerned. Of the three markets which were closely examined, only Old Soweto produced different pattern of results. Results obtained from Kaunda Square stage 1 market showed that 80% of marketeers interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market, were satisfied with reference to the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management compared to 18% who were dissatisfied while 2% decided not to respond to the question. It was also revealed by the Market Advisory Committee member for Kaunda Square stage 1 market that the Lusaka City Council had
managed to collect garbage from the market, i.e. primary garbage collection points where wheelie bins are placed but had difficulties collecting garbage from the secondary garbage collection point where skip bins are stationed. Similar statements were also echoed by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 market who stated that the council had problems collecting garbage from the secondary garbage collection point. Chart 3.1 summarises marketers’ responses with regards to the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management from the primary garbage collection point. Thus, going by the results obtained from the interviews with marketeers at this market it can be said that marketeers seemed to be satisfied with the way Lusaka City Council has been performing in the area of garbage collection from the primary garbage collection point in this market. Though marketeers interviewed from Kaunda Square stage 1 seemed to be satisfied with the way garbage was being managed, this researcher observed that garbage at the secondary garbage collection point of the market had not been collected for over four (4) weeks as revealed by the Market Master for this market.

*Chart 3.1: Satisfaction levels of marketeers at Kaunda Square stage 1 market on the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage collection.*

Like their colleagues at Kaunda Square stage 1 market, marketeers at Chelston market were asked to state their satisfactory levels with regards to the performance of the Council in the area of garbage management in markets. Results showed that 95.7% of marketeers interviewed at this market were satisfied with the performance of the Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management inside
Chelston market, while 4.3% were dissatisfied. Chart 3.2 gives a summary of Chelston marketeers responses with regards to the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management at Chelston market. It was also revealed by the Market Master for Chelston market that the general workers at the market regularly cleaned and collected garbage from the primary collection point to the secondary garbage collection point as there was no CBE to collect garbage from the primary garbage collection point (Interview with the Market Master for Chelston market on 23/01/2014).

**Chart 3.2: Satisfaction levels of marketeers at Chelston market on the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management.**

(Chart showing satisfaction levels with 95.7% satisfied and 4.3% dissatisfied)

(Source: Primary data)

Though chart 3.2 shows that the Council has performed better in the area of managing garbage from the primary collection points at Chelston market, it was observed that in some parts of the market, garbage was indiscriminately dumped despite the existence of wheelie bins which were placed in the various market streets. Furthermore, the Market Master for Chelston market said that though garbage was being collected from the primary garbage collection points in the market, collection of garbage from the secondary garbage collection point was not done as scheduled and this researcher also observed that garbage at the secondary collection point was piled up and had not been collected for over four (4) weeks at the time of this study.

Marketeers at Old Soweto were also asked to state their satisfaction levels in relation to the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage
collection. Their responses are illustrated in chart 3.3. As shown in Chart 3.3, 53% of marketeers interviewed at Old Soweto were dissatisfied with the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management at the market while only 45% were satisfied with the way the Lusaka City Council has been managing garbage at the market. 2% decided not to respond to the question which was asked.

**Chart 3.3: Satisfaction levels of marketeers at Old Soweto market on the performance of Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage management.**

(Source: Primary data)

There are a number of reasons which might explain the results shown in chart 3.3. One probable reason as to why some marketeers at Old Soweto market were dissatisfied with the performance of Lusaka City Council with regards to garbage collection from the market has to do with the non-availability of wheelie bins in the market. With regards to Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1 markets respectively, the Council has placed wheelie bins in these markets and probably this explains why marketeers seemed to be satisfied with the way the Council managed garbage inside these two markets (i.e. Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1). Another probable reason which could have affected the satisfactory levels of marketeers interviewed at Old Soweto market has to do with way the general workers collected garbage from the various sections of the market. It was revealed by a Market Advisory Committee member for Old Soweto that Council general workers were very selective when it came to collecting garbage from the various sections of the market. This researcher also observed that Council general workers were very selective with regards to places or sections within the market, where they collected
garbage. For example, some marketeers in the chicken sales section of the market complained that garbage was rarely collected from their section for possible transportation to the secondary garbage collection point. It was also reported by the marketeers from the Banana Sales section and some restaurant owners operating from Old Soweto market that, Council general workers had a tendency of forcing marketeers to use bare hands to lift the sack where they had dumped their garbage and throw the garbage in Lusaka City Council wheal burrows during collection of garbage from individual shops. This was despite them (Lusaka City Council general workers) having protective clothings. This is not only a risk to marketeers but also market users or buyers as chances are that this marketeer might not even clean her contaminated hands after lifting the sack containing garbage especially that water is a scarce commodity at this market. Thus, if someone is selling food, he may end up contaminating the food and the buyer is the one who is likely to pay the price. These reports given by marketeers from Old Soweto market together with the results displayed in chart 3.3 are an indication that very few marketeers are satisfied with the way Lusaka City Council has been collecting garbage from this market.

**Garbage management constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in markets**

The previous section has shown different views expressed by marketeers with regards to the performance of the Lusaka City Council in the area of garbage collection from markets. This study has already established that garbage management in markets begin from the secondary garbage collection points except for Old Soweto market where the Council seem not to have done enough to ensure that garbage is collected from the primary collection point in the market. As stated in the beginning of this chapter, the aim of this section is to show the main garbage management constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in markets. There are a number of constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council when it comes to garbage management and these are shown in this section.

The first constraint is in relation to poor collection of the market levy. This has had a negative effect on the management of garbage in markets run by the Lusaka City Council. It was revealed by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 market that Lusaka City Council collected about K3, 200.00 per month in form of market levy. The Market Master further said that, 40% of the collected market levy was deposited into a central account managed by Lusaka City Council while 60%
was retained by the Market Advisory Committee (Interview with the Market Master for Kaunda square stage 1 on 09/01/2014). The Assistant Markets Manager in charge of Finance at Lusaka City Council also confirmed that 60% of the market levy was retained by Market Advisory Committees for management purposes of the markets (Interview with the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). The collected market levies have been used to procure toilet chemicals, cleaning detergents for the markets, payment of water and electricity tariffs. This money has also been used as payment for garbage management. The Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 market said that, the market was not remitting the 40% entitlement to Lusaka City Council due to poor collection of market levies from the market. The Council official observed that markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 were being subsidized by other big markets such as New Soweto and City market. An attempt was made to establish whether or not marketeers from Kaunda Square stage 1 paid market levy to the Council. It was noted that majority (84%) of marketeers interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market said that on a monthly basis, they paid market levy to Lusaka City Council. Furthermore, it was revealed by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 that, the market levy for this market was K45 per market stand on a monthly basis and that the market had 300 functional stands. Thus, it was expected that on a monthly basis, Lusaka City Council collected not less than K10,000.00 taking all other factors into consideration.

Apart from Kaunda Square stage 1 market, Old Soweto market is another market run by the Lusaka City Council which has difficulties in collecting levies from marketeers. It was revealed by the Market Master for Old Soweto market that of the 687 functional shops at the market, Lusaka City Council Cashiers were only able to collect K8,000.00 on a monthly basis (Interview with the Market Master for Old Soweto on 03/01/2014). This collection was very low considering the number of functional stalls that the market has. However, the Market Master for Old Soweto said that the little collections of monies from the market were used to pay Waste Management Unit so that they could collect garbage from the secondary garbage collection point to the final dumping site. On the contrary poor collection of the market levy was as a result of poor service delivery on the part of the service provider. Therefore, marketeers were of the view that it was pointless to pay for a service which was not being provided.
Though the Council faced difficulties in collecting levies from markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto, the study noted that collection of market levies in other markets such as Chelston was better. For example, both Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1 markets have about 300 functional shops respectively. However, data collected from Chelston market showed that the Lusaka City Council collected about K25, 000.00 on a monthly basis in form of market levies while it collected only about K3, 200.00 on a monthly basis from Kaunda Square stage 1 market. The Market Master for Chelston market revealed that the collected market levy has been used to pay for “electricity, waste management, cleaning materials and the market lighting system just to mention but a few”. Probably, the fact that Chelston market is one of the modern markets constructed by the European Union under Urban Markets Development Programme explains why marketeers at this market have not shunned away from paying market levy as the market has almost everything which a market is supposed to have i.e. wheelie bins for garbage collection, piped water, good market infrastructure to mention but a few.

Since some markets are able to collect levies from the marketeers, it was important to find out the reasons behind poor collection of the market levy in some markets run by the Lusaka City Council. This researcher was of the view that the existence of political parties could have contributed to the problem, but as explained below this was not the reason behind poor collection of market levies in some markets. As already stated garbage was not collected on schedule from the secondary garbage collection points and this could be the reason for poor collection of market levies from markets.

The problem of revenue collection in some markets has been compounded by political party interventions in the operations of markets. There are still some markets in Lusaka which have political party structures and a case in point of such a market is Old Soweto where the ruling Patriotic Front (PF) have party structures. One Market Advisory Committee member who is also a member of the Patriotic Front branch committee was of the view that political parties should have structures in markets. The Old Soweto Market Advisory Committee member went on to say that ‘Lusaka City Council had failed to manage Old Soweto and that if a marketeer refused to pay market levy, members of the Patriotic Front branch committee were called upon and that the (Patriotic Front) compelled marketeers to pay market levy to Council officials with less difficulties’ (Interview with the Market Master, Old Soweto Market Advisory Committee).
Advisory Committee member for Old Soweto on 02/01/2014). Claims by the Market Advisory Committee member that the Patriotic Front branch committee has been compelling marketeers to pay market levies at Old Soweto market seemed not to have helped the Council to adequately collect levies from marketeers as collection of levies at the market have not improved. It was for this reason that the Market Master for Old Soweto was not of the view that political parties should have structures in markets. According to the Market Master for Old Soweto market, if a marketeer was a cadre, it became very difficult to collect market levy from him as they claimed that they were the ones who voted for the ruling government and trading without paying levy was one way by which the ruling government could show gratitude for their being voted into power. It was further revealed by the Market Master for Old Soweto, that if cadres were forced to pay market levies, they resorted to chasing Council officials and this had an effect on the Councils much needed revenue for service provision.

Despite the existence of political party structures in some markets, it was noted that in other markets managed by the Council such as Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1, political interventions were non-existence. In other words, political parties did not even have structures in these markets, hence; neither collection of market levies from marketeers nor management of garbage by the local authority was affected.

Another constraint faced by the Lusaka City Council in general and Waste Management Unit in particular when it comes to garbage collection is lack of fuel for the trucks and other vehicles involved in the transportation of garbage from the secondary garbage collection points in markets to the final dumping site which is Chingwere landfill. This was a concern raised by all the three Market Masters from the markets which were closely examined. They claimed that delay in collecting garbage from the secondary garbage collection points was partly due to unavailability of fuel. According to the Assistant Markets Manager in charge of finances at Lusaka City Council, the Council lacked financial capacity to procure adequate fuel for its trucks and this had adversely affected garbage collection from markets (Interview with the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). Thus, even if some markets had been paying or subscribing to Waste Management Unit for garbage collection the money was not enough to adequately assist in garbage collection from markets. Furthermore, markets which
were facing difficulties in collecting levies from marketeers were not even subscribing to the Waste Management Unit for garbage collection. It was also revealed by the Assistant Markets Manager in-charge of Finance that garbage volume in markets was not only accumulated by market users (Interview with the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/204). He stated that residents of Lusaka had a tendency of dumping garbage outside markets or secondary garbage collection points, that is to say those points outside the markets where skip bins are located. This increased the financial burden of the Council and as a result of this; it became very costly on the part of Waste Management Unit to effectively manage market garbage. It became costly on the part of Waste Management Unit in that Lusaka residents were expected to pay for their garbage through the various waste management companies engaged by Lusaka City Council. Thus, failure to subscribe to these companies had resulted into indiscriminate disposal of garbage especially by residents who reside near markets and the cost of garbage management which was expected to be paid by these residents to the waste management company was being borne by the Waste Management Unit. According to the Vice Chairperson of Chelston Market Advisory Committee, some people who were not marketeers at Chelston market had been throwing their garbage at market places or the secondary garbage collection point where skip bins were located. She also said that, some came as far as Avondale Township just to dump garbage at the market dumping site (Interview with the Vice-Chairperson for Chelston Market Advisory Committee on 23/01/2014). This concern was also echoed by the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance at Lusaka City Council who said that 75% of garbage found at the secondary garbage collection point was generated by residents surrounding the market. The Council official said that the skip bins in markets got full within a day due to the fact that non marketeers dumped garbage at these sites.

It’s not only residents who had a tendency of dumping garbage by the market skip bins or secondary garbage collection point but this tendency was also seen in respect to private companies that had signed contracts with the Council to collect garbage from markets and transport it to Chingwere landfill. According to the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council, once private companies have collected garbage from houses or residents, they were supposed to transport the garbage to Chingwere landfill. On the contrary these companies had a tendency of dumping garbage at the market dumping
site or secondary garbage collection point. This increased the financial burden of the Council as the Council had to find means of transporting this garbage which was supposed to be dumped at Chingwere but now dumped at the market by private companies. Furthermore, some markets do not make a lot of money to sustain the collection of waste in markets (Interview with the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services on 17/01/2014). As their contracts stipulated, that is to say contracts between private waste collectors/companies and the Lusaka City Council, these companies were supposed to dump garbage collected from the various parts of the City at the final dumping site which was Chingwere landfill and not markets. On the other hand, it was revealed by the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council that, private waste companies were scared of meeting the cost of transporting garbage from the various parts of the City to the landfill. In addition to this, there was a disposal fee of K20,00 per ton at Chingwere landfill which private waste companies seemed to be running away from. It was for these reasons that they resorted to dumping garbage at markets as they knew that the costs would be borne by Waste Management Unit of Lusaka City Council.

The other constraint faced by the Lusaka City Council when it comes to garbage management in markets is lack of adequate tools needed to effectively manage garbage in markets. This is in terms of trucks which are supposed to be used to transport garbage from the secondary garbage collection point to Chingwere landfill. The Cleansing Superintendent at Lusaka City Council stated that the Council had six (6) tipper trucks, of these trucks only three (3) were working; three (3) skip trucks, only one (1) was working; three (3) hookskips, only one (1) was working; three (3) compactors, only one (1) was working; and three (3) light trucks, only one (1) was working (Interview with the Cleansing Superintendent at Lusaka City Council on 17/01/2014). The Cleansing Superintendent further said that four (4) new refuse trucks had been bought and were soon to be handed over to Waste Management Unit. The study further revealed that the delay in frequent collection of garbage from markets had been exacerbated by frequent break down of existing fleet of vehicles as noted by the Cleansing Superintendent. The situation had further been compounded by delays in procurement of spares due to lack of finances. Therefore, it can be seen that Lusaka City Council is in greater need of more trucks as the existing number of trucks is not enough to cater for all the markets in the 33 wards.
The Lusaka City Council also lacked adequate wheelie bins which are ideally supposed to be placed inside the markets to serve as primary garbage collection points. Despite the fact that the Council has placed wheelie bins at Kaunda Square and Chelston markets, it seems as if there were no wheelie bins placed at Old Soweto market. The Market Master for Old Soweto also stated that they had requested for wheelie bins from Waste Management Unit of the Council but that nothing had been done to ensure that the market is provided with wheelie bins. It was also revealed by majority of marketeers (89.9%) interviewed at Old Soweto market that the market has no wheelie bins and it is for this reason that market users have resorted to indiscriminate means of garbage disposal at the market. Only 10.1% of marketeers interviewed at this market said that the market had wheelie bins. The Market Master for Chelston market also echoed the same call for more wheelie bins to be placed inside her market.

Support staffs at Lusaka City Council were also asked to state what they thought were the main constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council when managing garbage from markets. As noted from chart 3.4, 33.3% of Council support staffs identified poor budget support especially from the government as the main constraint faced by the Council when managing garbage from markets, 26.7% said that indiscriminate disposal of garbage was the main constraint, 20% said that inadequate trucks, equipment and fuel was the main constraint. 16.7% said that the main constraint faced by the Council when managing garbage has to do with the breakdown of hook trucks, while 3.3% did not give any response to the question which was asked. These results are in agreement with those found in a report by Lusaka City Council and the Environmental Council of Zambia (Lusaka City State of Environmental Outlook: 2008). The report showed that use of plastic bags or shakeshake Chibuku packs by people without sanitation facilities to defecate and throw or bury indiscriminately was very common amongst peri-urban dwellers.

As already established, poor budget support has affected the Councils capacity to adequately deliver waste management services to markets. This concern was also raised in the report by Lusaka City Council and Environmental Council Zambia (ECZ) (Lusaka City State of Environmental Outlook: 2008) which stated that limited financial capacity and inadequate trained human resource had made it difficult for the local authority to fulfil its obligations concerning waste management. This problem has been exacerbated by inadequate infrastructure and lack of
recycling facilities. Historically for the City of Lusaka, the Lusaka City Council delivered solid waste management services directly financed through normal municipal financing channels such as government grants and property rentals on Council owned properties or property rates. From middle 1980s to early 1990s, financing of municipal services through these traditional means was no longer attainable. This was attributed mainly to declining national economy which saw a significant decline in government grants to local authorities Lusaka inclusive. The situation was exacerbated by the sale of the Council owned housing stock which was one of the major sources of income for local authorities in form of rentals. Consequently, delivery of waste management services crumbled and was limited to sporadic collections at public trading places or in emergency response during disease outbreaks, mainly cholera (Lusaka City State of Environmental Outlook: 2008).

**Chart 3.4: Views of Lusaka City Council Support Staff on the main constraints faced by the Council when collecting garbage from markets.**

(Source: Primary data)
Conclusion
This study has not only revealed the extent to which garbage is collected in markets but has also shown the system which the Council has been using to manage garbage in markets. Depending on where the market is located, the following garbage management systems are used: (a) the use of private waste companies especially in the Lusaka City Councils Waste Districts, and (b) Waste Management Unit partnering with CBEs for peri-urban areas. Despite the existence of these two systems, it was noted that the Council has been facing difficulties when it comes to managing garbage in the markets more especially from the secondary garbage collection points. The Council has not done enough to collect garbage from these points as evidenced by piles of garbage existing outside the markets. Lack of machinery such as hooktrucks, tractors, and wheelie bins were identified as the major reasons leading to poor garbage collection from markets. Lack of fuel and indiscriminate disposal of garbage by market users were also noted as contributing factors to poor garbage management from markets in Lusaka. In other words, the Council lacks finances to effectively manage garbage in markets.

The study has also shown that Chelston market, a market belt with assistance from the European Union, has also faced problems in terms of garbage collection from the secondary garbage collection point (See Appendix F: Photo 9). It takes a lot of time for the Council to collect garbage from this point at the market. In addition to this, the Market Master for Chelston stated that the market is in need of more wheelie bins which are used to collect garbage from the primary collection point. The market had ten (10) wheelie bins at the time of this study which were not enough as revealed by the Market Master for Chelston.

Thus, in terms of garbage collection from markets, it is clear that the Council is facing difficulties to collect garbage even in those markets which were constructed with assistance from the European Union. This researcher noted that though marketeers seemed to be satisfied with the manner in which the Council was collecting garbage from markets, the Council faced difficulties collecting garbage from the secondary garbage collection point. In some markets like Chelston, garbage was indiscriminately dumped despite the existence of wheelie bins. This is an indication that, the Council needs to do more in terms of sensitizing market users on the relevance of the wheelie bins.
It’s also important to establish why some markets like Old Soweto do not have wheelie bins for primary garbage collection whilst others like Kaunda Square Stage 1 and Chelston do have wheelie bins. This researcher is of the view that part of the collected monies from markets can be used to procure the wheelie bins and this will in the long run motivate marketeers to pay the required market levy. Furthermore, the Council can also partner with private Companies involved in waste management to see how best market garbage can be managed. However, Companies that are known to be dumping garbage at the Secondary garbage collection point instead of dumping it at the landfill should be penalised.
CHAPTER FOUR

MANAGEMENT OF DRAINAGES, TOILET FACILITIES AND SUPPLY OF WATER TO MARKETS

Introduction
Provision of toilet facilities to markets is important as it helps to reduce disease outbreaks in markets. However, just like a good working toilet is important, so is effective provision of water supply to markets. This is important for the maintenance of high levels of sanitary conditions in markets. Toilets require water to flush away the waste matter. If waste matter or water does not leave a market, the results would be poor sanitary conditions in a market. Therefore, it is important that good drainage systems are constructed around markets to allow easy flow of waste water. Thus, it is the aim of this chapter to discuss various ways by which Lusaka City Council has been managing toilet facilities in markets, and what it has done to ensure that adequate water is supplied to markets. The chapter will also show how Lusaka City Council has been managing drainages in markets. To achieve these objectives, this chapter is divided into the following five sections:

The first section is the introduction. The second section will focus on the provision of toilet facilities to markets. It is the aim of this section to discuss what the Lusaka City Council has done to ensure that markets are provided with toilet facilities. This section will show whether markets run by the Lusaka City Council have adequate toilet facilities to cater for all market users. It will also show whether the toilets are provided with soap for hand-washing, hand-dryers and whether they are supplied with enough water.

The third section is a discussion of factors leading to poor supply of water to markets. As already stated, waste from toilets can be a source of disease outbreaks if not flushed away and it is for this reason that toilets in markets must be supplied with adequate water. In most cases, the main health problems are caused by poor hygiene due to insufficient water and by the consumption of contaminated water. It is the objective of this section to show whether markets run by the Lusaka City Council are supplied with sufficient quantity of water and the varying effects of poor water supply to markets on market users.

Related to the issues of toilet facilities and water is the need to ensure that water leaves the market. For this to occur, effective management of drainages is
necessary. Failure for waste water to leave the market may lead to outbreak of diarrhoea diseases such as cholera and dysentery. Thus, the importance of a good drainage system in a market cannot be over-emphasised. It is the aim of the fourth section to examine what Lusaka City Council has done to effectively manage drainages and toilets in markets. In an effort to effectively manage drainages, toilet facilities and supply water to markets, the Council has been facing a number of constraints and it is the objective of the fifth section to discuss these constraints. The final section is a conclusion of this chapter. The chapter now focuses on the provision of toilet facilities to markets by the Lusaka City Council.

Provision of toilet facilities to markets

As already stated this section discusses what Lusaka City Council has done to ensure that markets are provided with toilet facilities. The section will also discuss the kind of toilet facilities found in Council run markets.

There are some markets run by the Lusaka City Council which have been provided with toilet facilities while others have not been provided with these facilities. An example of a market which has been provided with toilet facilities is Chelston market. At the time of this study, Chelston market had one (1) ablution block consisting of seven (7) toilets on each side. Thus in total, the market has fourteen toilets (14), two (2) shower rooms (i.e. two (2) of the fourteen toilets also served as shower rooms) and a further two (2) urinals in the male toilets. The toilets at this market are flushable and connected to Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company’s (LWSCs) main sewer line. This was also confirmed by results obtained from marketeers who were asked to state the type of toilets which the Council has provided to the market. All the marketeers (100%) interviewed said that the market has flushable toilets. Another example of a market managed by the Council which has been provided with toilet facilities is Kaunda Square stage 1 market. With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 market, it was observed by this researcher that the market has one (1) ablution block consisting of two (2) toilets for men and another two (2) for women. Marketeers were also asked to state the type of toilets which the Council has provided them with. Majority (98.0%) of those interviewed said that the Council has provided them with flushing toilets while 2.0% of those interviewed said that the market has been provided with a pit-latrine. However, this is one of Council run toilets which has no shower rooms. Most marketeers leave their homes early in
the morning and spend most of their time at markets. This therefore shows the importance of having shower rooms in markets as they assist marketeers to take showers. This is however not the case at Kaunda Square stage 1 market as the market has got no shower rooms.

As already shown above, though Kaunda Square stage 1 market has been provided with toilet facilities, these facilities are not in a good working condition as revealed in a report by Lusaka City Council on the status of markets ablution blocks and their financial position (2013). The report stated that the walls of the toilets were dirt, cisterns were broken, supply of water to the toilets was erratic due to leakages and the sewer lines were not working. However, this is one of the Council run markets where the Council has provided toilet facilities to the market but the facilities are not in good working condition. The 2013 report by Lusaka City Council on markets ablution blocks highlights a number of markets which have toilet facilities but these facilities are not in good working condition and among the markets mentioned in the report are the following: Chachacha, Luburma, Northmead, Libala, Buseko, Chilenje, Bwafwano, Sekelela, Tigwirizane, Railside, Mwamba Luchembe, Kaunda Square stage 1 and Matero. The report showed that the above listed market toilets have broken cisterns, taps were leaking, toilet rooms did not have doors, showers were not working as well as broken toilet pans. With regards to Northmead market, the report showed that the roof of the toilet was almost falling. On the other hand, Libala market had a total of ten (10) toilets but of these, only three (3) were working while the rest were not working. The report further showed that toilets at Buseko market were frequently blocked as they were not connected to the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company main sewer line. The report also revealed that toilets at Chibolya market were closed as most of the cisterns and toilet pans were stolen.

As stated above, there are some markets run by the Council which do not have toilet facilities and an example of such a market is Old Soweto market. According to the Market Master for Old Soweto market, “there is a concrete slab for an ablution block but the Council has not yet started building the toilets. Plans for construction of toilets and an office for the Market Master are there” (Interview with the market Master for Old Soweto market on 03/01/2014). Results obtained from marketeers at Old Soweto market showed that 71% of marketeers interviewed were of the view that the local authority has not provided them with toilet facilities, 25%
said that the kind of toilets which the Council had provided them with, is a pit latrine while 4% said that the Council had provided them with a flushing toilet. Chart 4.1 presents these findings and as can be noted in this chart, 25% of interviewed marketeers said that the market has been provided with pit latrines. It was revealed by the Chairperson for the Market Advisory Committee at Old Soweto market that, the pit latrines have been established by some bar owners and not the Council and that these are only used for urinating purposes. It was observed by this researcher that these pit-latrines were not supplied with water; they did not have soap for hand washing, no hand dryers and not even toilet tissues. Therefore, in the absence of toilets at Old Soweto market it was revealed by the Chairperson for Old Soweto market that marketeers use fee-paying toilets at either New Soweto or City markets. (Interview with the Chairperson for Old Soweto market on 02/01/2014). The Chairperson further noted that, street kids on the other hand have resorted to using opaque beer packs for defecation purposes. After defecating in these packs, they indiscriminately dump them. This indiscriminate dumping of excreta has had an effect on management of garbage as well as drainages at this market. For example, it was revealed by the Market Advisory Committee member for Old Soweto market that Council general workers seemed not to be willing to collect excreta in opaque beer packs which is indiscriminately dumped in drainages or market surroundings. Lack of toilets at Old Soweto market has an effect especially on marketeers who have to frequently close their stalls and walk all the way to either New Soweto or City market just to use toilet facilities. On the part of the local authority, collection of market levy has also been affected, because marketeers are of the view that there is no need for them to keep on paying market levy when they are not provided with a service.

Thus, it is easy to see that, in terms of providing toilet facilities to markets, it is clear that the Lusaka City Council has not done enough to ensure that marketeers are provided with decent toilet facilities. For example, out of 26 markets under the markets unit of Lusaka City Council, 14 markets have toilets which are not in good working condition (Lusaka City Council 2013 Annual Report). The study has shown that only Chelston and New Soweto markets respectively have toilet facilities which are in good working condition. The two markets were belt with assistance from the European Union and as such they have adequate toilets to cater for all market users. This is not the case with regards to some markets such as Kaunda square stage 1 and
Old Soweto which were belt by members of the public. Probably this contributed to poor planning of these markets and toilet facilities are lacking.

*Chart 4.1: Views of marketeers at Old Soweto market on the kind of toilets found at the market.*

(Source: Primary data)

Though the Council has not done enough to ensure that markets such as Old Soweto and Kaunda Square stage 1 are adequately provided with toilet facilities, it was noted that construction of toilets in Council run markets was one of the goals of the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council in its 2013 work plan. According to the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services, the Lusaka City Council had plans to construct toilets in all Council run markets in its 2013 work plan. In fact the Council official stated that the Council intended to partner with the private sector so that more toilets could be belt in Lusaka City Council run markets. According to the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council, in its 2013 work plan, the Council had set aside K1, 700,000.00 for construction of toilets in markets run by the Council. He further stated that markets which already had toilets were to be renovated (Interview with the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014).

To ensure that toilets in Council run markets are kept clean, the Council has employed general workers whose sole responsibility is to clean the toilets on regular basis. For example, two (2) general workers had been assigned to clean the toilets at Chelston market. It was also observed that the Council had employed personnel to be
in charge of cleaning the toilets at Kaunda Square stage 1 market just like it is the case in other markets run by the Council. In addition to the two (2) general workers stationed at Chelston market, a cashier had also been stationed by the toilet to collect toilet user fees. A toilet user was charged K1.00 per use. It was reported that the toilets were cleaned several times in a day and this was done to maintain high levels of cleanliness. The Market Chairperson for Chelston said that they ensured that ‘toilet staff kept them clean all times’. At the time of this study, it was also observed that the toilets were in a clean environment. Various kinds of materials were used to clean the toilets at Chelston market. These included among others: Squeezers, hard brooms, disinfectants, spirit of salt, mutton cloths, water, buckets, gloves and other chemicals (Interview with the Chairperson of Chelston market on 24/01/2014). With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 market, cleaning of the toilets was done once every day and the kind of cleaning materials used were as follows: soft blooms, toilet brushes, mutton clothes, spirit of salt / disinfectants and deo blocks as air fresheners.

Though some markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 have toilet facilities, it was noted that the number of toilets were not enough to cater for all market users. When the Munali Ward 33 Councillor was asked as to whether or not the number of toilets at Kaunda Square stage 1 market were enough, he stated that the number of toilets were far from being enough considering that the market population was growing (Interview with the Munali Ward 33 Councillor on 08/01/2014). The number of toilets at the market was far from being enough to cater for all market users as international standards require that there should be one (1) toilet for twenty (20) stalls (Minimum standards in Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion). Therefore, a market which has 300 functional shops as revealed in the markets register at Lusaka City Council needs eleven (11) more toilets if quality toilet services are to be provided. This inadequacy in toilets at this market was also noted by majority of sampled marketeers at the market as chart 4.2 shows. 82% of marketeers interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market said that the existing toilet facilities were not enough to cater for all market users while 18% were of the view that the existing toilet facilities were enough. Chart 4.2 presents these findings. Furthermore, the number of toilets at Kaunda Square stage 1 market was not only inadequate, but that the flushable toilets were also not properly functioning. For example, this researcher observed that though the market was supplied with water, there was no direct water supply to the cisterns in the toilets. What the Lusaka City
Council, through the Market Advisory Committee, has done is to put 220litre drums inside the ablution blocks. Thus, after using the toilets, toilet users were told to get water from the drums and pour it into the flushable toilets so that the excreta is flushed away. Probably, this is the more reason as to why 86% of the marketeers interviewed were of the view that the toilets were not being supplied with enough water while the remaining 14% felt that enough water was being supplied to the toilets.

*Chart 4.2: Views of Kaunda Square stage 1 marketeers on whether or not the existing number of toilets at the market is enough*

(Chart showing percentages: 82% agree, 18% disagree)

(Source: Primary data)

With regards to Chelston market it was revealed by the Chakunkhula Ward 33 Councillor that there were plans to construct more toilets at Chelston market. He further stated that the fourteen (14) toilets currently at the market were constructed under phase 1 of the market construction project. It was anticipated that, phase 2 of the project would see more toilets being constructed as revealed by the Chakunkhula Ward 33 Counsellor (Interview with the Councillor for Chakunkhula Ward 33 on 24/01/2014). Marketeers at Chelston market were also asked to state whether or not the toilets at the market were enough. Responses obtained from a sample of marketeers at this market showed that 59.6% of marketeers interviewed were of the view that the toilets at the market were sufficient while the remaining 40.4% said that the number of toilets at the market were not sufficient. These results are displayed in chart 4.3. As earlier mentioned, international standards dictate that the minimum number of toilets in a market should be one toilet to 20 stalls (Minimum standards in Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion). Therefore, Chelston
market which has about 300 functional stalls may need about fifteen (15) toilets to cater for all the stalls. Though the market has 14 toilets, results obtained from this market shows that to some extent, the international standards required for the minimum number of toilets per market stall have been met.

**Chart 4.3: Views of Chelston marketeers on whether or not the existing number of toilets at the market is enough**

(Chart showing the percentage of marketeers who believe the number of toilets is not enough vs. those who think it is enough.)

(Source: Primary Data)

It was observed that, though some Council run market toilets were supplied with water, it seemed like very little has been done to ensure that the toilets were stocked with soap for hand washing. This appeared to be the trend in most Council run markets as it looks like they were rarely stocked with soap despite being supplied with water. Markets which were closely examined in this study, such as Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1 can attest to this fact. For example, the Chairperson for Chelston Market Advisory Committee stated that the Council had not been providing market toilets with soap for hand washing and this was also echoed by the Chairperson for the Market Advisory Committee of Kaunda Square stage 1 market.

Marketeers at Chelston market were also asked to state whether or not the Council provided the market toilets with soap for hand washing. Most of marketeers (79%) interviewed at Chelston market said that the toilets did not have soap for hand washing while the remaining 21% said that soap for hand washing was provided. With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 market which is another market closely examined in this study, majority of marketeers (94%) interviewed at this market said that there was no soap for hand washing in the toilets while the remaining 6% said that there was soap for hand washing. While Chelston market had hand dryers in
both male and female toilets, as observed by this researcher, this was not the case at Kaunda Square stage 1 market where toilets did not have hand dryers. Results obtained from Chelston market showed that 83% of marketeers interviewed said that the market toilets had hand dryers while 17% said that the toilets did not have hand dryers. With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 results obtained from sampled marketeers showed that 92% of marketeers interviewed, were of the view that the toilets at the market did not have hand dryers while 8% said that the toilets had hand dryers.

It was also observed that the toilets at Kaunda Square stage 1 market had a wash basin for hand washing. However, this observation was in contrast with results obtained from the marketeers which showed that 94% of the marketeers interviewed were of the view that there were no wash basins at the toilets while 6% of marketeers interviewed said that the Lusaka City Council had provided the toilets with wash basins for hand washing. This contradiction seemed to be as a result of the fact that the wash basins seemed to be broken and that toilet users tended to use the tap installed outside the ablution block to wash their hands. On the other hand, this researcher observed that the toilets at Chelston market had wash basins which toilet users used to wash their hands after using the toilet. This observation is in agreement with the responses obtained from marketeers when asked as to whether or not the toilets had wash basins. Majority (80.9%) of marketeers interviewed at Chelston market said that the toilets had wash basins while 19.1% said that the toilets had no wash basins.

The Lusaka City Council has to some extent executed its mandate of ensuring that toilets in markets are provided with toilet tissue. Market Masters for Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1 respectively stated that the Council had ensured that toilets in these markets were provided with toilet tissue. At the time of this study, this research also observed that the toilets had toilet tissue. Marketeers were asked to state whether or not toilets in markets which were closely examined had toilet tissue. 85% of marketeers interviewed at Chelston market were of the view that the Lusaka City Council provided toilet tissue to the market toilets while 15% of marketeers interviewed said that the toilets were not provided with toilet tissue. Similarly, results obtained from Kaunda Square stage 1 showed that, 78% of marketeers interviewed at the market admitted that the Lusaka City Council had been providing toilet tissue while the remaining 22% said that the Lusaka City Council
had not been providing toilet tissue to the market toilets. Furthermore, though the Council through the Kaunda Square stage 1 Market Advisory Committee procures deo blocks to promote pleasing toilet environment as stated by the Market Master for this market, this study revealed that all marketeers (100%) interviewed at the market were of the view that the local authority had done nothing to promote pleasing environment in the toilets. Similar results were also obtained from Chelston market were most (76.6%) of marketeers interviewed said that the Council had done nothing to promote pleasing environment in the market toilets. The other 23.4% said that the Council had procured air fresheners to promote a pleasing environment in the toilets at the market.

The toilets at Chelston market were also provided with mechanisms for dislodging, transport and appropriate disposal in the event that there was need to empty them. They were in fact connected to the main sewer line for Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company.

**Supply of water to markets**

The previous section has shown that supply of water to markets is important as it helps in maintaining high levels of hygiene in markets including facilitating the flushing of toilets. In this section, focus is on the role of the Lusaka City Council in ensuring that markets are supplied with sufficient quantities of water. The Council has the responsibility of ensuring that water is supplied to markets and to do this, the Council has to work together with Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC). The Council can also sink boreholes in markets to supplement water supplied by Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company. Therefore, the Council in this regard takes the role of the consumer and it has to ensure that water is supplied to markets. It is for this reason that this section will establish the extent to which Lusaka City Council has ensured that water is supplied to markets.

As already mentioned, supply of water to markets especially to the toilets is very important if hygiene standards are to be improved. The Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council revealed to this researcher that most market toilets managed by the Lusaka City Council were supplied with water. It was noted that Chelston market was one such market being managed by the local authority in Lusaka which had water supplied directly to the toilets. 96% of marketeers interviewed at Chelston market also said that water was
directly supplied to the toilets. They also indicated that the market was being supplied with enough water. It was also observed that the Lusaka City Council had placed some drums in the toilets for water storage purposes. This was to ensure that even if water runs out, the toilets should not be affected. 2% of the marketeers interviewed at this market said that the toilets were not being supplied with enough water while the other 2% did not respond to the question which was asked.

It was further, revealed by the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services that Lusaka City Council has ensured that markets are supplied with sufficient quantities of water by setting up boreholes in some markets run by the Lusaka City Council to supplement water supplied by Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) (Interview with Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services on 15/01/2014). However, an attempt was made to determine whether or not marketeers in all the three (3) closely examined markets had easy access to tap water. The results obtained from Chelston market showed that all the marketeers (100%) interviewed said that the market was supplied with sufficient quantities of water. Results obtained from Kaunda Square stage 1 market which was another closely examined market in this study, were rather different from those of Chelston market. 70% of marketeers interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market said that they did not have easy access to tap water while 35% said that they had easy access to tap water. It was observed that Kaunda Square stage 1 market had only one (1) tap servicing the whole market. This tap was installed just outside the ablution block (See Appendix F, Photo number 18). With regards to Chelston market, the market had over forty (40) water points (taps) when it was constructed but of these, only ten (10) were working at the time of this study whilst the rest were no longer working as can be seen in Appendix F (Photo number 15).

Old Soweto market is one of the Council run markets which is not adequately supplied by water. The Harry Mwaanga Nkumbula Kanyama Ward 11 Councillor was asked on what he had done to ensure that his market is supplied with water and his response was that he had ensured that a bore hole was sunk at Old Soweto market. An attempt was made by this researcher to locate this bore hole but to no avail (Interview with the Councillor for Kanyama Ward 11 on 02/01/2014). The Councillor’s statement seemed to differ with the views of the Market Master for Old Soweto who said that the market had only one (1) tap servicing the whole market with over one thousand (1000) stalls (Interview with the Market Master for Old
Soweto on 03/01/2014). The Market Master for Old Soweto further said that the only existing tap at the market was not enough to cater for the market population. It is, therefore, not surprising that majority of marketeers from this market, that is 87% of those interviewed, said that they did not have access to tap water while 13% said that they had access to tap water. As stated by the Market Master, this researcher also observed that the market had only one (1) tap at the time of this study. This tap was the initiative of the Patriotic Front (PF) political party which had its party structures in the market. It is in this vein that the Chairperson of Old Soweto market was of the view that political parties should be allowed to have party structures in markets because they tend to be more organised compared to local authorities (Interview with the Chairperson for Old Soweto on 02/01/2014). However, this researcher observed that, the only tap at the market was not in a hygienic surrounding as it was installed inside the closed drainage system or stagnant water (See Appendix F, Photo number 4).

This study has revealed that each restaurant at Chelston market was supplied with running water. That is, inside each restaurant at the market, there was a tap and sink. Chelston market does not only depend on water supplied by Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC), but also depends on the borehole which has been sunk by the Lusaka City Council as revealed by the Market Master for Chelston market (Interview with Market Master for Chelston market on 23/01/2014). It also has a water tank of about 1,200 litres which acts as a reservoir when Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) is not supplying the market with water. On the other hand, it was noted that Kaunda Square stage 1 market did not even have a bore hole to supplement water supplied by the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC). On most occasions, the market did not have sufficient quantities of water for use by all marketeers and this was usually as result of water rationing by Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) as well as non-payment of water bills by Lusaka City Council to the water utility company. It was also revealed that, unlike other Council run markets such as Chelston market where each restaurant has a water tap, a sink and a wash basin, the situation was rather different at both Old Soweto and Kaunda Square stage 1 markets. Restaurants in these markets did not have the above named facilities and as a result of this restaurant owners had resorted to reusing the same water to clean plates with a view to cutting on water costs.
The Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services was asked to state whether or not water supplied to markets was safe to drink. He stated that water supplied to markets was safe to drink. Marketeers in all three (3) closely examined markets were asked to state whether or not water supplied to the markets is safe to drink. The study revealed that 70% of marketeers interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market were of the view that water supplied to the market was not safe to drink while the remaining 30% thought that the water was safe to drink. Probably the point where the only tap at this market had been installed gives an explanation as to why majority (70%) felt that water was not safe to drink. The tap has been installed just outside the toilet (See Appendix F, photo number 18). Results obtained from Old Soweto market were similar to those of Kaunda Square stage 1. 58.8% of marketeers interviewed from Old Soweto market said that water supplied to the market was not safe to drink while 34.5% said that water was safe to drink. The question was not applicable to 0.8% of marketeers interviewed while 5.9% did not respond to the question which was asked. However, it should be stated that these results contradict those of a study conducted by NWASCO (2010) which showed that, 94% of water samples collected in urban areas were in compliance with drinking water standards in 2010. Responses from Chelston market were very different from those of Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto with regards to whether water supplied to markets was safe to drink or not. Most (89.4%) of marketeers interviewed from Chelston market said that the water was safe to drink, 6.4% said that the water was not safe to drink while 4.3% did not give any response to the question which was asked.

It was also observed that marketeers working in markets which are not adequately supplied with water faced a lot of difficulties as is noted from the results collected from markets which were closely examined in this study. For example, the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 said that marketeers had to close their shops to look for water. Results obtained from the marketeers at Kaunda Square stage 1 also showed that 34% of those interviewed were of the view that they were inconvenienced due to frequent closure of the shops in search of the commodity. 28% of those interviewed at Kaunda Square stage 1 market said that sanitation standards at the market were poor owing to non-availability of water at the market. 16% of those interviewed said that they were not affected by the poor supply of water to the market; 12% did not give a response while the question was not
applicable to 10% of the sampled marketeers. Similar results were obtained from Old Soweto market where it was learnt that 29.4% of marketeers interviewed at the market were of the view that poor supply of water to the market inconvenienced them as they frequently had to close their shops to search for the commodity. 22.7% said that they had less profits since part of the money had to be used as payment for water. Some owners of restaurants said that they spent about K15 per day just to buy water and pay the street kids for bringing water from the nearby City market to Old Soweto market. 21% of marketeers interviewed said that poor water supply to the market had no effect on market users while 3.4% said that hygiene standards were poor due to the absence of water at the market. The question was not applicable to 21% of interviewed marketeers at Old Soweto market while 2.5% did not respond to the question which was asked. It is therefore clear that if water supply to a market is poor as has been the case in most Lusaka City Council run markets, there is an adverse effect not only on the business conducted by the marketeers but also on the buyers or other market users.

As already shown, Council run markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto, face water problems as they are not adequately supplied with water. A number of factors were identified as major causes to poor supply of water to markets. Among the problems identified are the following: The first factor was inadequate water taps. It was revealed by the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services that most markets in Lusaka have inadequate water taps and hence the poor supply of water to such markets (Interview with the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). Council staffs were also asked to state what they thought were the main problems leading to poor supply of water to markets. As shown in table 4.1, 10% of Council staffs interviewed at Lusaka City Council said that inadequate water taps in markets was a contributing factor. The argument is that most markets have inadequate water taps and this has resulted into a situation where marketeers have to queue up for the commodity. A market such as Kaunda Square stage 1 is a good example. The market was opened in 1976 but very little has been done to improve the existing water infrastructure. Even if sufficient quantity of water is available to meet minimum needs, additional measures are needed to ensure equitable access for all groups. Water taps should be located in areas that are accessible to all, regardless of, for example, gender or ethnicity.
The other identified factor deals with leakages on underground pipes. According to the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services Lusaka City Council, most infrastructure in Council run markets have not been rehabilitated for a very long time (Interview with the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). This concern was also echoed by the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council who also said that water pipes in most Council run markets have out lived their usefulness and hence the need to have them replaced (Interview with the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social services at Lusaka City Council on 17/01/2014). For example, it was noted that the underground water pipes in Kaunda Square stage 1 were laid a long time ago but very little has been done to replace them. Thus, a lot of water was being lost underground before reaching the taps as a result of these leakages. Table 4.1 also shows that 10% of Council staffs interviewed at Lusaka City Council also identified leakages on underground pipes as one of the causes leading to poor supply of water to markets. Furthermore, it should be stated that this is one of the biggest challenges faced by Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company in its quest to supply markets with sufficient quantity of water. According to G. Ndongwe (Water and sanitation Service delivery in Lusaka: Challenges and Future outlook: 2013), most of the water infrastructure in Lusaka City is over forty (40) years old and this has resulted into reduced supply of water due to underground water loss. Table 4.1 presents the views of Lusaka City Council support staffs on what they thought were the major problems leading to poor water supply to markets.

**Table 4.1: Views of LCC staff on problems leading to poor water supply to markets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate water points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakages on underground pipes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loadshedding by zesco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor council leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non applicable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: primary data)

As already stated, there are a number of problems leading to poor supply of water to markets and it is for this reason that this researcher attempted to establish
what the Council had done to ensure that markets are adequately supplied with water. According to the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council, the Council working together with Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company had installed more taps in markets with a view to ensuring that these markets are adequately supplied with water. On the other hand 33.3% of Council support staffs who were interviewed were of the view that the Council had done nothing at all. 13.3% said that the Council had engaged Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) to help find the solution to the problem of poor water supply to markets while the other 13.3% said that the Council had sunk boreholes in markets. 3.3% of Council support staffs said that the Council had bought thermo electrical machines or water booster pumps, another 3.3% said that the Council had installed new water taps in markets while 33.3% decide not to answer the question. Clearly these results are in contrast with views of the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social services who said that all the markets under Lusaka City Council are connected to Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company water lines.

The Munali Ward 33 Councillor was asked to state what he had done to ensure that Kaunda Square stage 1 market is adequately supplied with water. The Councillor stated that lack of funds had hindered the process of supplying water to Kaunda Square stage 1 market (Interview with the Councillor for Munali ward 33 on 08/01/2014). It was however, revealed by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 that the Lusaka City Council in conjunction with LWSC had embarked on a project to improve water reticulation system in Kaunda Square including the market. At the time of this study, LWSC employees were found laying water pipes outside the western part of the market. Though this is the case, majority (88%) of marketeers interviewed felt that the Lusaka City Council had not done anything to ensure that supply of water to the market is improved. 4% of marketeers interviewed said that the Lusaka City Council had sunk a borehole and installed new taps while 8% of marketeers remained silent. These results are shown in chart 4.4. it should be stated that the market has got no borehole as it relies on water supplied by Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) and it is for this reason that supply of water to this market has been intermittent hence the need for a bore to be sunk if the water problem is to be resolved.
The Councillor for Harry Mwaanga Nkumbula Kanyama Ward 11 was also asked to state what he had done to ensure that water is supplied to Old Soweto market. The Councillor stated that there were no immediate plans to have the market connected to Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) main water lines. This was in spite quotations having been collected from LWSC by Market Advisory Committee members (for Old Soweto market) to have the market connected to the main water supply of LWSC as revealed by the Market Master for Old Soweto market (Interview with the Market Master for Old Soweto market on 03/01/2014). On the other hand, marketeers at Old Soweto market also gave their views on what they thought Lusaka City Council had done to ensure that the market was supplied with water. It appeared like very little had been done by the Lusaka City Council to ensure that markets such as Old Soweto are supplied with sufficient quantities of water. Results obtained from marketeers at this (Old Soweto) market, showed that majority of marketeers interviewed (96.6%) were of the view that the Lusaka City Council has done nothing to ensure that the market is supplied with water. Most likely, this was as a result of the fact that, the only existing water tap at the market was an initiative of the Patriotic Front (PF) branch committee (ruling party) which has party structures in the market. Furthermore, it should be stated that the water tap was only two (2) weeks old at the time of this study, hence, majority of marketeers were not even aware of its existence. Chart 4.5 also shows that 3.4% of the
marketeers interviewed at Old Soweto market did not answer the question which was asked.

Chart 4.5: Views of Old Soweto marketeers on what the Lusaka City Council has done to ensure that supply of water to the market is improved

(Source: Primary data)

As already stated, the Lusaka City Council has ensured that water is supplied to Chelston market which is also under its jurisdictions and this was done through sinking of a bore hole at the market as revealed by the Market Master for Chelston. The Councillor for Chakunkhula Ward 33 also said that the Council had sunk a bore hole at the market. Chart 4.6 shows that majority 92% of marketeers interviewed at Chelston market said that, to ensure improvement in the supply of water to the market the Lusaka City Council sunk a borehole and installed new taps. 2% of marketeers interviewed at this market said that the local authority has done nothing while 6% did not respond to the question. It is therefore evident from these results that the Lusaka City Council has ensured that the market is adequately supplied with water despite many constraints which it is facing. Thus, even though there are times when Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) rations water supply to Chelston market, this is not really a problem as the market has a water reservoir. In addition to this, the Market Master for Chelston market said that the Market Advisory Committee at Chelston market have used 220litre containers for water storage purposes in case there was no water supply by LWSC or may be the water pump has stopped functioning (Interview with the Market Master for Chelston market on 23/01/2014).
Drainage management in markets

The previous sections in this chapter have shown that for markets to function properly, they should have toilets and be supplied with adequate water. Waste water in a market has to be drained out as failure to do so may result in disease outbreaks from the markets. This, therefore, requires a good drainage system in a market. Most drainage systems in markets run by the Lusaka City Council are in a deplorable state except for a few markets such as Chelston market where the inner drainage system is in a good condition but the outer drainage system is in a deplorable state. Thus, in this section focus is on the management of drainages in markets managed by Lusaka City Council.

Management of market drainages is the responsibility of the markets unit which falls under the Department of Housing and Social Services. The unit works hand-in-hand with the Department of Engineering Services to ensure that drainages are properly managed in markets. According to the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services, the Council has a deliberate programme on maintenance of the drainage system in markets (Interview with the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). The Lusaka City Council uses the general workers stationed in the markets to clean up the drainage system before and after the rain season. For example, the eleven (11) general workers stationed at Old Soweto market have been...
used to clean up the drainage system. The Senior Administrative Officer of the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council also stated that the Council has a regular maintenance programme on drainages in markets and that unblocking of existing drainages in markets is usually done before and after the rain season. This was confirmed by the results obtained from Lusaka City Council support staffs who were asked to state if Lusaka City Council had a regular maintenance programme on drainages in markets. It was observed that of the 30 Lusaka City Council support staffs who were part of the study, 26 (86.7%) said that the Council does have a programme on drainage management in markets. Only 4 (13.3%) said that there is no program on drainage maintenance in markets. A summary of their responses is shown in chart 4.7.

**Chart 4.7: Views of support staff at Lusaka City Council on whether or not there is a programme on drainage management in markets at Lusaka City Council**

![Chart](image)

(Source: Primary data)

The Senior Administrative Officer of the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council also stated that all markets which are in the Central Business District have drainages, but only those which are in the peri-urban areas have the problem of drainages. These markets include among others the following: Kaunda Square stage 1, Buseko, Bwafwano, Sekelela, Tigwirizane, Rail Side, Mwamba Luchembe, Chibolya just to mention a few (Interview with the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 17/01/2014). Though this is the case, it should be stated that, the quality of market drainages in these markets as observed by this researcher is poor. Most markets which are run by the Lusaka City Council do not have properly constructed drainages. This researcher also noted that in some markets such as Old
Soweto, the drainages were not only poorly constructed but they were also blocked and did not even have an outlet. In other markets like Kaunda Square stage 1, it was observed that the drainage system was earth excavated and it was therefore, difficult for Council staff to maintain it. Thus, though it was reported by the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services that Council run markets have drainages, it is also important to consider the nature of drainages in these markets and whether they (drainages) are able to allow waste water to freely leave the market.

As already established the Council has a programme on drainage maintenance and as revealed by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1, the programme usually starts before and after the rain season. This researcher also asked marketeers from Kaunda Square stage 1, Chelston and Old Soweto to give their views on whether or not the Lusaka City Council regularly maintains market drainages. Marketeers from the above mentioned markets expressed different views when asked as to whether or not they were aware that the Lusaka City Council regularly maintains market drainages. Of the 216 marketeers interviewed, 113 (52%) said that the Council regularly maintained drainages in Lusaka markets while 103 (48%) said that there is no regular maintenance on market drainages. It is therefore clear, from these results that these marketeers seemed to have been divided on this issue. These results are displayed in chart 4.8.

**Chart 4.8: Awareness of marketeers on drainage maintenance in markets.**

![Chart 4.8: Awareness of marketeers on drainage maintenance in markets.](image)

(Source: Primary data)

However, though data collected from all marketeers showed that marketeers in Lusaka expressed different views on the existence of a market drainage
maintenance programme at Lusaka City Council, it should be stated that if a comparison is to be drawn among the markets which are under Lusaka City Council, it is clear that some market drainages are better managed as in the case of Chelston market while others are poorly managed as in the case of Old Soweto, Chibolya, Buseko and Kaunda Square stage 1 to mention a few.

With regards to Chelston market, this researcher observed that the drainage system inside Chelston market was stone patched and covered with drainage covers. The Market Master for Chelston also said that the market has a good inner drainage system and attributed this to the European Union who were the major funders of the construction project. She also stated that, it has not been difficult to regularly maintain the drainage system at the market owing to the good state in which it is. It is for this reason that of the 47 marketeers interviewed at this market, 34 (72.3%) were of the view that the Council regularly maintained drainages in markets while 13 (27.7%) of sampled marketeers at this market said that there was no regular maintenance of the drainage system at the market. However, this researcher observed that though Chelston market had a well maintained inner drainage system, the market was surrounded by an earth dug drainage system which was situated on the northern part of the market. This simply means that, the walls of this drainage system were not belt with concrete or stones. Such a drainage system is very difficult to manage and this is a problem which the Market Advisory Committee of Chelston market needs to deal with. According to the Chairperson of the Market Advisory Committee at Chelston market, the main drainage (i.e. the one surrounding the market) is ‘cleaned after many years and this contributes to blockage of the inner drainage system (i.e. the one inside the market)’ (Interview with Chairperson for Chelston on 24/01/2014). This concern was also raised by the Vice Chairperson of Chelston market who said that though, the market has an appropriate inner drainage system, very little has been done to effectively manage the system (Interview with the Vice chairperson for Chelston market on 23/01/2014). The Vice Chairperson further said that when the market was being constructed, market users threw garbage into the drainage system. This garbage was not removed when the drainages were being covered. On the other hand, despite the existence of drainages at the market, marketeers at Chelston market seemed to be divided on whether or not the market was well drained. 40.4% of marketeers interviewed at Chelston market said that the market was well drained while 59.6% said that the market was not well drained.
Councillor for Chakunkhula Ward 33 was asked to state what he has done to ensure that the earth excavated drainage system which was outside the market was improved on. The Councillor said that, there were plans to have the road outside or surrounding the market tarred and not until when this is done, would a concrete drainage system outside the market be constructed (Interview with the Councillor for Chakunkhula Ward 33 was on 24/01/2014).

Though some markets in the City of Lusaka (e.g. Chelston market) have better drainages especially inside the market, there are still some markets run by the Lusaka City Council which have poor drainage systems both inside and outside the market. Examples of such markets which were closely examined in this study are Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto. With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 market, apart from personal observation, it was revealed by the Market Master for this market that the market has got no drainage system inside the market and as such water from the only existing tap at the market does not freely leave the market as there is no drainage system to drain it. Marketeers at this market were divided on the subject of whether or not the Lusaka City Council regularly maintain the drainage system in the market and this is despite the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 stating that the Council regularly maintains drainages at the market. 27 (54%) of the 50 marketeers interviewed said that the Council did not regularly maintain drainages in the market while 23 (46%) said that the Lusaka City Council did regularly maintain drainages at the market. However, this researcher observed that the only drainage system existing at Kaunda Square stage 1 market lies on the western side of the market and drains into another drainage on the northern part of the market. This drainage is earth excavated and has proved to be difficult to manage as pointed out by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 market. Thus, the market is not wholly surrounded by the drainage system. Though this is the case, the market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 said that general workers had been assigned to regularly manage the drainage system in his market. On the other hand, marketeers at this market were of the view that the market was not well drained as seen from the responses which they gave when asked to give their opinion on whether or not the market was well drained. Majority (86.0%) said that the market was not well drained while 14.0% said that the market was well drained. Arising from these results, it can therefore be stated that the drainage system at Kaunda Square stage 1 market is in a poor state. The Councillor for Munali Ward 33 was
asked to state what he has done to ensure that the drainage system in his market was improved. His response was that he had used part of the ward fund to construct the existing drainage system surrounding the market. He also mentioned that there were plans of demolishing the existing market structures and constructing a modern market which will have a stone patched drainage system (Interview with the Munali ward 33 Councillor on 08/01/2014).

Another market which was closely examined by this researcher in this study is Old Soweto. Both the Market Master and the Chairperson for Old Soweto confirmed that there was regular maintenance of the only poorly constructed drainage system surrounding the market. However, results obtained from marketeers at Old Soweto market showed that of the 119 marketeers who were sampled, 63 (53%) said that there was no regular maintenance of drainages at Old Soweto market while 56 (47%) said that the Lusaka City Council regularly maintained drainages at the market. As can be seen from these results, marketeers at Old Soweto market were divided on this subject and probably this is as a result of the fact that the market does not have a properly constructed drainage system. Thus, like Kaunda Square stage 1 market, Old Soweto market does not have a drainage system inside it. What marketeers at this market have done is to make monetary contributions which they use to buy cement and sand with a view to constructing simple concrete drainages in each of the market streets. It was revealed by the Chairperson for Old Soweto market that this was an initiative of marketeers at the market and not that of the Lusaka City Council. The implication of this is that, stand owners who fail to contribute have had their streets not patched with concrete. It should be stated that these drainages which marketeers have constructed are very shallow such that it was even difficult for easy flowing of waste water especially during the rainy season and this has resulted in water flowing into the shops. This researcher also observed that, the main drainage system surrounding Old Soweto market had no outlet and thus, could not allow waste water to leave the market. The results have been that, waste water has been static. In addition to this, the poor drainage system has had a direct effect on marketeers because the passage to the market is usually covered with water. It is for this reason that 82.4% of marketeers interviewed at Old Soweto said that the market is not well drained to prevent muddy conditions while 17.6% said that the market is well drained to prevent muddy conditions.
As already established, the drainage system in most peri-urban markets managed by the Council is in a poor state. Of the three (3) markets which were closely examined in this study, this researcher observed that, Old Soweto and Kaunda Square stage 1 markets have got no drainage system inside the market while the existing drainage system surrounding Old Soweto had no outlet. In other words the existing drainage system at Old Soweto market is not serving the objective for which it was constructed. The situation was similar at Kaunda Square stage 1 which also did not have an inner drainage system but an earth excavated outer drainage system.

**Constraints faced by the Council in managing drainages, toilet facilities and supplying water to markets**

Having discussed how the Lusaka City Council has been managing drainages, toilets and ensuring that water is provided to markets, this section will now focus on the constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council in its quest to effectively manage markets. There are a number of constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council. Among others are the following:

Vandalism of ablution blocks and water taps in markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 and Chelston was spotted as the major problem in so far as provision of toilet facilities and supply of water to markets is concerned. This is the concern raised by the Councillor for Munali Ward 33 and some of the Council appointed officials (i.e. Market Masters for the markets). According to the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance at Lusaka City Council, rehabilitated ablution blocks are usually vandalised in a space of two (2) or three (3) weeks (Interview with the Assistant Manager-Finance at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). Poor supply of water to markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 has also been attributed to vandalism of most water infrastructure. In the case of Chelston market, though currently the market is adequately supplied with water, the Market Master stated that most of the water infrastructure at the market has been vandalised. The market had over forty (40) water taps when it was belt, but this is not the case as of today. Most of the water taps have been vandalised by members of public and if this trend continues it might result in a situation where the market will be poorly supplied with water.

Poor revenue collection from markets has also hindered the provision of quality toilet services to these markets. It was for this reason that the Deputy
Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services said that one of the objective of the Council with regards to the management of markets was to improve revenue collection in the markets which are under the jurisdiction of the Council (Interview with the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 15/01/2014). To achieve this objective; unoccupied stands were being repossessed and relocated to new owners, the revenue collection system was being computerised whilst shops were being physically numbered. It was further revealed by the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services that K125, 000.00 was spent on this process. The Councils Annual Report (2013) also showed that 456 defaulters from all markets under the Council were identified. These are marketeers who have not been paying levy to Council. The report further showed that a total of 4,250 stands/shops were physically numbered. It was further revealed that some markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto are self-belt and have dilapidated infrastructure thereby making it difficult to know the exact number of shops which are under the jurisdiction of the Council (Lusaka City Council Annual Report:2013). On the other hand, it should be noted that revenue collection has been poor probably due to Lusaka City Councils failure to construct proper toilets in markets. Thus, this has resulted in marketeer’s reluctance to pay for the services which are being rendered as they do not see the need to make such payments.

As already indicated, poor revenue collection in markets has had a negative effect on the Councils capacity to deliver services to markets. This has also resulted in delays in procurement of cleaning materials as revealed by the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance at the Markets Unit of the Council.

Infrastructural constraints were also identified as major factors restraining the Council from providing quality services to markets. According to G. Ndongwe (Water and sanitation service delivery in Lusaka: Challenges and Future outlook: 2013), most of the water infrastructure in Lusaka City is over forty (40) years old and this has resulted into reduced supply of water due to underground water loss. The problem of dilapidated infrastructure has also been echoed by F. Banda (2010:45), who argues that “all the commercial utilities in Zambia have failed to reduce unaccounted for water. The reason for this is that, the water infrastructure for most utilities is dilapidated.” It is estimated that 55% of Lusaka’s water is unaccounted for and it is for this reason that LWSC loses daily revenue of US$ 45,
000 (F. Banda: 2010). The problem has been exacerbated by limited investment into the sector. With regards to Old Soweto market, the Market Master revealed that when the market was established, water pipes were installed but they have not been replaced and it’s even difficult to establish where these pipes are laid.

The infrastructure in most markets run by the Council especially in peri-urban markets such as Kaunda Square stage 1, Chifundo, Bwafwano, Sekelela, Chibolya, Tigwirizane to mention but a few is dilapidated. This researcher observed that of the three closely examined markets (i.e. Old Soweto, Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1), only Chelston market had a modern structure whilst the other two did not even have a provision for constructing an inner drainage system and hence these markets did not even have inner drainage systems. However, it should be noted that, Chelston market was constructed with assistance from the European Union and hence the market has a modern structure. According to the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services, the unplanned state of most markets within the City of Lusaka has had a negative effect on the management of drainage systems (Interview with the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council on 17/01/2014). Some markets of Lusaka such as Old Soweto are poorly planned and it has been very difficult for the Council to construct drainages in such markets. The responses obtained from Lusaka City Council support staffs on what they thought were the major constraint(s) in improving the drainage system also showed that 10% of Council support staffs sampled were of the view that the major problem was as a result of the unplanned market structure while only 8% attributed the problem to inadequate tools. 50% of Lusaka City Council support staffs who were interviewed were of the view that indiscriminate disposal of garbage was the major problem to improving the drainage system in the markets. 13% of those interviewed attributed the problem to poor funding by the government while 20% remained silent.

Another constraint to improving the drainage system in markets has to do with street vending. According to the Senior Civil Engineer (Interview with the Senior Engineer at Lusaka City Council on 27/01/2014), street vending was another problem identified as an impediment to improving the drainage system in markets of Lusaka. Street vendors do not choose where to sale their merchandise from. For example, this study revealed that at Old Soweto market, street vendors have been selling on top of the outer drainage system surrounding the market. Some have even
belt on top of the drainage system and this has been a challenge on the part of the Council who have to regularly maintain the drainages. Similar observations were made at Kaunda Square stage 1 market where street vendors were trading near the earth dug drainage system. It is therefore easy to understand why there have been blockages of market drainages because garbage is easily thrown into the drainage system.

Bureaucratic procedures at Lusaka City Council were also identified as the major problem in improving the drainage system in markets. For example, the Chairperson for Chelston market noted that, “unless if the market had its own fund (Market Advisory Committee fund), it would have been easy to maintain the drainages but the problem has been that you have to apply to Council for them to come and unblock the drainages” (Interview with the Chairperson for Chelston market on 24/01/2014). The market Chairperson further said that they as Market Advisory Committee have never seen how the 60% allocation from the collected market levy, which is supposed to be retained by the Market Advisory Committee for market development has been utilised. The concern that the Lusaka City Council takes a lot of time to respond to job requests was also echoed by the Market Master for Chelston and the market Chairperson for Kaunda Square stage 1 who were of the view that the local authority seemed not to respond quickly to this important cause.

Lack of adequate manpower was identified by marketeers as one of the constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council as it tries to manage drainage systems in markets. However, the statement that the Council does not have enough general workers to manage drainage systems in the markets was dismissed by the Senior Administrative Officer of the Department of Housing and Social Services who said that the Council had employed enough general workers to manage drainage systems in markets (Interview with the Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services on 17/01/2014). The Senior Administrative Officer for the Department of Housing and Social Services also stated that the Council has employed enough general workers and cashiers to execute Council duties in markets as shown in table 4.2. The table shows that the positions of cashiers, market levy collectors and general workers were all filled at the time of this study. With regards to general workers the Council had employed 20 more general workers than the required number. It can therefore, be stated that, the issue of lack of adequate
manpower has not really been a factor in so far as drainage maintenance is concerned in markets.

**Table 4.2: Staff establishment for the Markets section at Lusaka City Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Markets Unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Markets Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Administration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Markets Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Finance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Master</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Cashier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Levy Collector</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Workers</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Lusaka City Council Annual Report: 2013)

**Conclusion**

The extent to which Lusaka City Council provides toilet facilities to Council run markets is questionable. This study has revealed that there are two sides to this story. Either the Council is providing these facilities to markets as is the case with Chelston and Kaunda Square stage 1 markets, or the Council is not providing these facilities as was observed at Old Soweto market. Furthermore, it was noted that in markets where these facilities were being provided, for example Kaunda Square stage 1, the quality of services were not only poor, but the toilets were not enough to cater for all market users and there was no direct supply of water to the toilets (See Appendix F: Photo 19). The case of Chelston market is unique because of the nature of the market. Unlike Kaunda Square stage 1, Old Soweto and other markets in Lusaka which are self-belt, Chelston market is a modern market belt with financial assistance from the European Union. Thus, the market has adequate toilet facilities to
carter for all market users. Despite this fact, the quality of toilet facilities at this market is gradually deteriorating. Some toilets at this market do not even have toilet covers as they have been broken and Council has not replaced them (See Appendix F: Photo 12). Similar observations were made in the shower rooms at the market where certain parts were not effectively functioning. Furthermore, one of the hand dryers in the toilets was also defective (See Appendix F: photo 10 and 13). Therefore, it can be stated that despite the existence of a modern market furnished with flushing toilets which can easily be managed, the Council has had difficulties managing toilets at Chelston market. There is need on the part of the Council to carry out periodic maintenance works on toilets with a view to maintaining sanitary conditions in markets.

With regards to water supply to markets, this study has revealed that of the three closely examined markets, Chelston market is the only market being supplied with sufficient quantities of water and probably this is because the market is a modern one. Though this is the case, out of forty (40) water taps installed when the market was constructed, only less than ten (10) are working and this can be attributed to poor management of the market as broken water taps are not being replaced (See Appendix F: Photo 15). This study has established that, the Lusaka City Council has not done enough to ensure that water is supplied to markets like Kaunda Square stage 1, Old Soweto and other peri-urban markets. This is evidenced by the few water points in these markets. In fact each of these markets (i.e. Old Soweto and Kaunda Square stage 1) has one (1) water tap which is not enough to carter for all market users. Thus, as a way of summarising, it can be stated that the Lusaka City Council has not done enough to ensure that Council run markets are supplied with enough water.

This chapter has also shown that of the three, markets which were part of this study, only Chelston market had an inner market drainage system which was properly constructed, concrete patched and covered with drainage covers. The drainage surrounding the market is however earth excavated thus making the flow of water very difficult. What this entails is that though the market has a properly constructed drainage system inside it, it is very difficult for water to leave the market as a result of the poor drainage system. Furthermore, it was observed that the inner drainage system despite being properly constructed was blocked (See Appendix F: Photo 6, 7 and 8). With regards to Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto markets
respectively, the study has revealed that the drainage system in these markets is also very poor. Kaunda Square stage 1 has an earth excavated drainage system outside the market while the drainage system covering Old Soweto market is closed and hence defeating the purpose of a drainage system.
CHAPTER FIVE
MANAGEMENT OF FIRE OUTBREAKS IN MARKETS

Introduction
This chapter mainly focuses on how the Lusaka City Council has been managing fire outbreaks in markets of Lusaka. It also shows the types of fire equipment possessed by the Lusaka Fire Brigade which is a unit under the Engineering Department of Lusaka City Council. The chapter also presents the views of marketeers from the markets on how the Lusaka Fire Brigade has executed its mandate of managing fire outbreaks in markets of Lusaka. Constraints faced by Lusaka City Council when managing fire outbreaks in markets is also discussed in this chapter.

Management of fire outbreaks in markets
Management of fire outbreaks in markets is the responsibility of the Lusaka Fire Brigade which is a unit under the Lusaka City Council. This unit works together with the Department of Housing and Social Services of Lusaka City Council to manage fire outbreaks in markets.

In its 2013 work plan, the Department of Housing and Social Services at Lusaka City Council set aside K50,000.00 to enable it effectively prevent fire outbreaks in Lusaka City Council run markets by conducting drills trainings in markets as well as procurement of fire extinguishers for markets. It was, however, revealed by the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing Social Services that, the drills training as well as the procurement of fire extinguishers had not been done at the time of this study. In addition to the fire drills training, the Lusaka City Council working together with Market Advisory Committees has issued a directive to all marketeers not to sleep and cook from markets. Restaurant owners have been allowed to continue with their businesses but they have been cautioned not to leave fire on the braziers during the evenings when they knock off.

Despite taking the above measures, a number of fire outbreaks have been reported at Lusaka Fire Brigade. For example the 2013 Annual report of Lusaka fire Brigade showed that, out of 483 fire occurrences in the City of Lusaka, a total of 42 fire incidences took place in various markets of the City of Lusaka. Among the markets affected by fire outbreaks in the City of Lusaka in 2013 include among others the following: Old Soweto, Matero, Chifundo, Buseko, Sekerera, Kulima Tower, Kazimai, City market, Mtendere, Kalingalinga, Kabwata to mention but a
few (Lusaka Fire Brigade, Annual Report:2013). Thus, it is evident that, there are some markets in Lusaka which have experienced fire outbreaks and a very good example of such a market, which was closely examined in this study is Old Soweto. The Market Master for Old Soweto said that there was a fire outbreak at the market on 6th September 2013, where all the shops in the Chicken sales section of the market were burnt to ashes and that she personally called Lusaka Fire Brigade to come and quench the fire. As shown in chart 5.1, most of the interviewed marketeers (89.1%) from Old Soweto said that there have been fire outbreaks at Old Soweto market. 10.1% of the marketeers interviewed at this market said that there have been no fire outbreaks while 0.8% decided to remain silent.

**Chart 5.1: Responses from marketeers at Old Soweto on whether or not there has been a fire outbreak at the market.**
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(Source: Primary data)

According to a MUVI Television report, ‘the fire outbreak at Old Soweto was said to have been caused by a candle left in one of the shops that later spread to more than two hundred stalls. Traders who went to the market were met with remains of their thousands of kwacha worth of chickens. Fire fighters had a tough time extinguishing the fire that started around 22:00 hours and were only assisted by Zambia Air Force officers’ (http://www.muvitv.com/thousands-of-live-chickens-burnt-to-ashes-at-lusakas-soweto-market/. Website visited on Tuesday 15th April 2014). On 1st April 2014, there was another fire outbreak at Old Soweto market which destroyed goods worth millions of Kwacha. According to a report given by MUVI Television, the fire was believed to have been caused by blazing charcoal brazier (http://www.trulyzambian.com/news/fire-sweeps-through-lusakas-old-soweto-market-18395. Website visited on 15th April 2014). It was further reported
that markets such as Old Soweto, Buseko as well as Chisokone had become prone to fire outbreaks and that in many instance fire fighters have failed to put out the fire as water usually runs out from the tankers, leaving firefighters watching the inferno helplessly until it reduces the burning property to ashes (Times of Zambia, 8th July 2014). It is as result of these fire outbreaks that prompted the Market Advisory Committee at Old Soweto market to embark on a project of constructing concrete block-made structures as opposed to makeshift stalls as a preventive measure for fire outbreaks.

It was however revealed by the Deputy Chief Fire Officer at Lusaka Fire Brigade unit of Lusaka City Council that some markets in Lusaka have been constructed using fire resistant materials like concrete blocks and this has helped to prevent fire outbreaks in these markets (Interview with the Deputy Chief Fire Officer for Lusaka Fire Brigade on 31/01/2014). The Fire Chief cited Chelston market as a case in point. It was also revealed by the Market Master for Kaunda Square stage 1 that the market had not experienced fire outbreaks in the last seven years he had been in office (i.e. to say that, the Market Master for Kaunda square stage 1 had been in office for seven years at the time of this study). It is for this reason that marketeers at Kaunda Square stage 1 market were asked to state whether or not there had been a fire outbreak from the market. Results obtained from Kaunda Square stage 1 market showed that of the 50 marketeers interviewed at the market, 84% said that the market had not experienced fire outbreaks while only 12% said that there had been a fire outbreak at the market. 4% of marketeers interviewed at this market did not respond to the question asked. Chart 5.2 represents these results.

*Chart 5.2: Responses from marketeers at Kaunda Square stage 1 on whether or not there has been a fire outbreak at the market.*
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With regards to Chelston market, the Market Master for this market stated that the market had not experienced any fire outbreak for the past five years. Results obtained at Chelston market showed that 97.9% of marketeers interviewed, said there have been no fire outbreak at the market and 2.1% decided not to respond to the question which was asked. These results are shown in chart 5.3.

*Chart 5.3: Responses from marketeers at Chelston on whether or not there has been a fire outbreak at the market.*

(Source: Primary data)

It was also observed that, although the Lusaka City Council has offices in markets, most of these offices are not stocked with fire fighting facilities such as fire extinguishers. With the exception of Chelston market, which has fire hydrants and a modern structure which can allow fire tenders to have access to each shop in the market, most of the markets in Lusaka do not have fire fighting facilities. As stated in the 2013 work plan for the Department of Housing and Social Services, one of the objectives in the plan had to do with procurement of fire extinguishers which were to be placed in the markets but this had not been done at the time of this study. The Deputy Director for Housing and Social services at Lusaka City Council also said that another objective in the 2013 work plan was to train marketeers and the General workers employed by Lusaka City Council on how best to use fire extinguishers in case there is a fire outbreak at the market. This had not been done at the time of this study.

Failure to have fire extinguishers in markets has resulted in a situation where marketeers use other means to save market property in case of a fire outbreak. For example, when there was a fire outbreak in September 2013 at Old Soweto market, it was revealed by 21% of marketeers interviewed at Old Soweto that they used
buckets of water and sand to extinguish the fire, 64% of marketeers interviewed said that the Lusaka Fire Brigade came to put out the fire. Though this is the case, these marketeers (64%), complained that the Fire Brigade came to the fire seen without water and thus failed to extinguish the fire, the question was not applicable to 9% of marketeers interviewed while 6% decided not to give an answer.

It should be stated that the Council does not only have firefighting equipment in markets but that the Fire Brigade unit of the Council also does not have enough firefighting equipment to quench fire outbreaks in markets. According to the Times of Zambia dated 8th July 2013, ‘the equipment which fire brigades have is not even sufficient enough to cool off the smoke from a raging inferno, even if firefighters drive there. For this reason, much of the fire which starts slowly rapidly spreads and starts other fires’. It was also noted by the then Deputy Minister in the Office of the Vice-President (Mr. Harry Kalaba) that the Fire Brigade unit in Lusaka in most cases fail to respond promptly to calamities such as infernos because of inadequate preparations on their part, that is to say that the Fire Brigade tends to start getting organized for a fire outbreak once called upon by members of the community. (http://www.lusakatimes.com/deputy-minister-office-vice-president-urges-fire-department-proactive/. Website visited on 14th April 2014)

On the contrary, this study has established that fire tenders at the Lusaka Fire Brigade are always ready for fire outbreaks. According to the Deputy Chief Fire Officer, fire tenders are always loaded with water because it is not known when fire would break out in a market. “When the fire tenders at the fire scene run out of water, they leave the fire scene to go and look for water somewhere else since these markets don’t have fire hydrants” said the Deputy Chief Fire Officer at Lusaka Fire Brigade unit of Lusaka City Council.

This study has also established that non-adherence to fire safety instructions by marketeers was another cause leading to fire outbreaks in markets. It was revealed by the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services that most marketeers have not adhered to fire safety instructions such as not leaving blazing charcoal braziers in the market when knocking off and not to sleep and cook from the markets especially at night. This has resulted in fire outbreaks in most markets run by the Lusaka City Council such as Old Soweto where there was a fire outbreak on the 1st April 2014 and the fire outbreak is believed to have been caused by a blazing charcoal brazier which was left in the market. This fire outbreak at Old
Soweto started in the evenings as reported by MUVI Television and probably the fire outbreak could have been started by marketeers sleeping in the market as they cooked their meals or it could have started as a result of a brazier which had fire on it (http://www.trulyzambian.com/news/fire-sweeps-through-lusakas-old-soweto-market-18395. Website visited on 15th April 2014). Marketeers in markets have also been instructed to construct concrete brick-made stalls as opposed to make-shift stalls. On the contrary marketeers have not adhered to this and they have continued erecting make-shift stalls and sleeping in markets thereby defying the laid down procedures for fire prevention. It was also observed that marketeers do not have fire extinguishers in their shops though this is a requirement for obtaining business license.

**Satisfaction levels of marketeers**

This section discusses the satisfactory levels of marketeers in all the three closely examined markets which are managed by Lusaka City Council.

When the Deputy Fire Chief at Lusaka Fire Brigade was asked to state his satisfactory levels with regards to management of fire outbreaks in markets, he said that his unit had done well in so far as management of fires is concerned. It is for this reason that marketeers in all the three closely examined markets in this study were asked to state their satisfactory levels with regards to Lusaka Fire Brigades ability to put off fire outbreaks from markets. Results obtained are shown in chart 5.4 below.

*Chart 5.4: Satisfaction levels of all interviewed marketeers with regards to the performance of Lusaka Fire Brigade in managing fire outbreaks in markets*
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(Source: Primary Data)
As illustrated in chart 5.4, most of the marketeers (49.1%) interviewed were dissatisfied with the performance of the Lusaka City Council when it comes to the way the Council managed fire outbreaks in markets. This study has shown that 42.2% of marketeers interviewed were satisfied with the way the Lusaka City Council managed fire outbreaks in markets. 8.8% of marketeers interviewed in this study did not state their satisfactory levels with regards to the performance of the Lusaka City Council in the area of managing fire outbreaks in markets.

Though most marketeers in Lusaka were dissatisfied with the performance of Lusaka City Council in so far as management of fire outbreaks is concerned, it should be noted that a close examination of the individual markets showed that, most marketeers who were dissatisfied with the performance of Lusaka City Council are those from Old Soweto and Kaunda Square stage 1 market. It was revealed by the Market Master for Old Soweto that, Lusaka Fire Brigade has not performed better in the area of fire management in markets. Her statement is also in agreement with results which were obtained from Old Soweto market where majority of marketeers interviewed (66%) said that there were dissatisfied with the Lusaka Fire Brigades ability to put off fire outbreaks from markets. 30% were dissatisfied and only 4% remained silent. As for Kaunda Square stage 1 market, of the 50 marketeers interviewed, 54% were dissatisfied and 30% were satisfied while 16% did not respond to the question which was asked. One reason for the poor rating by marketeers in these markets with regards to Lusaka City Councils performance in the area of quenching fire outbreaks in markets could be the poor response by the Lusaka Fire Brigade unit of the Council to cases of fire outbreaks in markets.

There are still some markets where marketeers were satisfied with the performance of the Lusaka City Council when it comes to management of fire outbreaks in markets. A case in point is Chelston market. It was revealed by the Market Master for Chelston that there is a fire education program at Chelston market where marketeers are trained on how best they can handle fire outbreaks. This program is organised by the Market Advisory Committee of Chelston market. It is for this reason that results obtained from this market showed that of the 47 marketeers interviewed 87% were satisfied with the Lusaka City Councils ability to put off fire outbreaks from markets. The rest that is 13% did not respond to the question. It can be seen from the results obtained at Chelston market that majority of marketeers felt that the Lusaka City Council is capable of quenching fire outbreaks
in markets. Probably this is due to the fact that, Chelston market is a modern market equipped with fire hydrants. Furthermore, the market has a passage which can be used by the Lusaka Fire Brigades fire tenders to have access to any shop which can be on fire. However, this was not the case with most Lusaka City Council run markets. These markets lacked fire hydrants and in addition to this, the markets are poorly planned such that if a shop which is centrally located is on fire, it would be very difficult for the Lusaka Fire Brigades fire tenders to have access to the affected shop.

**Constraints faced by the Council when managing fire outbreaks in markets**

There are a number of problems faced by the Lusaka Fire Brigade section when it comes to managing fire outbreaks in markets. Among others are the following which came out prominent in this study.

Firstly, it was revealed that Lusaka Fire Brigade section does not have enough fire tenders to cater for all the markets in the 33 wards which are under the jurisdiction of the Lusaka City Council. This is a concern raised by the Assistant Markets Manager in charge of Finance. This concern was further echoed by the Market Master for Chelston market and the Deputy Chief Fire Officer who also were of the view that fire tenders were inadequate. At the time of the study, it was revealed by the Deputy Chief Fire Officer at Lusaka City Council that the Council had a total of four (4) fire tenders that is two (2) new ones which had just been bought and two (2) old ones. When the Deputy Fire Chief was asked as to whether or not the Four (4) fire tenders were enough to cater for all the markets in the 33 wards of Lusaka, he stated that there were not enough. The Fire Chief further said that, the Lusaka Fire Brigade unit can only operate effectively if it had 10 – 15 fire tenders but that it was very difficult to procure them because fire tenders are very expensive. The Fire Chief further said that one (1) fire tender could cost about K3, 000, 000. 00. Thus, the high cost of fire tenders has made it very difficult for the Lusaka City Council to have more fire tenders at Lusaka Fire Brigade section.

Another constraint faced by the Lusaka City Council when managing fire outbreaks in markets has to do with vandalism of fire hydrants. It was revealed by the Assistant Markets Manager-Finance that vandalism of fire hydrants which are found in markets has also acted as a draw back on the part of the Council in so far as management of fire outbreaks in markets is concerned. This observation was also
made by the Deputy Director for the Department of Housing and Social Services and a Councillor for Harry Mwaanga Nkumbula Kanyama Ward 11. Both of them were of the view that most of the fire hydrants which were initially in the markets are no longer there as they have been vandalised. A very good example of a market in Lusaka which had fire hydrants when it begun is Old Soweto market, but when this study was being conducted, it was revealed that all the fire hydrants had been vandalised and it was even difficult to locate where the hydrants had been installed.

Poor budget support was also identified as having a negative effect on the Council’s capacity to manage fire outbreaks in markets. According to the Divisional Fire Officer for Lusaka Fire Brigade, the Council’s budget has not been adequately supported by concerned stakeholders especially central government and as a result of this, it has been difficult for the Lusaka City Council to effectively conduct fire drills in markets so that marketeers are adequately equipped with the necessary tools of managing fire outbreaks in markets. This is a concern raised by Lolojih (2008) in which it was disclosed that central government on many occasions does not honour its obligations in terms of paying the level of government support which the Council had been advised to include in their budget estimates. It was noted that the Council either receives an amount far less than what was promised or does not receive anything at all. According to Lolojih (2008) in 1995, central governments promised budget support to Lusaka City Council was K1.5 billion but the Council only received K1,022,271,000 while in 2001 the Council received K600,000,000 instead of the promised K3.5 billion. In 2004 the Council received budgetary support of K62, 667,000 instead of the original K3, 962,602,000. Thus, it can be noted that poor budgetary support has serious repercussions on the operations of the Council. This has hindered it from effectively managing fire outbreaks from markets

**Conclusion**

With regards to the management of fire outbreaks in markets, this study has shown that the Lusaka Fire Brigade section is faced with numerous constraints which have had a negative effect on the management of fire outbreaks in markets. These constraints include the following: vandalism of fire hydrants in markets, poor budget support from cooperating partners such as the government and inadequate fire tenders.
It has also been revealed that the four (4) fire tenders are always ready for any fire outbreak in markets of Lusaka but the problem has been that most markets are poorly planned such that they don’t have passages which can be used by fire tenders to access the affected market stalls. Furthermore, as a result of poor planning, most markets do not have fire hydrants where the fire tenders can draw water from. All these problems compounded, have resulted in poor management of fire outbreaks in some markets.

On the other hand, this researcher is of the view that, security in most markets managed by the Council needs to be enhanced and this would result in reduced cases of vandalism.

There is also need for the government to ensure that it financially supports the activities of the Fire Brigade section of the Council. The Council can also engage itself in Public Private Partnerships (PPP) as this might help the Council realise the much needed capital for the procurement of fire hydrants.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions
This study has identified a system of garbage management used by Waste Management Unit (WMU) of Lusaka City Council to manage garbage in markets. Lusaka City Council uses Community Based Enterprises (CBEs) as well as Council general workers to manage garbage in markets. However, this study has shown that though Lusaka City Council has a system of managing garbage in markets, the Council has continued grappling with the problem of uncollected garbage in markets. Garbage from the secondary garbage collection point is rarely collected on time. This study has also revealed that regardless of the existence of garbage management system at Lusaka City Council, the Council has no schedule as to when garbage is supposed to be collected in a particular market and this has contributed to the delay in the collection of garbage from the secondary collection point. It also appears as though Lusaka City Council staffs in Waste Management Unit are rarely ready for garbage collection because when they are called to collect garbage from markets they take a lot of time to respond. This is a concern raised by all the three Market Masters who were part of this study. It was also noted that even markets belt with assistance from the European Union such as Chelston market also had garbage collection problems especially from the secondary collection point. Furthermore, despite the market having wheelie bins, the Market Master stated that the bins were not enough to carter for the whole market. This researcher also observed that in some sections of the market, garbage was dumped indiscriminately an indication that the Council has been facing problems in managing the market.

This study has also established constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council when it comes to garbage management in markets. Firstly, lack of fuel was identified as a major problem faced by Waste Management Unit when it comes to garbage management in markets. It was noted that the Waste Management Unit lacked the financial capacity needed to procure adequate fuel for its vehicles. Secondly, this study has also established that the volume of garbage in markets is not only accumulated by market users. The community surrounding the markets have a tendency of not subscribing to the various waste management companies and thus resort to dumping waste outside the markets or secondary garbage collection points. The third constraint faced by the Waste Management Unit in managing garbage in
markets is that the Lusaka City Council lacks adequate machinery in terms of trucks and compactors which are supposed to be used for garbage collection. Waste Management Unit also doesn’t have enough wheelie bins which are supposed to be used for primary garbage collection in the market. This study has established that, the fact that there are no wheelie bins to be used for primary garbage collection, market users have resorted to indiscriminate means of dumping garbage.

This study has revealed that Lusaka City Council has not adequately provided toilet facilities to markets such as Old Soweto and Kaunda Square which were closely examined in this study. With regards to Old Soweto, the market has no toilet facilities. Kaunda Square stage 1 market is another case in point. The study established that though Kaunda Square stage 1 market had some toilets, the toilets were far from being enough and there was no direct water supply to the toilets or cisterns. It was only Chelston market which had toilet facilities which were functioning though certain components such as toilet pans were missing from the toilets. The toilets at this market also have a dysfunctional hand dryer. Therefore, it is clear from the results of this study that the Council needs to do more if it is to improve sanitary conditions in markets as the case of Chelston market suggests that markets which were belt with assistance from the European Union are gradually deteriorating to the old poor state in which they were before funding was received from the European Union.

This study has established that the Council is responsible for collection of market levy in Council run markets. It has also established that of the total market levy collected, 60% was retained by Market Advisory Committee while 40% was deposited into a Council account. The 60% retained by the Market Advisory Committee was ideally supposed to be used for management purposes of the market. This researcher is of the view that there is need on the part of the Council to be transparent in the way this money is utilised as some members of the Chelston Market Advisory Committee claimed that they had never seen financial reports prepared by Council officials which showed how the 60% was being utilised. They were verbally told that the money was expended on electricity and water bills, toilet chemicals and cleaning detergents. Furthermore, the study revealed that political parties didn’t interfere with collection of market levy in Council run markets.

This study has noted that the Lusaka City Council has not ensured that sufficient quantity of water is supplied to markets by Lusaka Water and Sewerage
Company (LWSC). For example, the study has shown that markets such as Old Soweto and Kaunda Square stage 1 are not adequately supplied with water. Each of these markets had one water point (tap) supplying the whole market at the time of the study. With regards to Old Soweto, the only tap was not even installed by the Lusaka City Council. It was an initiative of the PF branch committee. Thus, it can be stated that very little has be done to ensure that markets are supplied with sufficient quantity of water.

This study has identified the major problems leading to poor supply of water to markets and among these problems the following came out prominent: inadequate water points as is the case with Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto markets; leakages on underground water due to aged water pipes; and vandalism of water infrastructure in markets.

This study has established that the drainage system in markets is in a very bad state. The study revealed that only Chelston market has a better inner drainage system while the outer drainage system is in a bad state. Kaunda Square stage 1 market has got no drainage system inside the market but an earth excavated drainage system surrounding the market. Old Soweto just like Kaunda square stage 1market does not have an inner drainage system but the drainage surrounding the market has no outlet thus making it difficult for waste water to leave the market. Therefore, it can be stated that very little has been done by the Council to ensure that drainages in markets are improved.

This study has identified the following as major impediments to improving the drainage system in markets: lack of wheelie bins which has resulted into indiscriminate disposal of garbage; unplanned market structures; poor construction of existing drainages such as the earth excavated drainage in a market like Kaunda Square stage 1. This type of drainage system is very difficult to manage as the soil keeps on eroding. In addition, street vending was also identified as another problem faced by the Lusaka City Council when it comes to management of drainages in markets. This study has revealed that most vendors have a tendency of selling on top of the drainage system especially if the drainage system has covers. Some have even belt their stalls on top of drainages and this has hampered efforts by the Council to adequately maintain drainages in markets.

Management of fire outbreaks is the responsibility of Lusaka Fire Brigade a unity which is under the Department of Engineering Services at Lusaka City
Council. This study has established that the Lusaka Fire Brigade has not done enough to adequately manage fire outbreaks in markets. A case in point is that of Old Soweto market which has experienced a number of fire outbreaks. Marketeers at this market were concerned that the Lusaka Fire Brigade takes a lot of time to respond to fire outbreaks at the market. It was noted that when one shop caught fire in September 2013, by the time the Lusaka Fire Brigade responded all the shops in the Chicken sales section of the market had been burnt to ashes. This study also established that the Lusaka City Council through Markets Unit had a program of sensitising marketeers on how best to prevent fire outbreaks in their 2013 work plan but that this had not been implemented at the time of the study. The Markets Unit of Lusaka City Council has also not procured fire extinguishers which can be used to quench fire in case of fire outbreaks in markets. Based on these grounds, this researcher is of the view that the Lusaka City Council has not done enough to manage fire outbreaks in markets.

This study has also established constraints faced by the Lusaka City Council when it comes to management of fire outbreaks in markets. Firstly, the Lusaka Fire Brigade doesn’t have adequate fire tenders to cater for all the markets in Zambia. This study has revealed that Lusaka Fire Brigade only had a total of four (4) fire tenders which were not enough to serve Lusaka City as it needed not less than ten (10) fire tenders. Another constraint faced by the Lusaka City Council is failure on the part of marketeers to adhere to fire safety instructions. Though marketeers have been instructed not to leave charcoal burning braziers inside their shops when knocking off, they have failed to comply. This study has established that the problem has been exacerbated by the fact that most market stalls are not constructed using fire resistant materials. In addition, this study has revealed that poor budget support has also affected council operations and it is for this reason that the Council has failed to conduct fire drills in markets and procure more fire tenders.

It can therefore be concluded that on the overall, the Council has not done enough to ensure that markets are effectively managed and this also includes modern markets belt with assistance from the European Union as the infrastructure in these markets is gradually deteriorating to the old poor state in which the markets were before the markets received assistance from the European Union.
**Recommendations**

*Garbage management in markets*

The study recommends that collection of garbage from markets be done frequently. In other words the Council should have a schedule on garbage collection from markets and efforts should be made to collect garbage on the assigned days unlike a situation where it is not known as to when the Council would collect garbage from the markets.

The study further recommends that more garbage collection points be established inside the markets if indiscriminate disposal of garbage is to be reduced. As noted market users tend to indiscriminately dispose garbage due to the non-availability of wheelie bins in some markets. Therefore, it is recommended that more wheelie bins be procured and placed inside each market street. The study also recommends that more trucks and compactors be bought as these are very important when it comes to garbage collection from markets. Lack of adequate vehicles has had a negative effect on the operations of the Council in so far as garbage collection is concerned.

The study recommends that there is need to sensitise market users on the importance of maintaining high levels of hygiene in the markets. Market users should be sensitised not to indiscriminately dispose garbage in the market vicinity. The study further recommends that the Lusaka City Council should procure more fuel for Waste Management Unit as this will enable the unit to collect garbage timely unlike situations where collection of garbage from markets has failed due to non-availability of fuel.

*Provision of toilet facilities to markets*

The study recommends that toilets be constructed for Kaunda Square stage 1 and Old Soweto market. The study further recommends that the Lusaka City Council should ensure that water is supplied to toilets in markets. Toilets should also be provided with necessary requisites such as soap for hand washing.

*Water supply to the markets*

The study recommends that more water points be established in markets so that market users can have easy access to the commodity.

The study recommends that boreholes be constructed in markets to act as reservoirs in the event that Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) ration the
commodity. The study further recommends that the Lusaka City Council should engage LWSC so that regular inspections are conducted to check on water leakages as this might result in reduced water loss through leakages.

**Drainage management in markets**

The study recommends that earth excavated drainages must be stone patched as managing a stone patched or concrete made drainage system is easier compared to earth excavated drainage.

The study further recommends that more equipment for drainage management in markets be procured. The study also recommends that street vendors be removed from the streets as they have contributed to throwing of litter in undesignated places including drainages. The drainage system surrounding Old Soweto market must be reconstructed and an outlet be provided so that waste water is able to leave the market.

**Fire management in markets**

The study recommends that more fire stations be established as this will ease the pressure faced by the Central Fire Station in managing fire outbreaks.

The study further recommends that unplanned markets be demolished and modern markets be established. These should be equipped with fire hydrants and should also provide access to all shops in the event that there is a fire outbreak in the market. The study further recommends that more fire tenders be bought and that Council offices in markets be provided with fire extinguishers. The study recommends that marketeers be sensitised not to sleep in markets and that restaurant owners should ensure that they extinguish the fire before knocking off.

The study recommends that inspections must be conducted to ensure that shop owners have purchased fire extinguishers. Those defaulting should have their trading licenses revoked. The study recommends that the Lusaka Fire Brigade training school should be adequately funded and publicity of the existence of the school be done. This will result in more training of fire fighters. The study further recommends that fire drills be conducted amongst the marketeers in the market. This will enable marketeers to have first-hand information on how to manage fire outbreaks.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR OFFICIALS FROM LUSAKA CITY COUNCIL

Section A: Garbage Management system in markets

1. What system has the council put in place to ensure timely collection of garbage at Soweto, Kaunda Square and Chelston markets?

2. Is there anything which the council has done to engage the private sector in the management of waste in markets? If there is anything which has been done, please explain. If there is nothing which has been done, please proceed to question 3.

3. What are some of the problems faced by the council in collecting waste from Soweto, Kaunda Square and Chelston markets?

4. What do you think should be done to ensure effective collection of waste from Soweto, Kaunda Square and Chelston markets?

Section B: Management of fire outbreaks in markets

5. What system has the council put in place to effectively manage fire outbreaks in markets?

6. What are some of the problems faced by Lusaka City Council in managing fire outbreaks in markets?

7. What is it that should be done to effectively manage fire outbreaks in markets?

Section C: Drainage management in markets

8. What is it that the council is doing to improve the drainage system in markets?

9. What are the constraints in the way of improving the drainage system at Soweto, Kaunda Square and Chelston markets?
10. Does the council have a regular maintenance program on drainage systems in markets? (If yes, please give details of this program).

11. What do you think is the impact of a poor drainage system on marketeers?

12. What should be done to improve the drainage system in markets?

**Section D: Water supply to markets**

13. What system have you put in place to ensure that markets are supplied with sufficient quantity of water?

14. What constraints does Lusaka City Council face in the way of improving water supply to markets?

15. What is it that the council is doing to improve water supply to markets?

16. What do you think are the consequences of poor water supply to markets?

**Section E: Provision of toilet facilities to markets**

17. Does the council have plans of constructing more toilets in markets?

18. What systems has the council put in place to ensure that toilets are kept clean at all times?

19. What are some of the constraints faced by the council in maintaining high standards of hygiene in toilets?

Thank you for your assistance
Section A: Garbage management system in markets

1. What is it that you have done to ensure that garbage is timely collected from markets?
2. Have you engaged central government to help resolve garbage problem in markets?
3. If central government has been engaged, what has been the response?
4. Have you tried to engage private organization to help resolve the garbage problem in markets
5. What are the names of these organizations?
6. What is it that these organizations have done to assist in resolving garbage problem in markets?
7. What are some of the problems faced by the council in the collection of garbage from your market?
8. What do you think should be done to ensure effective collection of waste in your market?

Section B: Management of fire outbreaks in markets

9. What role have you played as a councillor to effectively manage fire outbreaks in markets?
10. Have you lobbied central government to assist with management of fire outbreaks in markets?
11. If central government has been engaged, what has been the response?
12. Has the council effectively managed fire outbreaks in markets?
13. What are some of the constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in providing firefighting facilities in markets?
14. What is it that should be done to effectively provide firefighting facilities in markets?

**Section C: Drainage management in markets**

15. What have you done to ensure that the drainage system in markets is improved?

16. Does the council have a regular maintenance program on drainage systems in markets? (If yes, please give details of this program).

17. What do you think is the impact of a poor drainage system on marketeers?

18. What do you think should be done to improve the drainage system in your market?

**Section D: Water supply to markets**

19. What role have you played to ensure that markets are supplied with sufficient quantity of water?

20. What constraints does Lusaka City Council face in the way of improving water supply to markets?

21. What is it that the council is doing to improve water supply to markets?

22. What do you think are the consequences of poor water supply to markets?

**Section E: Provision of toilet facilities to markets**

23. Do you think that the number of toilets in markets is enough to cater for all market users?

24. Does the council have plans of constructing more toilets in markets?

25. What have you done to ensure that toilets are kept clean at all times?

26. What are some of the constraints faced by the council in maintaining high standards of hygiene in toilets?

*Thank you for your assistance*
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR MARKET COMMITTEE MEMBERS FROM THE SELECTED MARKETS

Section A: Garbage management system in markets

1. How do marketeers dispose of their garbage?
2. What system has the council put in place to ensure timely collection of garbage in your market?
3. Has Lusaka city council placed bins where garbage can be thrown by market users?
4. Has Lusaka city council engaged private organization to collect garbage from this market?
5. Who is in charge of collecting market fees from this market?
6. How much money do you collect in a day in terms of market fees from this market?
7. Do you (market committee) retain a certain percentage of the collected market levies?
8. On what projects is this money expended on?
9. What has been the effect of the existence of political parties in this market on the management of garbage?
10. Are you of the idea that political parties should have structures in markets? (kindly give reasons as to why they should have structures in markets)
11. What are some of the problems faced by the council in the collection of waste in your market?
12. What do you think should be done to ensure timely collection of waste from your market?

Section B: Management of fire outbreaks in markets

13. What role have you played to ensure that fire outbreaks are managed effectively in markets?
14. Has the council been effective in managing fire outbreaks from this market?
15. What has been the effect of the existence of political parties in this market on the management of fire outbreaks in markets?

16. What are some of the constraints faced by Lusaka City Council in providing firefighting facilities in your markets?

17. What is it that should be done to effectively provide firefighting facilities in your market?

Section C: Drainage management in markets

18. Has Lusaka city council provided appropriate drainage facilities in markets so that water distribution points are kept free of standing wastewater?

19. Does the council regularly maintain drainages in your market?

20. What are the constraints in the way of improving the drainage system in your market?

21. What is it that the council is doing to improve the drainage system in your market?

Section D: Water supply to markets

22. Do marketeers have access to a sufficient quantity of water for drinking and personal hygiene?

23. Do people with special needs have easy access to water points?

24. What are some of the water facilities used in this market?

25. What do you think are the consequences of poor water supply to markets?

26. What constraints does Lusaka City Council face in the way of improving water supply to markets?

27. What is it that the council is doing to improve water supply to markets?

28. What do you think should be done to improve water supply to your market?

Section E: Provision of toilet facilities to markets

29. How many toilets are in this market?
30. If the number of toilets is not enough, what has been the effect on market users?

31. How many times are the toilets cleaned in a day?

32. What kind of equipment is used to clean toilets in this market?

33. Are the toilets sufficiently easy to use by all market users?

34. Are they provided with mechanisms for dislodging, transport and appropriate disposal in the event that the toilets are sealed or are for long-term use and there is a need to empty them?

35. What has been the effect of the existence of political parties in this market on the management of fire outbreaks in markets?

Thank you for your assistance
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUPPORT STAFF FROM LUSAKA CITY COUNCIL

Dear Respondent,

My name is Enos G. Phiri and I am a Postgraduate student from the University of Zambia, Great East Road Main Campus. Am conducting a study on “Effective Management of markets and service provision by local authorities to markets: A case study of Lusaka City Council (1991-2013)” The main aim of this study is to enable me, in part, to fulfill the requirements for the award of a Master’s Degree in Public Administration at the University of Zambia

Please be informed that you have been selected to participate in this study by answering the questions that I shall ask you. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Be rest assured that the information you will provide in this questionnaire will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Section A: Background information

1. Sex
   i) Male [ ] [ ]
   ii) Female [ ]

2. Age .......................Years

3. Marital Status
   i) Single [ ] [ ]
   ii) Married [ ]
   iii) Divorced [ ]
   iv) Widowed [ ]
   v) Separated [ ]

4. What is your highest level of education?
   i) Never been to school [ ] [ ]


ii) Lower primary level  

iii) Upper primary level  

iv) Junior secondary level  

v) Senior secondary level  

vi) Tertiary level  

5. Department / Section………………………………………………………………………………

**Section B: Garbage management system in markets**

6. Is your department involved in garbage collection from markets?

7. If your department is involved in collecting garbage from markets, how many times in a month do you collect waste from markets?
   
i) Once monthly  

   [ ]  

   [ ]

   ii) Twice monthly  

   [ ]

   iii) Three times monthly  

   [ ]

   iv) Four times monthly  

   [ ]

   v) Five times monthly  

   [ ]

   vi) Others, (Specify)………………………………………………………………………………

8. Are marketeers provided with bins where they can throw their garbage?
   
i) Yes  

   [ ]  

   [ ]

   ii) No  

   [ ]

9. If your department is involved in garbage collection from markets, what challenges do you face when collecting garbage from markets?

10. What do you think should be done to ensure that garbage is collected on time from markets?

**Section C: Management of fire outbreaks in markets**
11. Is your department involved in the management of fire outbreaks in markets?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

12. If you answered yes to question 11 above, select from the list below some of the firefighting facilities which you use to manage fire outbreaks from markets? *(please select all that apply)*
   i) Fire extinguisher [ ]
   ii) Fire hose [ ]
   iii) Fire alarm [ ]
   iv) Fire blanket [ ]
   v) Fire hydrant [ ]
   vi) Smoke detector [ ]
   vii) Others please specify……………………………………………………………

13. What challenges does the council face in providing fire fighting services to markets?

14. What do you think should be done to ensure that Lusaka city council provides efficient and effective fire fighting services to markets?

**Section C: Drainage management in markets**

15. Is there a regular maintenance program on drainages in markets at Lusaka City Council?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

16. If your answer is yes to question 15, does your department take part in maintaining drainages in markets?
17. What do you think are the major constraints faced by Lusaka city council in improving the drainage system in markets?

18. What should be done to improve the drainage system in your market?

Section D: Water supply to markets

19. Is water treated before supplied to markets?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

20. If your answer to question 19 is yes, is disinfection of water necessary, even if the supply is not contaminated?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

21. What are some of the challenges leading to poor supply of water in markets?

22. What is it that Lusaka city council has done to ensure that the supply of water in markets is improved?

Section E: Provision of toilet facilities to markets

23. Is your department involved in managing toilets in markets?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

24. If you answered yes to question 23, what do you use to clean toilets in markets?
   i) Premixed disinfectant cleaner [ ]
   ii) Disinfectant cleaner concentrate [ ]
   iii) Toilet bowl swab and container [ ]
   iv) Broom [ ]
   v) Dust-pan [ ]
   vi) Clean cloth [ ]
vii) Gloves

25. Do you think that the toilets in markets are sufficient?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

26. Are the toilets being supplied with enough water?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MARKETEERS

Dear Respondent,

My name is Enos G. Phiri and I am a Postgraduate student from the University of Zambia, Great East Road Main Campus. Am conducting a study on “Effective Management of markets and Service provision by local authorities to markets: A case study of Lusaka City Council (1991-2013)” The main aim of this study is to enable me, in part, to fulfill the requirements for the award of a Master’s Degree in Public Administration at the University of Zambia

Please be informed that you have been selected to participate in this study by answering the questions that I shall ask you. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Be rest assured that the information you will provide in this questionnaire will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Section A: Background information

1. Sex
   i) Male [ ] [ ]
   ii) Female [ ]

2. Age .......................Years

3. Marital Status
   i) Single [ ] [ ]
   ii) Married [ ]
   iii) Divorced [ ]
   iv) Widowed [ ]
   v) Separated [ ]

4. What is your highest level of education?
   i) Never been to school [ ] [ ]
   ii) Lower primary level [ ]
iii) Upper primary level [ ]
iv) Junior secondary level [ ]
v) Senior secondary level [ ]
vi) Tertiary level [ ]

5. How long have you been selling in this market?
   i) Less than a year [ ]
   ii) 1 year – less than 2 years [ ]
   iii) 2 years – less than 3 years [ ]
   iv) 3 years – less than 4 years [ ]
   v) 4 years – less than 5 years [ ]
   vi) Above 5 years [ ]

Section B: Garbage management system in markets

6. What is the normal practice of garbage disposal for this market?
   i) Compost [ ]
   ii) Collection system [ ]
   iii) Other, (specify)………………………………………………………………………………

7. Who is responsible for garbage collection in your market?
   i) Lusaka city council [ ]
   ii) Private organization [ ]
   iii) Others, specify………………………………………………………………………………

8. Is there any garbage collection point or bins in your market?
   i) Yes [ ]
   ii) No [ ]
9. If you answered yes to question 8, do you throw your garbage into these bins?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

10. Is garbage being collected from the collection point in your market?
    i) Yes [ ] [ ]
    ii) No [ ]

11. If yes how many times is garbage collected from the collection point in a month?
    i) Once monthly [ ] [ ]
    ii) Twice monthly [ ]
    iii) Three times monthly [ ]
    iv) Four times monthly [ ]
    v) Five times monthly [ ]
    vi) Others, (Specify)………………………………………………

12. Has the presence of uncollected garbage affected your business?
    i) Yes [ ] [ ]
    ii) No [ ]

13. If Yes, how has it affected your business?

14. Do you pay for garbage collection in your market?
    i) Yes [ ] [ ]
    ii) No [ ]

15. If Yes, how much do you pay for garbage collection?
    i) Less than KR5 [ ] [ ]
ii) Less than KR10 [ ]

iii) Less than KR20 [ ]

iv) Less than KR40 [ ]

v) Above KR40 [ ]

16. When do you pay for garbage collection from your market?

i) Daily

ii) Weekly

iii) Monthly

iv) Others, Specify…………………………………………

17. How satisfied are you in relation to the councils performance in the area of garbage collection from markets

i) Very satisfied [ ]

ii) Slightly satisfied [ ]

iii) Satisfied [ ]

iv) Slightly dissatisfied [ ]

v) Very dissatisfied [ ]

18. What should be done to improve on garbage collection from markets?

Section B: Management of fire outbreaks in markets

19. Are there firefighting facilities in this market?

i) Yes [ ]

ii) No [ ]

20. If your answer is yes to question 24, state the types of firefighting facilities in this market.

i) Fire extinguisher [ ]

ii) Fire hose [ ]
iii) Fire alarm [  ]
iv) Fire blanket [  ]
v) Fire hydrant [  ]
vi) Smoke detector [  ]
vii) Others please specify.................................................................

21. How satisfied are you with regards to the council’s ability to put off fire from this market?
   i) Very satisfied [  ] [  ]
   ii) Slightly satisfied [  ]
   iii) Satisfied [  ]
   iv) Slightly dissatisfied [  ]
   v) Very dissatisfied [  ]

22. What do you think should be done to ensure that Lusaka city council provides efficient and effective firefighting services to markets?

Section C: Drainage management in markets

23. With regards to your market, are water points and bathing areas well drained to prevent muddy conditions?
   i) Yes [  ]
   ii) No [  ]

24. Do you have the means to protect your market stand from local flooding?
   i) Yes [  ]
   ii) No [  ]

25. Is there regular maintenance of drainages in your market?
   i) Yes [  ]
   ii) No [  ]

26. If yes, who is responsible for the maintenance of drainages in your market?
i) Lusaka City Council       [ ]         [ ]

ii) Private organization  [ ]

iii) Others, specify…………………………………………………………………………………..

27. What do you think are the major constraints in improving the drainage system in your market?

28. What should be done to improve the drainage system in your market?

Section D: Water supply to markets

29. Do you easily have access to tap water?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

30. Is the current water supply safe to drink?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

31. Is the current water supply reliable?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

32. Are there any obstacles to using available water supply sources in this market?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

33. Would you say that supply of water to this market has been poor?
   i) Yes [ ] [ ]
   ii) No [ ]

34. If you answered yes to question 33, what has been the effect of poor water supply on your business?
35. What is it that Lusaka city council has done to ensure that the supply of water to this market is improved?

Section E: Provision of toilet facilities to markets

36. What is the current defecation practice in this market?
   
i) Flushing Toilet [ ]

   ii) Open defecation [ ]

   iii) Pit latrine [ ]

   iv) Other, supply .................................................................

37. Are there any existing toilet facilities in this market?
   
   iii) Yes [ ]

   iv) No [ ]

38. If you answered yes to question 37, are the toilets being used?
   
viii) Yes [ ]

   ix) No [ ]

39. Do you think that the toilets are sufficient?
   
   iii) Yes [ ]

   iv) No [ ]

40. Are the toilets being supplied with enough water?
   
   iii) Yes [ ]

   iv) No [ ]

41. Which of the following is found inside a toilet in this market? (Please select all that apply)
   
i) Soap for hand washing [ ]
ii) Hand dryers

iii) Toilet paper or tissue

iv) Wash basin

v) Sanitary disposal bins in female toilets

vi) Air fresheners to promote pleasing environment

Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX F

PHOTOS FROM THE THREE SELECTED MARKETS (OLD SOWETO, CHELSTON AND KAUNDA SQUARE STAGE 1)

Secondary garbage collection point at Old Soweto market. (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 1)
Main drainage system surrounding Old Soweto market. This part of the drainage shows that the drainage had not be cleaned for sometime (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 2)
Main drainage system surrounding Old Soweto market. This drainage has got no outlet (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 3)
LCC staff drinking some water from the only existing tap at Old Soweto market. (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 4)
One of the LCC bins used for collection of garbage inside Chelston market. This bin acts as a primary collection point of garbage before garbage is collected by council staff stationed at the market to the dumping site which is outside, on the southern part of the market. The main dumping area is the secondary garbage collection point (2014/01/06)

(Photo number 5)
Blocked drainage. Water is unable to move due to the fact that this part of the drainage system is blocked. It appears as though this part of the drainage system has been turned into some kind of a bin where used plastic containers are thrown. (2014/01/06)

(Photo number 6)
Unrepaired water drainage at Chelston market. On top of the drainage is garbage which has been dumped by market users. (2014/01/06)
Water is not able to move because the drainage has been blocked by market users (2014/01/06)
Secondary collection point located outside Chelston market in Lusaka on the southern part of the market. (2014/01/06)

(Photo number 9)
Handy dryers in one of the gents. This hand dryer is not functional (2014/01/06)
Functional shower in one of the gents at Chelston market in Lusaka (2014/01/06)

(Photo number 12)
Flushing toilet at Chelston market in Lusaka (2014/01/06)

[Photo number 13]
One of the urinals in the gents at Chelston market in Lusaka (2014/01/06)

(Photo number 14)
Unrepaired water points at Chelston market in Lusaka. This is one of the over 40 water points (taps) in the market which Lusaka City Council has not repaired for sometime now since the taps broke down though a report was submitted to Council authorities (2014/01/06).

(Photo number 15)
Earth excavated main drainage system surrounding the Kaunda Square stage 1 market. This is the northern part of the market. Garbage is also thrown into this system. (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 16)
This is a secondary garbage collection point at Kaunda Square stage 1 market. Skip bin is full of garbage as collection by WMU had not been done for over three weeks (2014/01/23)
This is the only water point used by all the marketeers at Kaunda Square stage 1 market. The tap is just outside the ablution block. Restaurant owners also drew water from this tap (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 18)
One of the broken toilets at Kaunda Square stage 1 market. As shown in this picture, water is not supplied directly to the cistern. (2014/01/23)

(Photo number 19)