

So now they are going to measure empowerment!

By James Taylor
Community Development Resource Association
2000

In recent years donors and international agencies in the development sector have successfully promoted and insisted on the implementation of strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation models and methodologies. There have been many positive spin-offs as activities have become more strategic and measurable, and organisations have become more accountable. But there is growing concern amongst practitioners around the limitations inherent in these seemingly sophisticated, but unavoidably reductionist, methodologies. Even if one ignores the harm done in instances where indiscriminate and non-developmental methods were used to introduce these methodologies - and overlooks the alienation and disempowerment caused by the language, and convoluted logic of these systems. There remains a more fundamental shortcoming of these systems, particularly if they are to be used to measure empowerment.

The greater weakness of these logical framework-type systems emanates from the obvious fact that they are best suited to measuring that which is most easy to measure. The delivery of products and services is relatively easy to measure. But if the sector has learned anything it is that there is no direct causal relationship between the delivery of products and services, and development. If we are starting to recognise that empowerment is the ultimate objective of development interventions, we will have to accept that it cannot be delivered like water pumps, health programmes, or training workshops. Equally it cannot be measured in the same way.

There is deep ambivalence about whether to welcome the interest of those who have the power to enforce new methodologies and approaches in the measurement of empowerment. The dominant, competitive, market-driven global paradigm dictates that power is used to the advantage of those who have the advantage. The view of practitioners closer to the periphery is that those at the centre are about to take ownership, and thus control, of that which is most important to them. There is a deep fear that in order to effectively measure it, empowerment will be reduced to the level of becoming the next development deliverable or handout, provided by the more powerful through capacity building workshops, training programmes, and participatory projects.

Those at the centre, closer to the money and the power, must understand that they have the ability to reduce empowerment to the next "flavour of the month". Those practitioners closer to the periphery have the responsibility to resist it, and to provide an alternative.

This paper explores an approach to measuring empowerment as one crucial element of an integrated development practice which has empowerment as its ultimate purpose. As it is written by a practitioner it begins with a story drawn from practice. As a practitioner from the "South" I will challenge convention, and highlight the universality of the need for empowerment, by using an example of some development work I once did in the "North".

The setting is a generally wealthy borough in north London (UK). Within the borough there are a number of large council-owned housing estates inhabited by predominantly unemployed single-parented families. I was employed as a community worker by the Social Services Department of the borough to work on one of these estates which my employers had identified as having unacceptably high levels of "social problems". These problems included child abuse, vandalism, substance abuse, family breakdown and mental health issues. The flats that people lived in, although not that old, leaked and in winter let cold air in around poorly fitting windows, and were generally in a poor state of repair. Despite housing well over a thousand people there were no communal or recreational facilities on the estate.

During my initial period of getting to know the people and their needs I was struck by their general sense of powerlessness. The little energy that the occasional tenant displayed was in the form of anger towards the authorities who were doing nothing to help, but generally there was an almost overwhelming apathy. I eventually managed to get a small group of single parents sufficiently motivated to get together to share some of their common problems. One example of the extent of the dehumanising situation became clear to me when they shared how desperate they became in the school holidays when they sat cooped up with their young children indoors all day. Two of the parents found humour in the fact that they had both stumbled onto the same solution to the situation. When it became intolerable they would open up a valium capsule prescribed for them by their doctor for their "nerves", and sprinkle the contents over their children's breakfast cereal – finding that the kids became much less troublesome, and more manageable as a result.

As part of my analysis of the situation I identified and observed a number of relationships that I considered to be central to it. Amongst these were the way in which the tenants related to (and felt about) themselves as individuals, how they related to each other on the estate, and how they related to the rest of the borough (in particular the local authority which was their landlord). The overwhelming quality in the nature of all of these relationships was the sense of being the victim. As the community worker it was not that difficult to build a picture of the quality and nature of these relationships. Essentially no one really believed in themselves or in their own ability to do anything about their situation. They did not get together around issues of common concern except occasionally to moan about them, or go to the pub to forget about them for a brief while. Their relationship with the Borough Council was a combination of acrimony, apathy, fear and frustration that collectively led to avoidance. When it was no longer possible to avoid each other the relationship very quickly became conflictual with the Council inevitably drawing upon its power and authority as landlord to achieve its objectives.

The other relationships central to the whole process were those between the development agent (myself, representing the Social Services department of the Borough Council) and the tenants on the one hand, and the rest of the Council (the Housing Department in particular) on the other. The relationship between myself and the members of the community was a complex one. One aspect of it was determined by the fact that in my mind I was a young, recently qualified, relatively inexperienced, community worker working in a foreign country. To the community members I was a member of the Council who represented authority to them. Coming from the Social Services Department as I did, I was seen as a social worker and there was an expectation that I would bring resources and solve problems for them. Within my own Social Services team I was the only community worker in a team dominated by social workers who expected me to engage in some form of therapeutic groupwork that directly addressed the "social problems" that had been identified. In the broader relationships within the Borough Council, the Social Service department was expected to assist the Housing Department by taking care of the social problems on the housing estates which made them difficult to manage and maintain. The general relationship between the Council and the members of the community was characteristically welfarist in nature, complementing and supporting the people's feelings of powerlessness and victimisation.

Even though this example comes from a period before consciously attempting to measure empowerment, issues of power were central to my community development practice at the time. I was conscious of the nature of existing relationships, and had a good idea in my mind of some characteristics of the ideal relationships that we were striving towards. With this understanding, analysis and objective in mind I set to work to involve tenants from the estate in initiatives that would start addressing their most strongly felt needs. There is no point in going into the detail of the range of activities I was involved in. It did, however, involve three years of full time, in-depth community work. It started very slowly and tentatively with a committee of four women organising a holiday playscheme that entertained a small group of children for four days. It gradually grew into regular holiday playschemes, a latch-key club for after school care, an adventure playground, a Tenants' Association, a community centre with a crèche and pensioners club during the day, and various activities for adults and youth in the evenings. The Tenants' Association eventually managed to get the Housing Department to replace all the windows on the estate and repair and maintain the buildings. This was achieved through a sustained campaign involving petitions, protest marches, negotiations and finally consultations and joint supervision of the work carried out.

But what of empowerment and its measurement? As always it was easier to measure the "products" delivered through the process. A range of new facilities and activities, new community structures and committees, numbers of children, elderly persons and youth involved in programmes. The social services department also had a lot to measure in changes in reported cases of "social problems". But in attempting to measure empowerment we have to look beyond these more simply measured achievements.. The delivery of facilities like community centres and benign social projects have the potential to be as effective in distracting people away from mobilising and exercising real power as they are in empowering. Equally the reduction in "social problems" could be

attributable to many factors other than empowerment, better policing being but one example.

I do believe, however, that it would not have been difficult to measure empowerment had we chosen to do so. Indicators of changes in relationships abounded. The simple increase in the numbers of people believing that they could make a difference could be measured by the numbers getting involved in committees, and community initiatives. Shifts in the relationships between people on the estate could be detected in the fact that they were now getting together, and in what they had achieved through their efforts. The ability of people to gain access to and control over resources, previously beyond their reach, was evident in improved maintenance of their dwellings and the building of the community centre. The shifts in power relations were nowhere more evident than in the transformed nature of the regular exchanges between the Tenants' Association and the Housing Department which had evolved into one of regular consultation and collaboration. The possible consolidation of this shift was imminent when I last got news, in that one of the original four women (who didn't know what to do with her children) had entered politics and was running for election onto the Borough Council.

Another place where the shifts in relationship were very evident was in my relationship with the system into which I was intervening (the community) and my relationship with the system out of which I was operating (the Social Services Department and the broader Borough Council). Through the process of empowerment the community had learned about its rights and how to exercise them. They had organised themselves and mobilised against the Council (my employer). Their relationship with me had shifted from expecting me to solve their problems, to making demands of me to assist them achieve their own objectives. This obviously put a lot of pressure on me from both sides. It was not easy to justify to my employer why it was important for me to assist the community to mobilise in protest against them. Equally it was difficult for the Social Services Department to explain to the Housing Department that they should be grateful that their tenants were becoming more empowered, and that in the long-term this would assist them in managing the housing estate more effectively. It is my contention that these difficulties are a part of the empowerment process. It is inconceivable that real empowerment can take place to the point of shifting power relations without those involved experiencing some level of pain or at least discomfort. These are also indicators of empowerment that need to be included as part of the measurement process.

It would not have been difficult to describe in more detail what the relationships were like "before" and "after" the development intervention. What would have added even more weight to the evaluation would have been stories told by the people themselves, about how their experience of their relationships had changed. In practice I do not believe that it is that difficult to measure empowerment; the difficulty lies in achieving it. Case studies of such obvious shifts in relationships over such a relatively short period of time, are rare. (I must admit even to the possibility of this one becoming just slightly idealised through the passage of time!)

As a South African practitioner the above example might have been a strange one to choose. My own country is being looked upon by the world as one of the most inspiring examples of empowerment in recent times. And it is true – we could measure it, but we

don't have to – we know it. But we also know that it is an ongoing process – we are at times almost overwhelmed by the sense that we have just begun. For this reason it might be important to learn to measure empowerment more accurately to ensure that the process does not falter.

Development and empowerment

As highlighted in the case study, genuinely developmental practitioners are not simply engaged in delivering resources and services to those in need, they are initiating processes which result in people exercising more control over the decisions and resources that directly affect the quality of their lives. In order for someone to exercise more control someone else will inevitably have to relinquish some control. A practice with the changing of power relations as its ultimate objective has to be built not only on a coherent understanding of what development is, but on an understanding of development in which empowerment is the foundation.

Development is an innate and natural process found in all living things. It is important to understand that as development workers we do not bring or deliver development, but intervene into development processes which already exist. Whether the intervention is into the life of an individual, organisation, community, or country, it is critical to realise that the process of development is already well-established and needs to be treated with respect. The first challenge facing the development practitioner is to understand the development process into which she or he is intervening. To know where the individual, the organisation, the community, or country is located on its own path of development. To understand where it has come from, how it has changed along the way and what is impeding its further progress. The second, and even more demanding challenge is to intervene into the process in a way that facilitates development rather than undermines it.

The process of locating an entity on its own path of development, and understanding the implications of the point it has reached, is obviously not a simple process of quantitative measurement. To understand development as a process the practitioner must be able to identify the different developmental phases. These phases are characterised by substantial shifts in the nature and quality of relationships. The terms used to describe the phases (dependence, independence, and inter-dependence) are drawn from the essential character of the different types of relationship. It is in these developmental shifts in relationship that empowerment is to be measured. Using the case study it becomes clear how these terms are helpful in describing the changes in the power relationships between the Tenants Association and the Housing Department, or the way in which the woman who entered politics related to her world.

Measuring empowerment.

Based on the above understanding of development, practitioners intervene into existing complex development processes. Through whatever resources, projects, or services they bring, they aim to affect change in the power relations of their beneficiaries. These shifts do not come about as a result of the efficient delivery of the resource or service, but through the developmental process employed. Measurement is but a part of this process. As mentioned above, the process begins with the ability to make developmental

assessments. To analyse and understand the situations into which you are intervening as living, dynamic, changing processes that have a rich history, a present reality and a future potential. A central component of this assessment must include qualitative and descriptive pictures of the formative relationships surrounding the subject of the intervention. These descriptions form the baseline against which empowerment will be measured. The developmental practitioner must be able to isolate and describe different types of relationship by building a "relationship" vocabulary and the ability to apply it accurately.

Another important application of relationship assessment is to distinguish between external and internal relationships. As important as the nature and quality of relationships with others, is the quality and nature of relationship with self. Although this might sound strange at first, we do relate to ourselves. We feel and act in certain ways towards ourselves. Our relationship with ourselves constitutes our basic orientation towards the world. We can feel essentially assertive or victimised; competent and in control, or perpetually undermined and exploited; confident and affirmed, or insecure – not only in specific relationships with others, but within ourselves. The ability to assess these internal relationships, and measure change over time, forms another important part of development practice.

Having created a textured picture of the nature and quality of the critical relationships that constitute the system into which the practitioner is intervening, the next step in the developmental process is to identify the nature of the change required. The preferred future relationships and their power dynamics must be described, and observable indicators that will reflect the desired changes identified. Once the difference between the existing relationships and the preferred future relationships is clear, a plan for the intervention must be devised and implemented.

In the case study there are simple descriptions of the relationships that individuals have with themselves, of the relationship between the tenants and the Council, and between the tenants themselves. Because of a developmental approach the projects and programmes were not simply designed to deliver services to the community as effectively and efficiently as possible. The services were delivered through processes that involved the recipients in ways that increased their control and shifted their relationships. In retrospect empowerment can be measured simply by comparing the original relationships to the ones that existed at the end of the three years. A more meaningful evaluation however could have been achieved if projections of 'empowered' relationships had been made, and indicators developed, at the planning stage.

When understood as part of an integrated development implementation process, the measuring and monitoring of empowerment does not present itself as an insurmountable obstacle. But, as previously pointed out, much that is done in the name of development falls far short of shifting power relations towards increased inter-dependence. If those who are the focus of the intervention are not directly, and centrally, involved in assessing their past and determining the picture of preferred future relationships, the process is not developmental. Developmental processes are participatory in nature. Monitoring and evaluation processes that contribute positively towards empowerment, rather than undermining it, must also be participatory. Another complication in the monitoring of

complex social processes such as empowerment is the fact that it is difficult to represent the change in numbers, percentages, graphs or tables. For this reason it is necessary to describe the changes in a narrative form. If "logical framework" type planning and monitoring methodologies are being used, the boxes (delineated spaces left open to be filled in) will need to be made a little bigger. Development practitioners will need to develop the art of describing relationships before and after their intervention. They will need to learn to tell the stories of the change.

In summary then, the essential elements of a developmental approach to the monitoring and evaluation of empowerment should include:

- An integrative, systemic, relational understanding of the world.
- An understanding of development as an innate natural process that results in shifts in the relationships between the elements of a system.
- The ability to undertake participatory developmental assessments which locate the subject on their own path of development, identify and describe the nature and quality of existing formative relationships (both internal and external).
- Identification of those relationships that most need to change in order to allow the development process to progress.
- Creation of an image of the preferred relationships with observable indicators of successful achievement.
- The measurement of the change essentially involves using the indicators as a means of identifying whether the change has occurred – and the ability to describe the changes in a narrative form.

Forces working against empowerment and its measurement.

Non-developmental paradigms.

After 400 years the scientific paradigm continues to dominate our world. This rational reductionist world view promotes a particular approach to measurement as one of its most central practices. This form of measurement is based on the belief that anything can be reduced to its essential ingredients, understood and controlled by man. (In relation to the scientific paradigm I use the terms "man" and "mankind" consciously in recognition of the eco-feminist view that the rational scientific phase has been particularly, perhaps even peculiarly, male in its orientation.) This paradigm is human-centred with mankind dominating, above or outside nature, valuing nature only in the extent to which it is useful. In this paradigm science assists in understanding nature in order to dominate and exploit it to meet the needs of man. The achievements of the scientific age have resulted in enormous gains in humankind's independence from many of the life-threatening vagaries of nature. Science and competition have combined to fuel a growing ingenuity and productivity that has produced satisfiers to an immense array of real and imagined human needs. It has developed an economic system that rewards those who are most efficient and competitive in exploiting and then adding value to natural resources, and

most effective in identifying (or creating) and then meeting human needs. The ability to understand and measure things dispassionately, objectively and scientifically is a central tenet of this paradigm.

However, the competition, domination and exploitation which characterises man's relationship with nature, and man's relationship with man, is no longer unquestioningly accepted. The present paradigm is being very fundamentally challenged, initially by those who realise that man's present relationship with nature is simply not sustainable if life is to continue on this planet. The development sector has played its part in attempting to moderate the very worst excesses of man's competitive, dominant and exploitative relationships with nature. It has had significant success in forcing environmental issues into the mainstream discourse and policy-making fora. But this voice from the periphery is increasingly being strengthened from other sources, not least of all from within the scientific discipline itself. The "new sciences" are beginning to provide glimpses of what might well be elements of an emerging new paradigm. Amongst development practitioners there are many who believe that the present dominant paradigm is coming to the end of its usefulness.

It is increasingly being suggested that the scientific, human-centred (anthropocentric or self-assertive) view of the world, despite its past successes, has resulted in distorted understandings and practices that are becoming increasingly threatening and dysfunctional. A new emerging ecocentric (or integrative) view puts humankind not as the central controlling and exploitative force in the world, but as an interdependent part of it. The following table from Fritjof Kapra's book, "The Web of Life" summarises some of the essential elements of the new paradigm:

THINKING VALUES

self-assertive integrative

rational intuitive expansion conservation

analysis synthesis competition cooperation

reductionist holistic quantity quality

linear nonlinear domination partnership

In pursuing an exploration of the measurement of empowerment it is vital to be conscious of the paradigm out of which we are approaching the subject. If we approach it out of the scientific paradigm which seeks to reduce everything to its simplest elements, the tendency will be to avoid the complex inter-relational, systemic nature of society. We need to locate the process of empowerment within a paradigm which is based on the emerging interdependent understanding of the world. A world that is more complex and less predictable than previously assumed. The scientific approach leads us towards viewing poverty as a social problem that needs to be isolated, analysed and measured so that it can be taken to pieces and fixed. To date this approach has been singularly unsuccessful in bringing about any fundamental shifts. A view of the world as a complex system made up of interdependent relationships will lead our thinking and practice in a

very different direction. We will start viewing poverty as being in an inter-dependent relationship with wealth. We will understand that the one will not shift without the other shifting too.

Non-developmental development practice.

The old scientific paradigm and its complementary competitive market driven economic paradigm have resulted in a "delivery-type" understanding of development and empowerment. In true market style those at the periphery of society with unmet needs are viewed as potential consumers who cannot afford to pay for the goods and services they require. It is assumed that the poverty at the margins can be eradicated by those at the centre finding the most effective and efficient means of transferring some of their surplus. It is further assumed that anything that has made a positive contribution to "developed" societies will aid the development of those which are "under-developed".

This welfarist type of thinking has been behind attempts to transfer all manner of things from the "haves" to the "have-nots". From the early transfers of religious, educational, political and health systems to more recent "gifts" of infrastructural engineering projects, aid and relief in times of emergency, loans to ailing economies, participatory rural development programmes, capacity building and training programmes, technology etc. etc. In keeping with this logic the obvious place to measure efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of the product is at the point of it reaching the ultimate recipient. We now know beyond doubt that the successful delivery of products and services has no direct or predictable impact on the power relations between giver and receiver. There is at least as much evidence of the delivery of development programmes and projects creating and fostering dysfunctional dependency, as there are examples of them contributing to increased independence or interdependence. Any meaningful attempt to measure empowerment will have to go beyond measuring the transfer of resources (be they physical, financial or human) to the least powerful. If empowerment is to be measured in changed relationships, change will need to be detected in both sides of the relationship.

A top down development approach

This non-developmental approach results in the whole development/aid system being thought of as a set of relationships that collectively form a conduit through which goods and services flow from the "north" to the "south". It is often referred to as the aid chain. The mental picture created is of a number of organisational links between the north and south – between the "haves" and the "have-nots". Whether through donations or taxation the chain is perceived as starting in the pockets of those more fortunate, and ideally ends in the stomachs, minds or healthier bodies of those less fortunate. Images abound of the chain disappearing into deep "black" holes in Africa, or weakened as links along the way get bloated with money intended for the poor getting invested in the skilling and resourcing of development practitioners, or "eaten" by corrupt intermediaries. The whole image of the ideal aid chain being a frictionless siphon, drawing off resources from those with a surplus and depositing them with those experiencing a deficit contributes enormously to many commonly held fallacies.

The first fallacy that this view of the aid chain perpetuates is that, on balance, resources flow from the more wealthy to the less wealthy, and that the flow is one-way. We know that in fact the opposite is true. Differentials in power and in the world's consumption needs ensure that the flow of resources is from the poorer to the wealthier countries. It further perpetuates a belief that the more resources you can get to the poor as quickly and as cheaply as possible, the better. It completely denies the devastating and dehumanising impact of creating and fostering dysfunctional dependency. It implies that development practitioners are simply required to be delivery technocrats moving development goods from donor to recipient as though the real developmental value is in the goods themselves. This view would see no need to fund a development sector with specialist competencies in assisting the poor to become more effective in assessing and addressing their own needs, and defining the resources they require. It does not view the development sector as a disciplined field of practice which needs to be adequately resourced in order to address the most intractable of societal inequalities and problems. This view of the aid chain (or conduit) perceives all that is of real value as being at the "top" of the chain with a vacuum being created at the bottom by the helpless need of the would-be recipients. Despite all the advances in participatory development theory and practice, this view of development persists in shaping the activities of the sector.

At best, this conceptualisation of the aid chain might have some value and validity when the need is to respond rapidly to disaster relief situations. As a point of departure for measuring empowerment it will lead to a dead-end. Its simplistic linearity and assumed altruism, belie the complexity and interdependent nature of the relationships that maintain the status quo between the different strata of society. At the very least we need to join the two ends of the chain together in order to accommodate the most rudimentary elements of interconnectedness and interdependence inherent in the systemic nature of society. We need to accept the most fundamental principle of systems theory which points to the fact that no single element of a system can change its relationships within the system without change occurring in all of the other relationships in the system. This has major implications for where we should be measuring empowerment. If I play a significant role in the empowerment of another, it is inconceivable that I will remain unaffected in my relationship with them. In order for them to develop I too need to develop. In order for me to develop I will need to shift my relationships with those who have power over me.

If the powerless are really going to change their relationships in society, there will be consequences for others. If development practitioners are seriously committed to empowerment they cannot focus their attention only on those less powerful than themselves. For a start they have to take their own development and relationships seriously. They operate at the interface between the "haves" and the "have-nots". They work out of systems which have more power than themselves, and intervene into systems which are relatively less powerful. As facilitators of changed power relationships they need to envisage shifts in the relationships between the systems they operate out of, as well as those they intervene into. In other words, if development practitioners are only seeking to facilitate change in those less powerful than themselves they will never themselves be engaged in that which they are expecting to measure in their recipients. The agents of development will not have experienced empowerment in their relations

with those more powerful. They will also not have moved from the old top-down paradigm that has contributed to entrenching the power relations it is pretending to shift.

If development practitioners are to contribute to and measure empowerment at all, they need to measure changes in the relationships on either side of themselves in the interconnected development chain. If it is worthwhile measuring empowerment, all those in the chain who are committed to development must be involved in the measurement, placing themselves at the centre of the relationships they are measuring. This includes the official northern development aid agencies, the northern NGOs, their southern partners and the CBOs they are engaged with, and the governments of donor and recipient countries. If everyone in the chain is engaged in the process the chain itself should develop over time as the relationships change within it.

Towards a practice which is empowering.

Because all monitoring and evaluation systems are best at measuring that which is easiest to measure it is vital that these systems do not start dictating and defining what empowerment is. It is all too easy for this to happen. If those who control the finances in the sector start demanding that empowerment be measured in a certain way, the methodology could start defining that which it is intended to measure. Any efforts and resources that go into measuring empowerment must be applied in ways that build a competent development practice in the sector that is at least as effective in achieving empowerment as it is in measuring it. The following general conclusions are presented as a challenge to anyone committed to this end:

- Those who do not see themselves as central to the power dynamics they are attempting to measure are not likely to contribute much through their efforts. The act of measuring someone else's empowerment is potentially disempowering.
- Those who do not approach their own development seriously and consciously, and are not prepared to experience the crises of change, are not going to be effective in facilitating empowerment in others.
- Those who do not see it as part of their task to empower themselves in their relationships with those who control the resources that make their work possible, are perpetuating the status quo and therefore cannot claim a commitment to development.
- Empowerment has to be planned into the way in which the services and resources of development are delivered. Empowerment lies not in that which is delivered but in the processes of delivery. Not in what is delivered but how it is delivered.
- Empowerment is to be detected in changes in the nature and quality of relationships over time.
- Changes in power relations are a definitive part of the development process. There is a tendency to progress from dependency through independence towards increased interdependence.

- If not incorporated as an integral part of a conscious and concerted development practice, monitoring and evaluation are likely to first diminish, and then undermine empowerment by reducing it to easily measurable elements that become a meaningless parody.
- The monitoring and evaluation of empowerment should lead to learning, which should lead to improved development practice. If it does not it is counter-productive!

The measurement of empowerment must not be allowed to become something that the more powerful do to the less powerful. It should become a regular and meaningful measure of the shifts in the power relationships between development practitioners (or agencies) and the systems out of which, and into which, are being intervened. It must also be applied to the relationships between those most marginalised and those who limit their access to resources and ability to make decisions. The measurement of empowerment needs to be promoted by development practitioners who are prepared to apply their practices to themselves and their own relationships.

About the Community Development Resource Association (CDRA)

The Community Development Resource Association (CDRA) was established in 1987 as a non-profit, non-governmental organisation (NGO) to build the capacity of organisations and individuals engaged in development and social transformation. We are based in Cape Town, South Africa and work mostly in Southern and East Africa.

Email: peta@cdra.org.za Webpage: <http://www.cdra.org.za>

P.O. Box 221, Woodstock, 7915, South Africa

Telephone: -27 -21 462 3902

Fax: -27 -21 462 3918