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It is frequently contended that NGOs and the wider context of development are intrinsically different from other organisational settings within which Human Resource Development (HRD) is believed to play an important role. The author outlines the basic concepts underpinning human development within organisations, and organisational development, and sets out the arguments for greater investment in people. While this can raise ethical and practical issues in organisations that depend on external funds rather than generating their own income, the failure to develop the staff on whom a development organisation ultimately depends carries far greater risks. Management and specifically HRD are not desk-bound activities that can be pursued through the application of protocols and sanctions, but require vision, leadership, and hands-on engagement.
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The background

Whenever the subject of management arises in development agencies, Human Resource Development (HRD) is typically accorded high importance. Almost immediately thereafter a contradiction usually arises. On the one hand it is stated that the NGO is ‘different’, and the development context is ‘different’, and that teaching HRD in the NGO context must take these differences into account. On the other hand, the breakdown of the training course into sub-topics and sessions is pretty much the same as most management courses (with some cosmetic modifications), the same preoccupation with tools (including ‘the latest’), and even the same standard texts.

It has become increasingly clear to us at the P&P Group that it is not enough to say that the NGO/development context is ‘different’. We need to examine the differences, come to grips with them, and find ways to deal with them in bold, innovative ways. The initiatives can only come from within the development sector. We cannot expect them to be handed down from the temples of HRD that produce the standard course texts.
The human-resource perspective

Any organised effort for a defined purpose, any enterprise, business, productive endeavour, whether profit-oriented or non-profit, a company or a voluntary body, must recognise the simple truth that success is usually determined by only a small number of critical variables. These are the ‘20 per cent of things that need 80 per cent of attention’. For instance, in the soaps and detergents business it may be the distribution system; in many services it is the management of working capital; in software engineering it might well be customer relations, and so on. What is the critical variable in NGO work? Could it be the human resource? Most experienced managers of development programmes would readily agree that it is.

The significance of this observation must form the basis and the starting point for any course on HRD in the development field. We are not addressing HRD in order to achieve such things as operational efficiency, cost-effectiveness, the delivery of projects, targets, key results, objectives, and so on, but we regard HRD as integral to sustainable development. Further, since most – if not all – programmes aim to achieve a sustainable development process through community-based organisations (CBOs), then the task of HRD for NGOs extends from the NGO to the CBOs themselves.

The principal difference between HRD in the corporate realm and in the development context is thus not in the application of modified tools from a common (sacred) methodology, but a variation within the methodology itself. It may even be a difference at the level of paradigms. Let us elaborate.

What is methodology after all – the ‘ology’ of methods used? One way to understand what any methodology is all about is illustrated below:

\[
\text{Methodology} = \text{theory} + \text{principles} + \text{tools/techniques} + \text{operating skills}
\]

for reliable outcomes

At the start, then, we need good theory. This raises a serious question about the credentials of HRD as a discipline. The problem is acknowledged even within mainstream academic and practitioner circles. The bag of HRD tools has grown far more in bulk than in its knowledge base.

HRD in the development ‘sector’ has both the burden of this legacy as well as the marvellous opportunity to develop a sound body of theory and a methodology of its own. Certainly, the way forward cannot be through continued dependence on the parent body.

Common words and phrases

We shall make a brief excursion into the vocabulary of HRD and related approaches to influencing organisational performance before we return to the main focus of this essay.

Human Resource Development

HRD refers to systems and procedures by which the people in an organisational setting are brought into a productive relationship with the organisation’s tasks. ‘HRD’ is currently preferred to the term personnel management.
Much of our current understanding of organisations and their effectiveness is derived from systems science, one principle of which appears particularly relevant for managing the human resource. The *purposefulness* and *robustness* of an organisational system can be seen as being largely determined by a *vital organic balance* to be struck between two seemingly opposed processes. See Figure 1. In reality, the two forces are complementary, and they need to be brought under control and in balance in all management, in all types of endeavour. However, the task presents a special challenge in human-resource management (HRM) because of its complexity. Too much conformity at the expense of innovation can be as dysfunctional to the system as too much innovation without conformity.

**Figure 1**

**Human Resource Management**

HRM usually refers to the totality of the HR task, replacing the previous term ‘Personnel Management’ (PM). The difference is supposed to reflect a difference in orientation – from the preoccupation with regulatory practices (in PM) to progressive/proactive practices (in HRM). The distinction by labels is deceptive, however, and perhaps shallow. There are many PM departments that are ‘progressive’ enough, and many HRM outfits are quite ‘primitive’.

HRD may be viewed as a sub-set of HRM, dealing specially with its *developmental* objective – the enhancement of effectiveness in the person–organisation fit. The larger whole may be depicted as in Figure 2.

Herein lies the catch. Enhancing an effective fit between person and organisation calls for two complementary tasks: fitting the person to the organisation, and fitting the organisation to the person. A preoccupation with the former, albeit through ‘modernised’ procedural systems, is simply regulatory PM with a new label. True HRD is possible only when the *organisation as a whole* is constantly re-examining its jobs, positions, structures, and systems from periodic

**Figure 2**
reviews of its operational experiences. This position takes HRD closer to Organisational Development.

**Organisational Development**

This refers to the process of strengthening the capability of a single organisation or group. The task involves attending to both the *organisational* variables (such as structures, systems) and the *people* variables (including competencies, skills, attitudes). The stress is on the performance of the organisation as a whole. It becomes obvious that HRD, viewed this way, is really a sub-set of OD. We cannot expect much from the human resource until we have the suitable organisational environment for it.

**Training**

This usually refers to the task of enhancing individual competencies in specific areas of application. The trainees may or may not be from the same organisation. While training may lead to enhanced performance of the *individual* trainee, it does not lead directly to enhanced *organisational* performance.

**Capacity Building**

Commonly used in development programmes, this term connotes a combination of ideas from OD, training, and HRD, but often without a clear definition. The term is used in different ways in programme settings.

**Institutional Development**

This term is commonly equated with OD but should be applied to enhancing trans-organisational processes, i.e. the *social institution* that holds together several groups and organisations, or the *organisation of organisations*.

Let us now identify the principal challenges in HRD for NGOs and development programmes insofar as these differ from the corporate or commercial contexts. While the focus is on HRD in the following analysis, the more inclusive HRM perspective should not be lost.

**The purpose of HRD**

Why should a corporate organisation attend to HRD? When all is said and done, it is about *winning* in an operational environment that is competitive. Is this saying something about an underlying value system governing the practice of HRM? Of course! Strengthening organisational capability (OD) to achieve a competitive advantage finds a simplistic parallel in strengthening individual capability (HRD) through practices that also reinforce competitive values within the organisation – pitting individual against individual, team against team, project against project, and so on. For instance, some business organisations pride themselves on applying a performance-appraisal system whereby the lowest-performing 15 per cent of staff are ‘culled’ every year (although the practice does not extend to the CEO). Supposedly, this keeps everybody on their toes. It is important to note the preoccupation with *appraising* performance rather than *enhancing* it.
Interestingly, most donor agencies that decide to invest in an HR function appoint someone from the corporate sector. When the donor insists on ‘good management’ in the NGO partner, one of the first management systems to be introduced is performance appraisal. For all its ‘participative’ and ‘transparent’ content, the performance-appraisal system remains essentially competitive. The consequences are at best dysfunctional and often disastrous.

In the NGO context, the concept of performance must go far beyond the individual, the project, and even the implementing organisation. More important, this understanding of performance has necessarily to be based on collaborative practices, nurturing a collaborative value system.

Systems science also suggests the delineation of ‘system levels of behaviour’. Just as increasing the capabilities of individuals (through training) does not lead directly to a more capable project team, so increasing the capability of a group or organisation (through OD) does not lead directly to a more capable social institution. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that capacity building at one system level (say, a single NGO or CBO or Self-Help Group) often leads to reduced collaboration at the next system level, a phenomenon known as ‘system sub-optimisation’: a gain in one sub-system at the expense of others. This happens all the time, glaringly so, in the corporate sector. But while the corporates can afford to live with it, development efforts simply cannot.

**Question:** What do the standard textbooks have to offer for enhancing performance in a collaborative way?

- At the level of individual and team performance? (HRD)
- At the level of inter-group/inter-functional performance? (OD)
- At the level of inter-organisational performance? (ID)

**Answer:** Precious little. Worse, attempts at OD in an NGO setting are often negated by the unquestioning adoption of HR practices that are, at the core, incompatible with the collaborative value premises of OD. The key words here are *values* and *compatibility.*

**The human-resource supply**

Where do people recruited to work in the development sector come from? What is the pool to draw from? Why do NGOs’ attempts at ‘scientific’ recruitment so often end in frustration?

Heads of NGOs and those long associated with the development sector will admit that the supply has diminished rapidly in the last 12 years or so. Yes, it is in a way linked to economic liberalisation. They will also admit that there are more job opportunities for today’s educated youth and, in combination with other socio-cultural transformations taking place, this has made a career in development less attractive to people in the critical age group from which the sector drew its strength in the 1970s and 1980s.

So what is the HRD task here? It is a bit like the case of a marketing manager with a new and exciting product to sell, but with a poor appreciation of how it fits in the market. *Market development* becomes a priority in itself. Applied to HRD in the development context, this means innovative manpower planning (the term includes womanpower!), reaching campuses creatively, summer projects, volunteer placements, internships, and so on, extended to more formal education/training avenues for careers in the sector.

Whose job is it to develop the market for careers in development – this peculiar combination of manpower planning, public relations, and educational innovation? Part of it can be attempted by a single NGO for itself. A good part of it also requires collaborative effort by an institutional body comprising several NGOs and related organisations. Is this a legitimate part of HRD? It certainly could be so – but not if we confine ourselves to the standard textbook.
The nature of NGO work

An NGO comes into being around a project, however broadly defined. In time, with success in the project and a reputation established, the NGO develops several projects, sometimes handled separately, sometimes clustered into programmes. The pursuit of these projects and programmes is largely conducted through funds received from donors of one kind or another. The funding is typically allocated for a specific project. Herein lies the next challenge in HRD.

A project, by definition, has a beginning and an end. Staff appointments are therefore project-based, contractual, and for specified periods. It is a purely informal understanding that a person has a place in the organisation as ‘a member of the family’. With such a heavy dependence on project funding, how does an organisation invest in HRD? Can an NGO offer long-term employment with career paths to its staff, accepting the risk of projects not coming its way in the volumes desired? If the software-development sector can function this way, are there lessons to be learned there? The critical question for the NGO is something like this: what sort of HRD can we offer, even if all staff are going to be with us only for three to five years?

The link to the previous issue of manpower planning must be obvious. There is also a link to the next challenge, concerning the evaluation of and remuneration for jobs.

The worth of jobs

Investing in HRD amounts to spending on ourselves. What is the appropriate budget for this? What norms do we follow? NGOs find decisions about spending on themselves among the most difficult. The first difficulty is how to determine appropriate salaries and benefits.

A basic discipline that has stood the test of time, weathering many HRM fashions and fads, is the Job Analysis, which breaks down into the three sub-tasks shown in Figure 3. The Job Description explains the role to be performed in any position – what is done. Job Specifications describe the person who can do that work competently – the attributes required. Job Evaluation refers to the monetary worth of the job, given the mix of role and attributes. These three components are highly interdependent; any change in one calls for changes in the other two.

If we focus on Job Evaluation, we see that an organisation’s decision about the monetary worth to apply to a job (salary, perks, growth opportunity, etc.) may be influenced by any one of three main factors, as depicted in Figure 4. Once again, it is useful to recognise that these three factors may actually be interdependent, although in practice most organisations tend to rely heavily on one, ignoring or undervaluing the other two.

The important point is that an integrated approach requires a good-sized, reliable, and frequently updated database for comparative analyses, the only basis upon which to establish norms. In the business world, data are produced by qualified institutional bodies. How can this be done for NGOs in the development sector?
The worth of people

In spending on ourselves, the questions of growth and the advancement of people within the organisation pose even tougher decisions – especially when it amounts to a performance-based reward system. Indeed, the word *reward* is troublesome in the thinking of many NGO managers and is often avoided in formal statements.

The first difficulty is seen as an ethical dilemma. When a business organisation rewards its employees, it is from funds that the organisation has *earned* for itself. In an NGO, the budgetary outlay on increases in staff salaries and benefits is made possible by *somebody else’s money*, often public money. How is this to be justified?

The second difficulty is seen as a normative one. What is an acceptable ‘overhead’ in a development programme, defined as the ratio of what is spent on ourselves to what reaches the people for whom we exist and work? What is the appropriate benchmark? UNDP? Oxfam? Missionaries of Charity? Grameen Bank?

The third difficulty is the (often unarticulated) conflict between the value of voluntarism and the value of professionalism. *Should* people expect advancement, growth, rewards, and career prospects? Many NGOs are wary of ‘reward systems’ on such grounds. Yet decisions are taken all the time that differentiate among people on the basis of their worth to the organisation, often based on performance. The bare minimum is that increments in compensation should be enough to cover increases in the cost of living. Anything more calls for decisions that go beyond arithmetic.

Role stress

There is likely to be some form of role stress, to greater or lesser extents, in all jobs, in all fields of work. It is important to recognise the nature of stress faced by the development worker and find ways to deal with it within the HR function. There appear to be at least four types of stress that form a rather unique cluster in the lives of young development workers. Not all of these are recognised. Not everybody is equipped to deal with them.

*Alienation*

There is a price to be paid by young people who choose to work in the field of development. They have family and friends who don’t quite understand it: *‘he should have studied for the civil service’; ‘she could be married into a nice family by now’; ‘look at his classmates’; ‘what sort of life is she leading?’*; and so on. Over time the young person is distanced not...
only from family and old friends, but also from the community and the larger middle-class constituency itself. ‘What do they know – and what do they care – about our development problems?’ The price to be paid for such isolation is both emotional and intellectual.

**Emotional load**

People working in the helping and healing professions experience some of the highest levels of job-related emotional stress. This may be true of development work too. The young person is plunged into a world of degrading poverty, cruelty, exploitation, and blatant injustice. One feels somewhat helpless at times, but is not expected to reveal such a feeling. One feels angry at times, but on what does one vent the anger? There is some guilt too, for one always has a safe haven to return to, a wholesome meal, a comfortable bed, even a cold beer. By day, one is the bright, analytical, competent project officer. Many a night, however, one suffers bouts of severe self-doubt and depression.

**Responsibility load**

Young people coming into development work are pitched into roles that require extraordinary levels of analytical, managerial, and relational skills, for which they have neither the training nor the life experience. They not only have to carry on, but must also project an image of themselves as knowledgeable, competent, and capable. Very soon they are also protecting that image, unfortunately an unrealistic self-concept. Overnight, one has turned into a development expert – not always on sound grounds.

**Work–life balance**

Ours not to reason why, but development workers are expected to work long hours, long weeks, long months. Working on Sundays and holidays is as common as the three-day stubble. One feels guilty finishing on time and leaving for home by 6 pm. One is expected to be seen around the place until 8 pm or even later. The development NGO often displays a dual character – apparently a caring organisation, as an NGO is supposed to be, yet demanding that staff put the development goals of the project before home and family. Burn-out can become an NGO status symbol.

There may be other stresses too, unique to a particular type of NGO work or a particular location, but the four noted above could be regarded as fairly universal. It seems useful to view the four types of stress as a cluster, because they tend to be interconnected, with the manifestations of one aggravating those of another. The manifestations are easily recognised as the classic psychosomatic syndromes – compounded by increased smoking and drinking, irritability, breakdown in relationships, isolation, dysfunctional defence mechanisms, and so on.

Whose job is it to address the problem of role stress?

**Induction**

One of the links in the HRM chain is induction. We often take a lot of time and trouble over selection procedures, seeking to appoint the very best candidate. However, selecting somebody who is presumed to be suitable for a certain kind of work and bringing that person into a productive relationship with the position are two entirely different propositions. To bridge the gap, we need another system, followed as methodically as the selection procedures.
Unfortunately, induction is the most neglected aspect of HR in most NGOs. Many NGOs are not even aware of such a procedure. Its importance is rarely recognised. When one considers the nature of work in development programmes, the manpower supply, and the types of role stress that people experience, induction may well be the HR procedure that most needs to be systematically followed in NGOs. The main features of a sound induction procedure would be the following:

- The inclusion of a ‘personal growth’ programme – i.e. life skills, inter-personal and team competencies, and communication skills.
- Roles for existing staff as mentors (including the driver, who usually knows the project areas better than anyone).
- The hard requirements of project management: the systems and procedures.
- Most important, the induction process is spread over a year – with an intensive week or ten days as a group at the start, and a shorter regrouping thereafter on a quarterly or four-monthly basis.

It is impossible to overstate the importance of the personal growth component in induction. Much of the success of an NGO comes from the maturity and relational skills of its staff. Especially significant is the critical balance to be struck between the need for empathy and the need for detachment. The induction procedure offers an excellent opportunity to get started on these relational skills, signalling the organisation’s recognition of their importance. This calls for a sensitive and imaginative HRD function.

**Work structures**

How should an NGO’s work be organised? If development workers value democratic processes, participation, empowerment, transparency, equality, and so on, how do these ideals get translated into practice and internalised? We are dealing here with the subject of *organisation structure*. The way in which work is structured determines the actual organisational processes directly and far more powerfully than do statements of intent and sentiment. The most common discrepancy in an NGO is between the periodic exhortation to engage in teamwork on the one hand, and the project structure that reinforces one-to-one reporting relationships (and competition) on the other.

Most development efforts are likely to be interdisciplinary, requiring strong interfaces across several domains of expertise, the relevant expertise being located in different project groupings. These need genuine team-based structures, with a facilitative style of leadership, rather than expert leadership. Conventional group-based structures would be unhelpful and even dysfunctional in such a situation. The term *performance management* supposedly refers to comprehensive attention to several determinants of organisational performance in a systemic way, very definitely attending to the *organisational* factors that are hampering individual and team achievement. Unfortunately, in practice, the idea is reduced to appraisal by another name. ‘Performance management’ and ‘project management’ need to be brought together in a completely different mould here. Can HRD handle this?

**Leadership and management**

Conventional management wisdom differentiates four broad levels of management function:

- Strategy
- Policy
Management control
Operational control.

In a large organisation with diversified operations, these functions are the specialised responsibility of different groups of people – from the Board to the field. What about an NGO? The logic of differentiation into the four types of management function might remain valid. However, it is likely to be the same group of project leaders, along with the founder, who will be undertaking all four types of management function. Quite a responsibility! What is the preparation for this responsibility? What kinds of institutional support exist?

The all-too-common leadership gap in many NGOs arises from the failure of the founder to involve others in handling the first three management functions – if not all four – and keeping them exclusively to herself or himself. ‘Management development’ in the organisation is typically restricted to project-management methodology. Leadership development is even more remote. A leadership team comprising a critical mass from the staff is a great need in all NGOs.

The managers that form the leadership team must also handle the HR function. Every manager should be a leader, every manager a counsellor, every manager a trainer, every manager a manager of people. How do we orient the HR discipline to accomplish this?

Security and rights

NGOs generally have a poor record of providing decent social security benefits for their staff. Legal loopholes are exploited to the full in keeping the benefits minimal. Development work being noble, staff are not expected to grumble. Women employees are often hit harder.

Consider the irony of the case. An NGO grows in stature for its commendable work in the non-organised sectors of employment – organising domestic workers, truck loaders, coolies, and casual labourers into associations to press for their basic rights to minimum wages, decent working conditions, social security, and so on. However, when the staff get together with other like-minded people to discuss working conditions in the development sector, they are firmly discouraged.

What is it about HRM that makes it so pro-management and so anti-unionisation? It tells us something about the underlying values in HRM – perhaps the very origins of HRM. Indeed, industry rewards for ‘best practice’ in HR have gone to companies that ‘successfully’ kept unionisation at bay. Is this the HRM that we want grafted on to our organisations?

The road ahead

Returning to the observation that the human resource may well be the critical variable in NGO work, we have also to contend with the reality that the substance of HRM as taught and practised in the business/industry sector is likely (at best) to be unhelpful in the non-profit development sector. At worst, it may be counterproductive.

What is the path ahead? There appear to be four tasks that demand urgent attention. They need to be viewed as four streams of work, mutually supporting, intertwined, and interdependent:

- **Curriculum development** for an alternative approach to HRM for NGOs.
- **Faculty development** for teaching, training, and dissemination of the curriculum.
- **Leadership development** to equip NGO managers to handle the HR tasks.
- **Institutional development** to support and further the work in the first three streams.
It should be possible to begin work on each of the four fronts immediately. However, an integrated view of the four streams is likely to be more beneficial than piecemeal approaches. Some initial ideas for the first and fourth streams of work are presented in brief here, based on experiences at The P&P Group.

Curriculum development

One way to begin would be to list the tasks that can be called basic to HRM – the things that need to be done in any work organisation for and with the human resource – uncoupled from the tools/techniques/methods employed to perform those tasks in a particular work context, such as an NGO. Is such a list possible? Figure 5 should help. It suggests not only the basic tasks, but also the logic by which they are integrated as a chain into the HR function; in other words, each successive task provides feedback to revise and strengthen the earlier tasks in the chain.

Next, we can reconsider the challenges posed to HRM in the NGO/development sector. We have identified ten challenges in this essay. There may be more.

We could visualise a tasks x challenges matrix. In each ‘cell’ in the matrix we may rigorously re-examine the content, process, and methodology for that task with respect to the challenge.
posed. For instance, if the first task in the chain is Job Analysis (within Manpower Planning), and the first challenge is the question of Purpose in the NGO context, addressing the question of Purpose should help to redefine Job Analysis for ourselves. When the questions from all the challenges are similarly addressed, we would have a quite different view of Job Analysis in the NGO/development sector. With all HRM tasks so re-examined, we would have a genuinely alternative view of the function for ourselves.

**Institutional development**

Like all other specialised management functions, HRM requires a minimum scale of operations for an organisation to set up its own department. Do we have a HR manager in an NGO of 20 staff members? Probably not, although the HR function is crucial for the organisation. What should we do?

Some of the HR-related tasks can be performed by the leadership team, as suggested earlier. Other tasks in the HR function are more specialised (for example, knowledge of statutory obligations), and an ‘amateur’ effort might make things more difficult for the organisation. One possible solution is for a syndicate of NGOs to set up a ‘HRM Co-operative’ to provide services, supporting it on a shared-cost basis. Indeed, this could extend to a ‘Management Services Co-operative’ in which several key management services are based for and on behalf of the member NGOs – strategic planning, job analysis, market research, and so on. Such a co-operative would be very different from a consultancy firm offering these services to the NGO sector. As we have seen, a pressing need in the NGO sector is for a reliable (and constantly updated) database for job evaluations and staffing decisions. The periodic benchmarking and inter-organisational comparative surveys needed for this may be located in such a co-operative.

For the long-term effectiveness of the HR function in the development sector, we will need to undertake a more substantial institutional development process that supports the curriculum development, faculty development, and leadership development streams of work. Such a set-up must also integrate the HR, OD, and ID efforts in the sector.

**Postscript**

One other trend in HRM in the corporate realm appears important for NGOs to note. With an increasing range of HR software suites available in the marketplace, the HR manager spends more and more time performing the HRM tasks . . . at the desktop! The explanation given is that it is an inevitable consequence of vast increases in organisational size and scale of operations. The human side of the function cannot help becoming depersonalised, perhaps even dehumanised. A good part of a physician’s success is said to lie in his or her bedside manner. Can it be very different in HR practice?

A scene from a play by Julie Bovasso (1976) seems to have been far ahead of its time.

**Scene:** The cafeteria. At the centre of the back wall is an enormous closed-circuit television projection screen. The beaming face of the President appears on the screen. An announcement.

*Hello there, ladies and gentlemen. This will be a brief message regarding April birthday people. In accordance with Company policy we are continuing to acknowledge birthdays of all our loyal employees, but there will be a slight change in the procedure. Beginning today, April 1st, all birthday people will be seen on the first day of each month, instead of the date of their birth. Will all April birthday people please form an orderly line outside my*
office this afternoon between 2 and 3 pm? There is to be no chattering on the line. Please wait in a quiet, dignified manner for your turn, arranging yourselves, graciously, according to date of birth. That is to say, April 1, 2, 3, et cetera, et cetera. If there is more than one person with a birthday on the same date, please subdivide according to alphabetical order. Which is to say, April 1: Abbot, Carter, Foster. April 2: Porter, Schwartz. April 17: Viviano, Yoho, Ziegler, et cetera, et cetera. You will then be seen by me for your congratulations in five-minute intervals. When you have received your congratulations, please leave my office, collect your birthday gift from Mrs Farrell and leave immediately. Please do not stop to chat on your way out. Just pick up your gift and report back to your Department. Birthday gifts are not to be opened until 3 o’clock coffee break. Thank you. And happy birthday.
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Notes

1. The P&P Group is a management resource centre with specialised interest and experience in Organisation and Institutional Development. It has been a privilege to have been invited in this capacity to advise a number of education and training institutions. The following observations are based on these interactions, backed by the experience over many years of assisting NGOs and development programmes in their organisational development processes.
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