An Introduction to

Social
EQUITY
Audit

A Charter on Social Equity Audit

The occurrence of social exclusion and discrimination even in the best of relief and rehabilitation as evidenced in tsunami or other development

interventions is a matter of serious concern. Ironically it often gets strengthened during these interventions. Development programmes

governmental or non-governmental, that address the issues of social exclusion in terms of caste, ethnicity, class, gender, age, religion, occupation or anything else, have seen it surfacing in one form or an other.

However perennial or pervasive social exclusion is, it is certainly containable and reducible and can be eliminated in programs and projects aimed at social equity and inclusion because it is human-made.

A consciously planned critical analysis of any initiative including its organisational values, vision, mission, structure and staffing, program design, allocating resources, and functioning from an equity perspective is a way out to progressive social inclusion.

The need of the hour is political will, increased stake holding of marginalized sections and people's vigilance.

We hold that

social exclusion and discrimination in any form, anywhere is against human dignity and values.

Hence, every excluded, marginalised and discriminated group/community and individual's human rights in any situation needs to be upheld.

We recognise

social inclusion is a structural issue and therefore does not automatically happen but has to be carefully planned, comprehensively designed and sensitively executed.

>>>>>>

An Introduction to
Social EQUITY Audit

Social Equity Audit Secretariat
A-11, Niti Bagh, New Delhi 110 049, India
123, Sterling Towers, Sterling Road, Nungambakkam, Chennai,600 034, Tamil Nadu, India

An introduction to Social Equity Audit

PART II: Social Equity Audit:
A practical, hands-on guide

Part III: Annexures

Core Group

Amitabh Behar, Director, National Centre for Advocacy Studies (NCAS), Pune

Anand Kumar, Programme Officer, Christian Aid

Annie Namala, Development Consultant

Belinda Bennet, India Country Representative, Christian Aid

Manuel Alphonse, Director, Social Watch, Tamilnadu, Chennai

Prakash Louis, Director, Bihar Social Institute, Patna

Sandhya Venkateshwaran, Director, Advocacy Unit, CARE India

Sruti Mahopatra, Director, SWABHIMAN, Bhubaneswar

Sushila Zeitlyn, Senior Social Development Adviser, DFID

Tom Thomas, Chief Executive, Praxis-Institute for Participatory Practices, Delhi

Xavier Arockiasamy, National Coordinator, SEA

Preface

As the title suggests, this book is about social equity - the quality of being fair, just and inclusive. The only difficulty is that this is easier said than done, especially in a world where exclusion is the norm. It runs rife in everyone's daily life and we take on the role of perpetrators or victims as the situation commands. In a society that is deeply hierarchical, it is not surprising that people tend to form exclusive groups at every level possible - based on caste, class, education, language, ethnicity, etc. in an attempt to stand out from the other. Exclusions are so omnipresent that we have internalised most of them and fail to recognise them in our personal or professional lives. This book is an attempt at helping us identify and understand exclusions in our professional work.

This book contains a framework and set of tools that help to hold a mirror up to us to show forms and levels of exclusion that might exist in the work that we do. The chapters that follow will guide you through the context, the conceptual underpinnings and the practical steps involved in conducting a social equity audit. Even though a sequential reading of the chapters is recommended, if you are familiar with the context and the concepts behind this exercise, you could flip forward to the practical guide.

Given that the scope and aim of the book are well explained in the following chapters, it is best to shed some light on the making of the social equity audit as a tool in this preface. It all began when reports of exclusion started pouring in from different parts of India in the aftermath of the tsunami that hit the south-eastern Indian coast in December 2004. These prompted many professionals engaged in 'development work' to sit up and think about ways of making themselves more accountable to ensure that development interventions do not fall prey to exclusive tendencies that dominate society at large.

Having tried and tested this tool in the context of emergencies, it is now important to move towards making it a tool applicable in other contexts as well. It will also be important to make a planning version of this tool so that it can be used as a 'pre' as well as 'post facto' tool. The challenge is also to make it a self-administrable tool so that it becomes an organic function of all developmental interventions as opposed to an externally administered tool. Given the commitment and the energy of all those who are associated with this process, it is a highly achievable proposition. As more organisations join in, it is bound to make this an even more relevant and useful tool in ensuring fair, just and inclusive development for all.

Tom Thomas

1. Why take up a Social Equity Audit?

Social Exclusion

Social exclusion, understood as the 'processes by which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society in which they live', adds value to our understanding of poverty and deprivation of individuals and social groups by focusing on their causative and relational aspects. While Rene Lenoir (1974) coined the term to primarily describe individuals who seemed to fall outside the welfare system of the State, the term in our context has greater relevance to social groups that are discriminated against and prevented from participating wholly or partially in the social, economic, cultural and political spheres of our society. The exclusion is a reflection of the power relationship between various social groups and is based on common group characteristics such as gender, age, caste, ethnicity, class, ability or other, more specific, ones.

> *"I would be in favour of retaining the concept of social policy analysis for a number of reasons. First it captures an important dimension of the experience of certain groups of being 'set apart' or 'locked out' of participation in social life. Secondly a focus on the processes of exclusion is a useful way to think about social policy because it draws attention to the production of disadvantage through the active dynamic of social interaction rather than through the anonymous processes of impoverishment and marginalisation"* [1]

The concept of social exclusion has the added value of expanding our understanding of poverty beyond its indicators to its causes, which are

---

[1] Kabeer, N. *Social Exclusion, Poverty and Discrimination: Towards an Analytical Framework.* IDS Bulletin, Vol.31, No.4. October 2000

more structural and institutional. Social exclusion also helps us focus on the relationship between various social groups where majority/ dominant sections prevent access to, and benefit sharing of, social and economic goods by other social groups. The process of exclusion is embedded in and perpetuated through social institutions. They affect and impact multiple spheres of the life of the affected persons and groups, resulting in multiple deprivations, inequality and poverty among the excluded groups. These institutions and norms are maintained by social sanctions and by punitive measures against those who violate them. The institutions, being older than developmental interventions, have a tendency to accrue value and benefit to the powerful sections and to exclude those whom the programme proposes to benefit most. In this context, understanding the dynamics of social exclusion can help us progressively design development interventions that are less patronising and more egalitarian, based on the principles of human dignity and worth.

Amartya Sen[2] has clarified various dimensions of social exclusion. Social exclusion can be, both, forced exclusions through partial inclusion, and inclusion on discriminatory terms to forced inclusions. Each of these requires distinct attention owing to their negative impact in the long run. State policies and social norms could actively promote and perpetuate social exclusion which one can term 'active exclusion'. Often, social exclusion is an inadvertent outcome of existing policies and norms (passive exclusion) necessitating sensitive study and analysis of marginalised communities to recognise the manifestations and impact. This particular form of exclusion may be a constituent part of social exclusion, like segregated housing colonies, and could also have instrumental value in causing further exclusion, such as segregated housing limiting access to natural resources or cultural participation. Social exclusion is thus a dynamic process that reinvents itself in changing contexts.

Social exclusion and discrimination have particular relevance in societies that are built on watertight, strict and hierarchical social stratifications

such as caste, race or descent based occupations. Such societies are governed by strict norms that decide social interface, economic access, and occupations and learning, cultural practices and participation in decision making of various sections of the population. These norms set the limits of participation and prohibit exchanges across the different sections, thereby impinging on the fundamental rights and dignity of individuals and groups. Social exclusion needs also to be understood in local contextual practices, in macro global and market processes, and in religious and traditional beliefs that shape our worldview, language, culture and the socio-economic fabric in which we operate.

Our present modes of social ordering, whether formal or informal, from the government to communities to religions and families, international, national and grassroots NGOs and other groups, have structural or attitudinal biases and blind spots that make them overlook social exclusions at community and macro level. Though social exclusions are all- pervasive, age-old and complex, they are surmountable and can be wiped out provided there is the political will to do so. Reason for such a belief is rooted in the understanding that such exclusions are not predestined, but are human-made and an affront to human dignity and personhood.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Art.2. Para (1) sets the global framework for inclusion and non-discrimination: *"Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."*

One also finds a number of Constitutional provisions that stress on equality, prohibition of untouchability, prohibition to practise caste discrimination, as well as protective and promotional measures to overcome the historical disabilities and deprivations thrust upon social groups such as Dalits in India.

Greater knowledge of the social exclusion process on the ground will, therefore, help to develop appropriate strategies to map/understand/ combat exclusion. The recognition and acknowledgement of a larger framework is imperative to address social exclusions at the programme and community levels relevantly and realistically. Any pro-active and

[2] Sen, A. *Social Exclusion: Concept, Apllication and Scrutiny.* Office of the Environment and Socail Development, Asian Development Bank. June 2000

affirmative effort or measure to enable the most vulnerable section or sections within a social group or community in any given context of social exclusion and discrimination to move towards inclusion is part of the struggle for equity and social justice. The Social Equity Audit has evolved as a tool and process in this context.

Tsunami context

The urgency for addressing the question of social exclusion and discrimination were the many reports of exclusion or marginalisation of Dalits, tribals, minorities, women-headed families and other social categories in relief and rehabilitation measures in the wake of the tsunami in 2004. The earlier experiences in disaster situations like the Gujarat earthquake (2001) and Orissa floods (2001) had already triggered the debate among development thinkers, service and human rights organisations.

The relief efforts after the tsunami highlighted the fact that despite high levels of awareness, good intentions, adequate resources and accepted standards and principles of relief operations as being universal and non-discriminatory, the marginalised and most vulnerable repeatedly fall by the wayside when operationalising programmes. These sections are not counted for adequate relief and rehabilitation. When they are counted, they are given leftover, substandard, and sporadic relief and are most often left out of substantive rehabilitation measures.

Property-centric rehabilitation measures as against livelihood and need-based rehabilitation measures ensures that marginalised communities do not qualify for rehabilitation as they have not lost anything, not having had any property to lose in the first place. In many cases they were actively prohibited and prevented from accessing services and benefits by civil society as the tsunami was understood to have affected only the fishing community at first, and the social frame is that fishing is a caste-based occupation. Hence it is not possible to think of other communities as being engaged in any fishing-related activity.

In the context of stark reports of exclusion both across coastal communities and within coastal communities in tsunami relief and rehabilitation, the issue was taken up by a group of organisations and

individuals for further enquiry and to develop a methodology that can understand and address it. Carrying on 'business as usual' was found to be insufficient to correct the thinking and operation behind processes of exclusion and discrimination; unfortunately this is the widely accepted view that many of us in the development sector and in the upper levels of bureaucracy have to deal with.

The concept and development of the Social Equity Audit (SEA) arose from the realisation of the need for a systematic enquiry into processes of exclusion, and evolving strategies to address the same in emergency relief as well as developmental interventions. From this would come an increased understanding about exclusion and discrimination, sharing best practices in social inclusion and expanding the consensus among development organisations and the State.

The role of SEA

Most often, organisations take on specific mandates and focus their attention on addressing them through designing necessary programmes. The intention is to implement the programmes efficiently and effectively. For various reasons organisations get identified with specific social groups as 'beneficiary groups'. In identity-based social structures and systems, cutting across the existing social barriers does not happen in the natural course of events for both development actors and community groups. SEA helps identify excluded stakeholder groups and the barriers that keep them out. It helps the organisation to take necessary inclusive steps both within its own set-up and in designing the programme and implementing it. Within the organisation, SEA would help identify the absence or lack of equity representation and participation of excluded social groups like Dalits, tribals and women in various decision-making and executive bodies in the organisation. It also helps focus attention on the lack of participation or equity benefit sharing by marginalised groups in the programmes. SEA particularly recognises the exclusionary nature of caste-based discrimination in the NGO context and to address it in the organisational structure, systems, policies and programmes.

SEA, as mentioned before, has evolved in the context of disaster relief and rehabilitation programmes. As a professional and participatory tool it can:

- Help us better understand the root causes and the processes of social exclusion and discrimination in the social and community context.
- Ensure that recovery programmes increase accountability and social inclusion.
- Pro-actively address issues of social exclusion and negative discrimination affecting the poorest as well as other marginalised communities.
- Facilitate analysis of complex social and economic relations affecting the poorest and the marginalised.
- Assess how the principles of non-discrimination and inclusion are operational in the organisation as a whole: in its vision-mission statements, organisational structure, strategies and decision-making processes.
- Collectively engage in creating appropriate design of programmes to unearth ongoing social exclusion and discrimination.
- Help the organisation identify best practices and blind spots regarding inclusion, for instance in the staffing pattern.
- Provide social equity audit capacity to assess the programme's effectiveness in prioritising the poorest and most marginalised in interventions and ensuring responsiveness and accountability to the marginalised.
- Share lessons learned to enhance quality of future development work as well as emergency relief and rehabilitation work with the poorest and most marginalised.
- Engage in only those programmes that will reduce patronage and change power relations between individuals, households and communities, the State, corporates etc. and avoid social exclusion and discrimination against weaker and poorer categories based on social origin, caste, class, gender etc.
- As a learning process, SEA is always open to adopting appropriate tools from other existing systems of enquiry and audit and evolving new ones according to the exigencies of the situation.

Exclusion within excluded sections

SEA is rigorous and dynamic enough to help address exclusions within excluded sections also. When an organisation works with recognised socially excluded groups, one takes it for granted that issues of social exclusion and discrimination are being adequately addressed. However, the social system has produced several layers of social exclusion and such processes are a reality even within so-called excluded groups. The different Dalit communities or Adivasi communities maintain internal hierarchies and exclusionary mechanisms. 'Dalits' are not homogenous. For instance, one of the 'lowest' Dalit castes is the Arundhatiyar. In just one district of Tamil Nadu, they are divided into eight sub castes. Similarly, another category, the Pariah, has nine different groups. All of them are stratified.

In addition, the complex and multi-dimensional nature of exclusion is further evident in women, the young and the old, and the physically and mentally challenged within any particular social group where the intersectional forces of exclusion are particularly operational.

SEA would help analyse whether the programme actually covers all the Dalits:
- Castes and sub-castes, or only one section of them
- Age groups: children, adolescents, and senior citizens
- Gender: gay, male, bisexual, transsexual, female, lesbian.

It would also help track the reach of the programme in terms of
- Coverage
- Membership
- Per capita benefit
- Leadership opportunity

In the case of an organisation working with women, SEA can facilitate the organisation to look at internal structures and processes as well as programme design from an equity angle. Women, again, are not a homogenous social group; stratification based on caste, ethnicity and class is obvious among women. SEA could, in addition, help focus attention on different types of social exclusion that women face: at

different stages of their life (age based), depending on their marital status (widows have a especially difficult time) and ability (physically or mentally challenged).

Inclusion does not 'just happen'. It has to be carefully planned, comprehensively designed and sensitively executed. It needs to be an intrinsic part of the programme, not an optional add-on. 'Development', without a careful nurturing of participation and equity, results in the consolidation of prejudice, stratification and social exclusion rather than the reverse.

2. What is a Social Equity Audit?

The *Social Equity Audit* is an open, voluntary and learning process to enable organisations to progress systematically towards inclusion and equity in their programming and institutional development.

The Social Equity Audit (SEA) is, at once, both professional and political. These two basic objectives of SEA are crucial and non-negotiable. SEA would always be professional in that it would maintain globally accepted standards of professional identification of processes, patterns and structures of social exclusion. It would be political to enable organisations and communities to effectively move from exclusivist to more inclusive approaches and processes.

SEA is a *value-based approach*, looking at development though the lens of the most vulnerable, the most powerless and the most helpless and to enquire if the development effort is really reaching them. The inclusion of these 'excluded' people in development, and eradication of discrimination against them, is central to equity concerns. This would mean empowering the vulnerable and changing power relations.

It is a *process* that is organisation-friendly and transparent, but not a fault-finding or policing exercise. SEA will not condone any gaps found, nor does it condemn any lapse. It is a rigorous process that is professional and supportive at the same time, based on mutual respect, an openness to learn, and an understanding of the difficult field circumstances.

The SEA process would be participatory. It would be facilitative and not extractive. All those who have a significant stake in service delivery will be actively involved throughout the audit, from the initial stages of design to implementing community-led solutions.

It is a *proactive tool* to understand and address structural, organisational and strategic constraints and bottlenecks that prevent or limit marginalised and vulnerable communities from equitable participation and benefit sharing in development programmes.

It supports the organisation to design and implement programmes to internationally accepted standards of inclusion and equity. It enables the organisation to ensure the participation of vulnerable communities and inclusion in its:

- Organisational structure
- Process
- Delivery
- Decision making

The following basic beliefs and assumptions guided the development of SEA:

- Social exclusion can be systematically countered, despite its macro links. The 'larger framework'—structural causes—cannot be excuses to ignore the social exclusions at the programme and community levels.
- Increasing the participation of excluded social groups in both decision-making and benefit sharing is the means to development, social justice and communal harmony.
- Formal and informal structures and institutions of the state and civil society have structural/attitudinal biases that make them overlook social exclusions.

- Increased knowledge of the social exclusion process will help develop appropriate strategies for inclusive interventions.
- Communities have an inalienable right to their means of livelihood. This cannot be compromised under any pretext—security, tourism, protection or anything else.
- Being a voluntary process, the organisation will own the findings. This could translate into actual implementation rather than a defensive response as does sometimes happen.
- The goals are set based on the organisation's vision and mission. It gives the organisation the space to change at a self-determined pace, if it does want to be inclusive. Being organisation-friendly, it provides the necessary support for such inclusion.
- Emphasis on inclusion being win-win (and demonstrably so) would help surmount mental barriers, and building capacity would help put in place the necessary skill-sets for 'inclusion by design'.

A SEA is intended to focus on system and programme content, rather than on individuals or organisations. However, the prejudices of individuals that has led to social exclusion will be taken into consideration and addressed. Inadvertent social exclusion and negative findings can be framed as a starting point for improvement. Findings will be constructive rather than judgmental. SEA enables social inclusion and accountability from (and to) all stakeholders and participants in development programmes.

The SEA process needs to move beyond being an 'audit' to developing strategic and programme planning tools for inclusion and equity. This framework has been developed with a primary focus at the grassroots level. A longer-term goal is to extend the use of SEA to other levels and contexts and use by a variety of stakeholders. SEA will be used as a tool to enhance government services accountable to the community.

3. A short history

The context

The tsunami of 26 December 2004, triggered by a massive undersea earthquake of magnitude 9 on the Richter scale near the northern island of Sumatra off Indonesia, left over 200,000 people dead, many more homeless and livelihoods destroyed in South East Asia. The killer waves devastated the coastal areas of Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and parts of Puducherry in India.

The destruction caused by the tsunami was immense. A significant number of the victims were peasants and from small-scale, artisan, traditional, beach-based, labour-intensive fishing communities, living in marginalised socio-economic conditions. The effect on their lives, property and livelihood was unprecedented. Unprecedented also was the response from within and outside India. The state and central governments, and their agencies, did their best in the immediate rescue and relief operations.

More devastating than the natural disaster were the discriminatory practices and deep-rooted biases that determined the nature and scope of relief and rehabilitation. The theory that common adversity brings about solidarity was thoroughly debunked with many of the affected refusing either to be under the same roof with the Dalits or drink water with them *even on day one* of the disaster.

As the days proceeded, there were also reports of women, widows and women-headed families being denied access to relief and rehabilitation. Those who are physically challenged in most cases suffer severe discrimination, which was further aggravated in the post tsunami phase. These sections were not counted for adequate relief and rehabilitation. Even when counted, they were neglected or extended leftover and substandard relief. In many cases, men and patriarchal structures actively prohibited and prevented them from accessing services and benefits extended to tsunami victims by civil society.

Many groups that were working for development and human rights, saw to their dismay that the disaster brought out some of the worst forms of discrimination though there was immense assistance from the community to the relief process.

The initial findings

Fact finding missions undertaken by human rights defenders only served to confirm their worst fears. In the post tsunami relief and rehabilitation phase, the following social groups were found to experience social exclusion and discrimination.

- The Dalit and indigenous communities in the coastal area
- Women (specially girls and young women, single women, widows and women-headed families)
- Children
- Elderly people
- Minorities (ethnic, linguistic and religious)
- People with disabilities, the differently-abled and those with special needs
- Inland people
- Labourers and traders who were dependent on those sectors which are affected by calamities
- Others in specific situations
- Farmers and agriculture-dependent communities who were affected considerably due to damage to standing crops, loss of livestock, salinity, sand and mud casting of their land, and meagre compensation given for damage as well as land reclamation.

The initiative

Recognising the size and scale of the disaster and the depth of programming required to recover, sustain, empower and create social equity, there was concern amongst local communities and activists whether the relief and reconstruction efforts would be inclusive.

Discussions were initiated involving many stakeholders, civil society groups and development thinkers. The discussions sought to explore

whether those involved in tsunami relief and rehabilitation interventions would be willing to accept advisory support on issues of social exclusion and develop an independent SEA capacity for post tsunami rehabilitation programmes.

The objective was to ensure that recovery programmes increase accountability and social inclusion by proactively addressing issues of social exclusion and negative discrimination affecting the poorest as well as the other marginalised communities in the post tsunami relief and rehabilitation phase. It is not just about including the poorest, but also preventing social exclusion of the entire artisanal coastal community within a larger context of social equity.

This process of social equity auditing has arisen out of:

- Concern of human rights defenders about discrimination in relief and rehabilitation.

- Civil society response to local communities' concern that NGO intervention should address social exclusion.

- Development of platforms of local NGOs seeking to ensure social inclusion

- INGOs' (international non-government organisations) concern to apply the internationally accepted SPHERE standards.

These strands came together through participatory meetings held in Chennai and technical meetings held in Delhi for the production of a draft framework. It has also been informed by concerns expressed by those active in the various platforms and meetings held in Chennai and the affected districts. It was a real opportunity for local advocacy groups operating effectively in Tamil Nadu, in response to the tsunami, to influence national processes and future programming.

Consultations across a wide spectrum of people from bilateral agencies, INGOs, NGOs and activists across the country agreed upon the need for a systematic enquiry into processes of social exclusion. There was broad agreement on the need to evolve strategies to address social exclusion in emergency relief as well as developmental interventions. It was expected that the process would increase understanding about social

exclusion and discrimination, share best practices in social inclusion and expand the consensus among development organisations and the State for social equity audits in development interventions.

Designing the tool

In July 2005 began the process of meeting with organisations to explain the purpose of the audit: the why, what, where and how. It was a time to develop internal collective understanding of the process with all the organisations involved in the SEA.

A pilot audit was done for the tsunami programme of Church Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA), Chennai, in August 2005. The lessons fed into the process, and in November 2005, a handpicked group of potential auditors were called for a consultation and training.

Subsequently, there was a second round of training and consultation in March 2006. Working collectively, the SEA process and mechanism were fleshed out.

The first full–fledged SEA was done in March 2006 on the request of People's Action for Rural Awakening (PARA) and Dalit Bahujan Shramik Union (DBSU), for Punarnirmaan, their joint tsunami response programme. The next audits were in April 2006 on the request of Women's Collective and Social Need Education and Human Awareness (SNEHA). The third round of SEAs were done on the request of CARE India and Society for Education, Village Action and Improvement (SEVAI), in July 2006 for their tsunami programmes.

Refining the tool was, and continues to be, an interactive process. Each audit feeds into the learnings, which in turn are incorporated into subsequent SEAs.

Ensuring diversity in scope, application and testing

The tsunami context helped to fashion and sharpen the tool that can be used by individuals and institutions—government and non-government, international and local. The broad framework of SEA ensures diversity of application of SEA and ensures that it can be applied in virtually any situation and for organisations with diverse focus areas and reach.

SEA was successfully tested with a range of organisations with specific reference to tsunami intervention. Among the organisations that underwent the SEA process are one INGO (CARE India), one national organisation (CASA), two Dalit focussed organisations (PARA and DBSU), one women focussed organisation (Women's Collective) and one fisher folk focussed organisation (SNEHA). Two had long-term presence in the area (SNEHA, SEVAI), two started their intervention in the area after the tsunami (CARE India, Women's Collective). One had considerable experience in emergency relief (CARE India) while others learnt on the run. They had varying geographical reach and spread (global to local), and diverse budgets. Some followed the human rights based approach, some others the development approach and yet others a combination of these.

The framework has been developed to focus primarily on impact at the grassroots level: on how the development intervention impacts on the most excluded. A longer-term goal is to extend the use of SEA to other levels, contexts, and use by a variety of stakeholders. SEA seeks to make government services accountable to the community.

Auditing the audit

A review was held in Chennai on 16 August 2006. The core group, secretariat, and representatives from the audited organisations and the auditors did the review. The audit experience, the gaps in the process, methodology and framework were discussed and the feedback was incorporated into the SEA process.

It was decided that the tool was now robust enough and tested enough to be made public.

The present status

SEA was tested extensively and applied in the context of the post-tsunami recovery process with a range of organisations. If equity can be built into an emergency programme, then it certainly can be built into a development programme in non-emergency situations. It can be adapted to other rehabilitation and development social issues.

The process is now open, and any organisation can request a Social Equity Audit for itself.

4. Lessons learnt after phase I

The SEA process has been exciting and educative. It has seen the evolution of a robust tool to ensure inclusion. Conscious application of a participatory methodology at every stage promoted a learning atmosphere for all concerned. It also ensured the development of a robust tool to examine the presence or absence of inclusion in a given context and in a friendly manner.

SEA is both rigorous and organisation–friendly. It is an 'audit' in its original sense, meaning 'to listen'. Unfortunately, audit has now come to mean fault–finding, as opposed to learning. The term audit is used in SEA and in this book in its original sense of 'listen and learn'.

There has been considerable feedback telling us that more people would be willing to do an SEA if the name was less threatening. Though essentially it is a learning exercise, it is a professional tool based on equity standards and critical enquiry. The term is used to indicate the rigour and professional standards followed.

Lessons in inclusion

The key finding is that inclusion is not only feasible, but also possible even in emergency situations. It validates our position that inclusion by design in development is well within human competence. It just requires organisational commitment at the highest levels—often referred to as 'political will'.

Inclusion needs an active engagement. By being passive, the unjust status quo will be perpetuated—and one is not being 'neutral', but on the side of injustice and social exclusion. Sometimes this social exclusion is unconscious, but oftentimes it is by design; the reluctance to be inclusive is due to ingrained bias of caste, gender, religion or class etc.

No project is 'perfect' or 'ideal' in inclusion. There is always scope for improvement, provided planners consciously create space for progressive inclusion.

Attitudinal

Prejudice against Dalits and Adivasis is still very pervasive, unfortunately even within the development sector.

Effective implementing of inclusion requires creating an institutional culture for inclusiveness. It needs to be practised within the organisation in all its functional areas as well as in programmes.

Programmatic

Though organisations use inclusive terms and terminology in their vision and mission statements, the values depicted by them are often not internalised and institutionalised through policies, structures, mechanisms and practices.

Organisations may include vulnerable communities in their constituency, but this seldom translates into inclusion. That their programmes do not lead to strengthening and empowering the vulnerable communities in the socio-political realm shows the absence of a conscious effort on the part of the project holders. Participation of communities in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation is, therefore, a pre-requisite for the promotion of inclusion.

The desire to achieve the project objectives could cause social exclusions. Rules and procedures for selecting beneficiaries can also cause different forms of social exclusion.

The development notion of 'beneficiary contribution', particularly when it comes to financial contribution in a larger project like housing, has a greater chance   of excluding the poor and the marginalised.

Organisational

Openness to change and commitment to the cause of social equity from the chief functionary is a pre-requisite for an effective SEA process. Active top management support is essential for the success of an audit, especially if it is to be a process, and the suggestions are to be implemented. The policies of the organisation need to be inclusive, such as recruitment policy with regard to affirmative actions in favour of vulnerable communities.

Staff recruitment and training are important functions to concentrate on. However, orientation and training of staff and leaders of community-based organisations (CBOs) on equity principles is not part of the regular agenda.

Disaggregated data on staff based upon religion, caste, gender and ability, with their functions, is an important indicator to know how the organisation addresses social exclusion in its staff and their functions, but it is not readily available.

SEA process

Preparation

Visiting the organisation a month in advance helps prepare the organisation for a friendly and mutual learning process. It also helps to give the organisational persons the framework for collating data and giving the relevant information.

The chief functionaries of organisations understand the significance of the audit process better when the secretariat personnel appraise them about the process and the method.

Pre-audit research and guidelines help in understanding the organisation and ensures that the process of auditing goes smoothly.

Considerable time has to be spent in the preparatory process. The organisation must be sent an introductory note on the SEA purpose and process. A general introduction to SEA as a process may also help in understanding it better. Sending the framework alone does not seem to be the best means.

Another important task during the preparatory stage is the careful articulation of the indicators, to trace social exclusion in the given programme as that would provide the auditors the necessary detail and information.

Language

Translating the concept paper and using the local language is very important. The concept paper in the local language helps wider understanding of the SEA process even before the audit. Knowledge

of the local language is imperative; at least one member of the team should be fluent in the local language.

Pre-audit meeting

The responsibilities of the planned tasks and scheduled programme should be shared among the team members. Some of the responsibilities include:

- Facilitation
- Process documentation
- Data collection

These should be decided at the pre-audit meeting of auditors. While the composition of the team would give an understanding of each other, explicit agreements would remove any ambiguity and foreclose chances of surprises.

New formats for data collection suited to the organisation need to be developed and given to the organisation, based on the information provided to the secretariat.

Entrance and exit conferences

The entrance and exit conferences as outlined in the framework are helpful to set the tone of the SEA as well as to clarify and have a shared understanding of the insights. Meticulous planning for the entrance conference with the methodology and content will help focus the discussions and create an atmosphere of learning. An open mindset is necessary for successful conclusion of the entrance conference.

Getting the list of board members and senior staff who will participate in the entrance conference in advance shows the seriousness of the exercise. Otherwise, whoever is available at the time of the entrance conference will be made to attend.

The exit conference helps validate data, and helps the organisation get a 'preview' of the final report. It is as important as the entrance conference. It is the last time that the entire organisation and SEA teams will meet in the course of the audit. Therefore, sufficient time (at least three hours) should be given to the exit conference, to make the best possible use of the time.

Schedule and sampling

The organisational personnel present in the session for sampling and scheduling must be told about the rationale behind the purposive sampling, and the process must be done with the contribution of all present. Working out a proposed schedule in advance and finalising the same with the organisational personnel saves time.

Data collection

The organisation may not have data and information based on the principle of equity. Disaggregated data as per social groups is not usually maintained. The organisation may be able to collate it from existing data or gather it from the field team. Such a process needs time and has to be built into the preparatory process. Developing formats will help to put together the data.

- The SEA team has to prepare a list of documents and formats for data capture from the organisation and hand it over to the SEA secretariat.
- Similarly, the team needs to customise the format for collection of data. The SEA secretariat has to coordinate with the NGO in getting these documents and data.
- After getting the documents and data formats, a one-day visit to the organisation to fill the gaps in the data and documentation is often required. The auditors have to analyse the data and documents and evolve a plan of work for their auditing. This can be worked out through the internet.
- Formats need to be devised such that the data captures the nuances.
- Even after getting the data, there may still be gaps and these need to be filled progressively even as the audit process is on.
- Apart from Focused Group Discussions (FGD), and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques, specific individual interviews with the stakeholders (disaggregated) and a range of other tools can be used.
- There needs to be a focus on the indicators of social exclusion. This then becomes the information that auditors can look for. A checklist will help.
- The current framework focuses on the bare minimum.

Field visit

The field visits are a vital part of the SEA process and must be done even for support organisations such as INGOs and donors. They help give a wider picture of the organisation and its programmes. The field visits have to be made and then discussed taking the organisation into confidence and keeping in mind that SEA is not an evaluation of the work, but an enquiry into the dynamics of social exclusion and its impact.

Field visits will help in assessing both ongoing programmes as well as earlier interventions such as relief. In the case of the latter one could use the recall method.

Intensive preparation is needed for every field visit. The programme and field staff in charge of the village must be met with and all relevant information must be collected. Field visits and interactions must be decided together with the organisation to ensure coverage of the maximum number of variables: the schedule, the organisational team, the places to be covered, persons to be interviewed, groups and leadership being met, villages selected for field visits and the focus groups for discussions.

Living with the affected people for some time will help in understanding and bringing out the internal dynamics and process of social exclusion. However, time could be a constraint.

Apart from the demographic details, disaggregated data on the village, the number of NGOs present, and their activities, the intervention of the organisation, the number of CBOs, category of people, PRA tools etc must be collected and studied.

Coordination during audit

The first day of the SEA field visit should be used to plan the time schedule and the methodology to be used. The formats and material needed should be kept ready.

Each auditor can play a specific role apart from enquiry and interaction, which is common to all. One can look for data and information from the secondary and primary sources, the second one can facilitate community and other group interactions, and the third can document the process and take down the minutes of the meetings.

Audit team meetings in the morning for planning, and in the evening, after the work is over, for recording and reviewing, will help to fill up the gaps, to reflect together, document the process, take note of the details and findings and frame critical enquiries as well as choose appropriate tools and plan further.

Data analysis

Analysing implementation vis-à-vis plan in terms of activities, budget and deviation are important. The analysis needs to factor in the difficulties and concerns expressed by the field team as well as the organisation's leaders.

Training of SE Auditors

Auditors need to possess skill sets and enabling attitudes with a blend of professionalism and equity perspective. They need thorough orientation and awareness of the emergency (tsunami in this context).

The emergency context will be a priority, though the auditor will be made familiar with the pre-emergency context and livelihood, issues regarding social exclusion raised in the particular context, general trends in responding to the context, programmes being implemented and government policies.

They would need a similar orientation on the different social groups that get excluded: ways of social exclusion, its manifestation and its impact on human rights and development issues.

The training should include a process to help auditors reflect on their own attitudes and behaviour and what they should be sensitive to.

A generic decision and understanding of the type of suitable methodologies during the training will also help.

5. Joining the SEA process

Being a rather 'young' process, SEA is dynamic and is in an exciting stage of its development. More people and organisations are welcome to be part of this process. Organisations could undertake a SEA for their own organisation, while individuals could become SEA auditors.

The auditor's attributes

- Integrity
- Proven credibility
- Professionalism
- Fairness
- Interpersonal skills
- Commitment towards diversity principles and social inclusion
- Understanding of social exclusion
- Willingness to learn
- Respect for the beliefs and viewpoints of others

Auditor's competencies and skills

- Facilitation skills (community and team)
- Communication skills (English writing and spoken local language)
- Analytical skills and ability to distill key learning experiences and connect smaller pieces with larger pictures
- Leadership skills (including planning, control and recording of audit)
- Understanding of issues around social exclusion
- Experience in working with, or on, issues of excluded sections such as fisherfolk, Dalits, indigenous people, women, children, relief and rehabilitation and larger development issues
- Audit experience (social/systems audit or conventional performance audits)
- Experience in research (desk/qualitative research)
- Experience in PRA will be added advantage.

Undertaking a Social Equity Audit

Organisations can undertake a Social Equity Audit for themselves by following the steps outlined in the following section, or by contacting the SEA secretariat.

PART II:

Social Equity Audit:
A practical, hands-on guide

1. An overview

Doing a SEA requires will, commitment and skills. This section has the simple operational steps, sufficiently detailed for a do-it-yourself.

The SEA is a process to promote equity and inclusion. It must not be seen as a one-off event. Several audit cycles are usually needed to measure impact and progress over time, and to focus planning efforts where they can be most effective.

Areas audited

- Vision, mission and policies
- Programme strategies
- Programme implementation
- Monitoring and evaluation systems
- Budget allocation/utilisation
- Organisation structure
- Organisation systems/ processes
- Beneficiary participation in project cycle.

Methodology

SEA uses a variety of methods. Both qualitative and quantitative methodology is used. With the community, Focus Group Discussions (FGD), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) are used. Desk study and data scan are an integral part of SEA.

Since the universe for sampling is small and the purpose of the audit is to reach out to all social groups that are susceptible to exclusion and discrimination, purposive (maximum variance) sampling would be appropriate. If necessary, further exploration could be done using stratified random.

All methods used should seek to get verifiable data. The auditor liaises with the organisation and designs, coordinates, analyses and documents the information collected during the process. This is to ensure that the SEA process is participatory and fully owned by the organisation.

The audit team

The audit team would normally consist of three auditors with multi-disciplinary skills. At least one of them will be a woman, and at least one will have community facilitation skills to meet the community, establish rapport and elicit response to the questions.

Minimum information required

The success of SEA depends, in large measure, on the completeness of the information provided to the auditors. The 'completeness' of the information refers to all relevant information being made available. Care needs to be taken to ensure that information does not add to an overload, which could be the case if extraneous information is provided.

The following are the minimum requirement in terms of background information from the organisation:

- Vision/mission statements
- Plans and budgets documents
- Organogram and staff structure (including the governance structure)
- Policy documents: staff policy, gender policy, policies on inclusion, etc
- Disaggregated data on the staff
- Programme areas and geographical coverage and its demographic profile
- Annual reports of the past two years, including budget realisation
- Reports and other documents specific to the particular programme, including budget realisation
- Reports of any Organisational Development Process undertaken
- Minutes of meetings: board, staff, community, network meetings
- History and timeline of the organisation
- Any other information as required.

The appropriate background material is sent to the SEA secretariat by the commissioning organisation. At the earliest, the audit can start only two weeks after the information reaches the SEA secretariat.

Stakeholders required for interactions

Primary Stakeholders

- Organisation:
- The board and key functionaries of the society/trust
- Senior team members
- Field team
- Programme team
- Community.

Different groups (for instance in the tsunami context: fisherfolk, Dalits, vendors, trawler labourers, minorities, agriculturists, etc.)

- Intra group - women, widows, elderly, children, disabled
- Community based organisations that are promoted by the organisation
- Traditional panchayat members.

Secondary stakeholders

- Government agencies working in the area/on the issues
- Other NGOs working in the area/on the issues
- Elected panchayat leaders
- Religious institutions - if applicable
- Other interested civil society groups (in the tsunami context, those that responded to tsunami - youth groups, cultural groups)
- School teachers.

The costs

The Memorandum of Undertanding (MoU) between the chief of the organisation and the SEA coordinator will include a schedule of payments, and a detailed line-item budget. The audit has the following costs:

- 29 person days of audit facilitation
- Travel for auditors to and from the organisation and its field area(s)
- Local travel, boarding and lodging for three auditors for nine days (one day pre-audit; five days audit; three days joint report writing)
- Computers for three days during the joint report writing
- Report production costs.

These are indicative costs, which could vary depending on the scale of the organisation.

The Timeframe and Responsibilities

From the time of signing the MoU, an SEA takes about two months. This schedule is short enough to keep the momentum going and the interest high, and long enough to internalise the process.

It is important to note that the SEA process, being voluntary and participatory, can start only after sufficient background information is provided and the audit team has sufficient time to familiarise themselves with it. On doing so, the SEA team would customise the formats, as explained under the pre-audit section below, for the organisation before their visit.

Sl. No.	Activity	Time frame	Persons Responsible
1	**Pre-audit**		
1.1	Orientation on SEA to the commissioned organisation and signing of MOU with	One month before the audit begins	SEA Coordinator and the Chief of the the organisation
1.2	Documents to the secretariat	15 days before the start of the audit	Chief of Organisation
1.3	Documents to be sent to the auditors	10 days before the start of the audit	SEA Coordinator
1.4	Pre-audit research	Prior to audit commencement	Audit Team
1.5	Pre-audit planning session	Previous day of the audit	Audit Team

Sl. No.	Activity	Time frame	Persons Responsible
2	**On site interactions (audit)**	**5 days**	**Chief of the Orgnisation and Audit Team leader**
2.1	Entrance conference	Day 1 of audit	Chief of the Organisation and Audit Team leader
2.2	Field visits	3 subsequent days	Chief of the Organisation and Audit Team leader
2.3	Exit conference	Day 5 of the audit	Chief of the Organisation and Audit Team leader
3	**Audit report**		
3.1	Report writing as team	3 days immediately after audit	Audit Team leader
3.2	First draft to the organisation/ secretariat - all formats to be filled, key questions addressed and report completed in the required format	Within 10 days after the exit conference	Audit Team leader
3.3	Response to the draft to the audit team leader	Within 15 days after the receipt of the draft report	Chief of the Organisation
3.4	Final report to be sent to the secretariat - a soft copy and 2 hard copies along with the documents and reports of the organisation collected for the audit	Within 5 days after getting the response from the organisation.	Audit Team leader

2. The audit process

The audit is done in the following stages:

Stage 1 : Introduction
Stage 2 : Pre-audit research and planning
Stage 3 : Pre-audit meeting of the SEA team
Stage 4 : Entrance conference
Stage 5 : Audit
Stage 6 : Exit conference
Stage 7 : Audit report
Stage 8 : Follow-up

Stage 1: Introduction

The SEA secretariat and the commissioning organisation work together to assess the SEA needs of the organisation. A secretariat personnel visits the organisation to introduce the SEA process to the key organisation personnel, explains to them the information needed and discusses the logistics. This is the starting point for the whole audit process. The team of auditors is constituted and the MoU is signed between the organisation and the secretariat and between the auditors and the secretariat.

The MoU has the following:
- Objectives of SEA
- Scope of the audit
- List of documents required for the audit
- Responsibilities of the commissioning organisation
- Responsibilities of the secretariat
- Time schedule
- Costs
- Conflict resolution mechanism

Stage 2: Pre-audit research and planning
- The documents and reports are collected from the organisation and sent to the auditors.
- The auditors review and familiarise themselves with the documents to understand the background and functioning of the organisation
- The auditors prepare briefs about various documents
- · They identify the areas for enquiry

Stage 3: Pre-audit meeting of the SEA team

The SEA team would meet for a day before the audit. It is an occasion for each member to present his/her understanding, reflection on the background materials perused.

The following tasks are undertaken during the meeting:
- Arriving at a description of project/summary of evaluation of records
- Customising the tools, formats and tables
- Evolving project specific data collection tables and key questions, if need be
- Developing specific audit checklist
- Working out provisional sampling
- Tentative time schedule
- List of people to be interviewed
- List of groups to be met
- List of other stake holders to be interviewed
- Preparing for Entrance conference
- Dividing the task
- Facilitation
- Process documentation
- Data collection

Stage 4: Entrance conference

The entrance conference is a key step in the process. It ensures that the audit is participatory and a mutual learning process right from the outset.

The purpose of the entrance conference is to:
- Set the tone of the audit
- Discuss apprehensions if any

- Clarify the why, what, where and how of SEA
- Develop internal collective understanding of the process with the organisation
- Identify the gaps in the data provided
- Identify the areas to be audited
- Clarify the programme objectives and the activities undertaken to achieve them
- Prepare a stakeholder map of the organisation and identify the key stakeholders
- Determine the scope of the SEA
- Finalise the indicators which will allow performance to be assessed
- Identify what existing records and data can be used
- Decide what new, additional data will be collected and how
- The customised data formats would be given out so that the appropriate data can be collected
- The sampling of people and places to be visited would be finalised
- Finalisation of schedule, logistics.

With the greater understanding of the SEA process, the whole team of the commissioning organisation can give quality input on the data required: areas to be audited, time required for preparation and optimum sampling for understanding the organisation and programme best.

Stage 5: Audit

- The audit is for five days.

- The appropriate data forms need to be filled in (entrance conference, exit conference, each meeting).

Interactions

The SEA team would meet with as wide a section of stakeholders as possible and feasible. They would also interact with representatives from the board and key functionary senior team members and programme team.

The audit team would participate in some planning-monitoring meetings if feasible.

The interaction would be both as groups and as individuals. Different methodologies would be used to facilitate better understanding and information generation.

Field visits

The field visits are an indispensable component of the audit process.

They need to be planned to cover maximum number of variables through purposive sampling.

Field visits allow interaction with community members covered by the programme, and also with community organisations promoted by the organisation.

The meeting with the community is important for validation of perceptions. Meeting community representatives will suffice, if they are a representative cross-section of the community and community organisations.

In keeping with our knowledge of social exclusion and the section that has potential to be excluded, the field interactions should also include interaction with those who may have been left out–this is a sensitive matter for the organisation/community and needs to be discussed with them and sensitively handled.

Stage 6: Exit conference

The exit conference will be on the last day of the audit. The exit conference should be of at least three hours duration to be meaningful At the exit conference the auditors will share the preliminary findings and recommendations with the commissioning organisation. There will be clarifications, and factual errors can be corrected. The data will be validated. The views of all stakeholders will be elicited.

The discussion would cover the following specifically, to ensure the continued relevance of the programme:

- Sharing of the perceptions and feedback of the community
- Review of vision, mission and policies in the light of the audit findings
- Suggestion of proactive measures, possible alternatives and improvement areas for inclusion and equity
- Difficulties encountered in information collection process and the suggestions for improvement
- Congruence between objectives and strategies? Make sure that community programmes justify their existence
- Feedback of the organisation stakeholders on SEA process. See if the stakeholders are benefiting from the audit exercise.

Stage 7: Audit report

A draft report will be submitted to the organisation within 10 days of the exit conference.

The response of the organisation to the draft report is expected within 15 days. It could contain clarifications, and a plan of action to address the recommendations.

The final report will be sent within five days of getting the comments from the organisation, correcting any factual errors and incorporating the comments.

The finalisation of the report by the auditors:

- This is an important step in the audit process that requires looking through all the data, discussions and documents before finalising the report

- The audit team should meet together after the exit conference to finalise the audit findings.

  The meeting should also be used to capture all un-captured data (verbal data, anecdotes, things that have not been written down and are still in the mind, detailing of cryptic notes that might have been taken during various exercises, meetings, etc.)

- Any internal disagreements to any of the findings/ observations should be captured with explanations/ rationale for such differences

- The responses to points of disagreement by the organisation should be examined and auditor's responses (collective or individual) noted down

- Should also detail the disagreements with the organisation – for example, some disagreements the auditor might actually agree with and accordingly change his/her finding whereas some others the auditor might not agree with while noting the organisation's disagreement. It is important to note down how each point of disagreement has been dealt with to ensure complete transparency of the process.

Stage 8: Follow-up

The commissioning organisation should use the recommendations in their programming, systems and structures.

Ideally, there should be at least one follow-up visit by the SEA team after six months or one year. Several audit cycles are usually needed to measure impact and progress over time, and to focus planning efforts where they can be most effective.

3. The report framework

Preamble

The preamble would explain the context and the purpose of undertaking the SEA. It will include the intention and rationale of the audit process and highlight the appropriate international standards in relation to social equity auditing, as for instance the SPHERE standards for disaster situation.

Profile of organisation

A brief introduction of the commissioning organisation's vision-mission-goals and background will be presented. This will be linked with the inclusion, equity and social exclusion issues. The organisation's approach to social reconstruction work will be gathered. An analysis and understanding of issues related and possible options for interventions by the organisation and the actual response made by the organisation will form part of this section.

Context of the community

The context of the community or the area under audit will be presented in this section. Some of the areas highlighted will be social groups affected by disaster, gender issues, power structure, socio-economic structure, livelihood issues, political economy of the region and social structure.

Audit findings and recommendations

This section will include the organisation's interventions in terms of its own policies, structures, programme designs, implementation, review structures, budget allocations and possible future impact. A separate section on 'gender audit' findings will help engender the programmes.

Organisation's response

Before the report is finalised, each organisation will be requested to send its response to the draft audit report and then the final draft will be prepared.

Future plans

From the responses to the SEA report, the organisation will be requested to present their plan to address the various issues raised in the report.

The final report

The final SEA report will include the organisation's final statement provided it is sent within the time-frame set.

4. Key questions

As SEA is a professional tool, every audit would cover specified areas that are encapsulated in the 'key questions'.

The questions in the next section were the 'key questions' during the first phase of the SEA process, when it was entwined with the tsunami recovery process.

When a SEA is done in a non-tsunami context, the questions would be different, but the basic thrust would be the same.

Each of the key questions has a data collection format, and a suggested methodology for data collection. This is to ensure that data collection is participatory, has maximum authenticity, is objective and independently verifiable.

The SEA process works best when there is at least a basic minimum paper trail. It is suggested that the organisation prepare policy papers on inclusion (gender, staff, Dalit etc) if they don't already have them, or update/revise the existing ones before the audit.

Disaggregated data, to the degree required, is seldom available with the organisation. Presence of such data is a strong indicator that the organisation is aware of social exclusion and being inclusive. Though it is likely that the data required for the audit is available with the organisation, it is best to collect it in the format suggested for easy analysis. Though seemingly simple, it does take time to fill them up.

The SEA process has a strong qualitative and quantitative element. The data tables help make the process transparent. Though the data might be available with the organisation, organising it into tables makes analysis simpler, and makes it easier to identify the gaps in inclusion.

Table 1 (Overview)

Table I is required for all the key questions. It gives a brief snapshot of the community, the organisation, the CBOs and the programmes promoted by the organisation. In each of these, it explores whether the historically and socially excluded are being included.

Within the organisation, do the traditionally excluded castes find a place? If so, at what levels, in what roles and with what salaries? In the programmes, how many single women find a place in the CBOs? And within the CBOs, how many women benefit from the programme, and how many of them are leaders?

Each of these questions is gone into in much more depth in the later tables. For instance, 'caste' itself would be disaggregated sub-caste wise and gender- and age-wise. The degree of customisation would depend on the extent that the organisation is already cognisant of social exclusion and addresses it.

In Table I, the broad outlines are laid out and tracked according to their vulnerability or social exclusion, such as gender and caste. Many more exclusions could be added, depending on the organisation's expertise and area of work. For instance, groups working with migrants may like to add cross-border migrants as a vulnerable category.

Table I								
		Gender	Caste	Disability [mental]	Disability [Physical]	Age	Religion	…
NGO	Staff Pattern							
	Board members							
CBOs	Leadership							
	Membership							
	Beneficiaries							
	Number who take decisions on budget							
	Number who take decisions on actual budget allocation							
	Number of those who take decisions on utilisation							
Society	Leadership							
	Benefits							

Explanatory notes:

This table needs to be filled in with as much detail as possible with data that the organisation already has, or can access. All tables can be filled in by the organisation even without the auditors.

How many men and women are employed in the organisation? How many are disabled? How many are senior citizens? What is the diversity profile according to religion and caste? Even for a 'women's organisation', the questions could be further disaggregated: are the staff predominantly married women or single women? Are those more vulnerable such as widows and divorcees and those with HIV/AIDS, included? Are women from different castes and religions included? The same can be checked with the programme and the CBOs.

The pattern of society is also included as a tracking indicator so that it can be compared to the structures in the space created by the organisation.

Note: We have used the terms 'disability' and 'widows'. There are many other, better, politically correct words such as 'differently-abled', and 'people with special needs' and 'single women'. However, when we sent out the tables using such terminology, it was difficult for some organisations to understand. Those using the tables and formats would need to be sensitive in the use of terminology, and change them according to local sensibilities.

1. To whom does the coast belong?

The question needs to be answered from the perspective of the

- Commissioning organisation
- People and community and
- The SEA team.

Suggested methodology: FGD in combination with transect walk, social and resource mapping, occupation mapping.

Data collection format: Table II

Table II: Who owns the coast

Users	Purpose	No.%	Accessibility		Affected	Assertion of rights
			Free	Conditional		

Explanatory notes:

User: Who are the people who use the coast? (fisherfolk, tourists)

Purpose: For what purpose do they need it? (eg: keeping boats, morning walk…)

Number/percentage: How many are there and/or what percentage of users are they?

Accessibility (free or conditional): Do they have free or conditional access to the coast? Do they need a licence or a permit?

Affected: How were they affected by the tsunami?

Assertion of rights: How should their rights be defined and secured?

2. Who amongst them were affected?

Suggested methodology: FGD in combination with social mapping with Venn Diagram.

Data collection format: Table III

Table III: Coverage

Sl. No	Social exclusion	Total in village		Total covered		CBO Leadership	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
1	Population						
2	Women headed households						
3	Widow/Single						

4	Children							
	a	0-6 years						
	b	7-12 years						
	c	13-18						
	d							
5	Senior citizens							
6	Religion							
	a	...						
	b	...						
7	Caste							
	a	...						
	b	...						
	c	...						
8	(Dis)Ability							
	a	Mental						
	b	Physical						
9	Economic status							
	a	Rich						
	b	Poor						
	c	Medium						
10	Any other							

Explanatory notes:

Table III goes a little deeper than Table I.

The organisation will have to define its own criteria of economic status.

Table IV: Coverage

Sl No.		Sub population group	Nature of impact	Extent of impact	NGO's intervention	Does it match with requirement
	Internal	Fisherfolk				
		Dalit				
		Agriculture (other castes)				

	Intra	Women			
		Elderly			
		Children			
		Disabled			
	Extra	Tourist			
		Pilgrims			

Explanatory notes:

Table IV goes a little deeper into the programme coverage. It looks at what was the impact of the tsunami on each section, assesses their needs, and checks whether the NGO response matches their needs.

Internal: Those who use the coast for livelihood.

Intra: Within fisherfolk, are the women, elderly and children covered?

Extra: These are the 'external' people, who come to the coast for non-livelihood purposes such as tourism and pilgrimages.

Nature of impact: How did the tsunami affect each section?

Extent of impact: How severe was the impact?

Table V: Coverage budget

	Budget	Relief	Rehab	Total	% of Total
Fishing Community	Men				
	Women				
	Children				
	Disabled				
Dalits	Men				
	Women				
	Children				
	Disabled				
Adivasi	Men				
	Women				
	Children				
	Disabled				
Agriculture community					

Table VI: Budget realisation

	Budget	Relief	Rehab	Total	% of Total
Fishing Community Men					
Women					
Children					
Disabled					
Dalits Men					
Women					
Children					
Disabled					

Explanatory notes:

Tables V and VI provide a snapshot of the budget allocation and realisation. It is an extension of gender budgeting.

Table V gives details of the plan—the intentions—of how much is raised, or proposed to be raised, for each section.

Table VI gives details of the actual utilisation of the budget—how much is spent for each section. This table is necessary for various reasons. The planned budget could be changed due to the rapidly changing circumstances or operational requirements.

The realisation should also include the other groups as in budget allocation.

Table VII: Structure

Structure	Fisherfolk		Dalit		Women		Children		Mental Disability		Physical Disability	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Governance												
Trust/ governing board												
General body												
Advisory body												
Senior Staff Programme												
Administration												

Junior Staff Programme					
Administration					
Other decision making bodies					

Explanatory notes:

Other decision-making bodies could be the Committee Against Sexual Harassment (CASH), the grievances committee, the disciplinary committee etc.

These are bodies created by the organisation. Once formed, they would provide a clear indication of how inclusive the organisation is in the structures it creates.

Table VIIIa: Profile of Partners

Name	Pre-tsunami			Post-tsunami				Criteria for selection of NGO	Whether partner prior to tsunami? Y/N	Long or short term support	Any prior experience with tsunami communities or with emergencies in general?
	(A) Geographic area of coverage	(B) Thematic focus	(C) Total budget outlay	(A)	(B) Tsunami budget		(C)				

Table VIIIb: Disaggregated total budget of partners

Sl No.	Name of partner	Total budget	Women (general)	Women (single/ widow/ separated/ abandoned)	Children	Dalits	Fisherfolk	Disabled	Other occupa tional groups

Explanatory notes:

Tables VIIIa and VIIIb are for INGOs/Donors

Does the partner profile reflect inclusion and diversity?

How many are women-headed organisations?

How many are Dalit-headed organisations?

Is there a pattern in the budgetary support provided to such groups?

How focussed is the organisation?

How equitably is the budget allotted?

3. Is the organisation cognisant of issues of social exclusion?

Suggested methodology: Venn Diagram and Pair wise ranking.

(If the answer is no, skip the following questions. However, that would be an extremely rare situation.)

a. **Has the understanding of social exclusion been translated into programme strategies?**

Suggested methodology, data collection: Secondary data and FGD.

- Process of identifying project measures - the beneficiaries - project design.
- Did the organisation address the issues of social exclusion in the relief work?

b. **Has the understanding of social exclusion been institutionalised - systems, staff knowledge, monitoring and evaluation, etc?**

- Include demographic details
- Experiences and learning of the organisation
- Was the organisation open and move towards inclusive programmes?
- Where there review meetings? What were the corrections?
- What are the reporting systems?
- Is there a change in the thinking and policy? What are the indicators? What is the plan for implementing these changes?
- Which are the other NGOs and civil society groups working for the excluded people (see Table X).

c. Has the understanding of social exclusion translated into practice at the field level?

Suggested methodology: Individual interviews (CBOs, NGOs, Community)

Data collection format: (see Table III)

d. Does the structure reflect it?

Data collection format: Tables VII, IX a, IX b.

Table IXa: Particulars of staff employed

Sl.No.	Name	Age	Sex	Qualification	Designation	Number of committees/ decision making bodies the staff is member of.	Salary or grade. In case of grade, fill table III b as well	Experience	Years in the organisation	Social exclusions (gender, caste, single woman, physical/mental disability...) if orgn. doesn't provide this info, collect III c from individuals

Table IXb: Grades and Salaries

SI No	Grade	Lower Limit	Upper Limit
1	A		
2	B		
3	C		
4	D		
5	E		
6	F		
7	G		
8	H		
9	I		
10	Consultants		
11	Others		
12	Others 2		

Explanatory notes:

This format (IXb) was specifically developed when an organisation was reluctant to share information about staff salaries. Therefore the upper and lower limit for each grade was requested.

Table IXc: Vulnerabilities
(Please do not write your name)

SI No		
1	Grade	
2	Sex	
3	Age	
4	Are you disabled/ handicapped:	
4.1	Physical	
4.2	Psychosocial	
5	Religion	
6	Caste/Community	
6.1	ST	
6.2	SC	
6.3	OBC	
6.4	FC	
6.5	Others	

Explanatory notes:

This format (IXc) was specifically developed when an organisation was reluctant to share the social profile of the staff especially their caste. Therefore this was given to each staff on the condition of anonymity.

e. Do communities/ clients have control over decisions?

Role of communities in implementing and evaluation

Involvement of beneficiaries in rehabilitation process: have inbuilt systems been developed?

Table X Fund flow table

S.No	Name of the Agency	Receipts	Programmes	Name of the Villages	Focus Groups

Explanatory notes:

Name of agency: The donor / supporting agency.
Receipts: How much money was received, and for which programme?
Focus group: The core constituency in that village

f. Are the programmes in line with community/ client requirements/ priorities?

What is the role of communities in designing, planning and implementing the programmes?

g. What are the difficulties encountered in the implementation?

h. Are we missing the wood for the trees?

When monitoring specific forms of exclusion, we must be realistic about the organisation's competing interests in addressing its core constituency. We must understand and acknowledge that specific forms of marginalisation, discrimination, and exclusion must be placed within the larger context of marginalisation of the community as a whole. In the process of building a cohesive community, the organisation may need to take tough decisions as to the priority and pace of change that can ensure community cohesion as well as social justice.

5. Formats

Name of the Project   : _____

Project Holder   : _____

Area of operation   : _____

Audit team   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

PRE AUDIT RESEARCH

1.   List of documents received & reviewed:
(date received __/__/____)

    i)

    ii)

    iii)

2. Project fact sheet:

Tsunami programme start date:	
Tsunami Programme-in-charge:	
No. of villages covered	
No. of families/ population covered	
Resource support agencies	
Total tsunami programme exp. up to __/__/___	

3.   Description of salient features of the project:

4.   Description of any specific areas that need to be looked into:

5.   Any other issues/ remarks:

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Date of meeting   : _____

Place of meeting   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature)   : _____

Date   : _____

ENTRANCE CONFERENCE MINUTES

1. Agenda:

2. Members attending:

3. Key discussion/ decisions:

Endorsement by project representative – name and Signature:	

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Audit noting no.   : _____

Area of visit   : _____

Date/ time of visit   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

AUDIT NOTINGS & FINDINGS

1. Key area(s) of enquiry:

    i)

    ii)

    iii)

2. List of participating persons/ groups or list of documents (if secondary data research):

    i)

    ii)

    iii)

3. Description of methodologies:

4. Facilitated by:

5. Key findings:

6. Description of any differing views:

7. Remarks, if any:

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Date of meeting   : _____

Place of meeting   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

EXIT CONFERENCE MINUTES

1. Agenda:

2. Members attending:

3. Key discussion/ decisions:

4. Key suggestions/ follow up points (mutually agreed):

5. Points of disagreement, if any:

Endorsement by project representative – name and Signature:	

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

AUDIT FINALISATION NOTES

1. List of team members:
    i)
    ii)
    iii)

2. Description of any internal disagreements:

3. Description of any disagreements by the NGO:

4. Auditors response to the disagreements by NGO:

5. Description of how disagreements by NGO have been reflected:

7. Remarks, if any:

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Annexure no.   : _____

Relating to which audit noting? : _____

Number of pages   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

AUDIT ANNEXURES

Description of annexure (please attach separate cover sheets for each annexure):

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

AUDIT / PROJECT TEAM DETAILS

Names and contact details of audit team:

Names and contact details of key project functionaries:

Names and contact details of key community members:

Name(s) and contact details of SEA secretariat person responsible:

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Dates of visit   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

AUDITORS' LEARNING/ SUGGESTIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS

(List Key Learning/ suggestions/ recommendations)

a) Methodology:

b) Process:

c) Logistics:

d) Any other:

Name of the Project   : _____

Audit no.   : _____

Prepared by (name and signature) : _____

Date   : _____

NOTES ON SAMPLING

1. Method used:

2. List of the variances used:

3. Rationale for the variances used:

4. List of villages visited:

5. Maximum variances that are available from the villages selected:

6. To how many of these variances where you able to reach out?

PART III:

Annexures

1. Model MoU

MOU with XXX, for undertaking Social Equity Audit

Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between XXX and the SEA Secretariat to undertake a SEA of XXX, the commissioning organisation (Organisation) from / / /

Part I – Introduction

1.   SEA

SEA is a tool to understand and address structural, organisational and strategic constraints and bottlenecks that prevent/limit marginalised and vulnerable communities from equal participation and benefit sharing in development programmes towards more inclusive and equity based development interventions.

SEA was initiated because a greater understanding of the root causes and the processes of social exclusion and discrimination was necessary to ensure that recovery programmes increase accountability and social inclusion by pro-actively addressing issues of social exclusion and negative discrimination affecting the poorest as well as other marginalised communities.

The SEA process is to ensure that the emergency response as well as development programmes proactively include the most marginalised and vulnerable in specific contexts, reducing patronage and enhancing participation and power-sharing across communities, making development real and meaningful to those excluded on the basis of social origin, caste, gender, age, religion or occupation.

2.   Objectives of SEA

- Ensure that recovery programmes increase accountability and social inclusion.
- Pro-actively address issues of social exclusion and negative discrimination affecting the poorest as well as other marginalised communities.
- Assess how the principles of non-discrimination and inclusion are operational in the organisation as a whole: in its vision-mission statements, organisational structure, strategies and decision-making processes.
- . Facilitate analysis of complex social and economic relations affecting the poorest and the marginalised.
- . Collectively engage in creating appropriate design of programmes to unearth ongoing social exclusion and discrimination.

- . Provide social equity audit capacity to assess programme effectiveness in prioritising the poorest and most marginalised in interventions and ensuring responsiveness and accountability to the marginalised.
- Share lessons learned to enhance quality of future development work as well as emergency relief and rehabilitation work with the poorest and most marginalised.
- Engage in only those programmes that will reduce patronage and change power relations between individuals, households and communities, the State, corporates etc. and avoid social exclusion and discrimination against weaker and poorer categories based on social origin, caste, class, gender etc.

3. Scope of SEA

Justice, dignity and human rights are integral to development organisations and interventions. Inclusion and equity especially of the vulnerable and marginalised sections begins with the vision-mission of the organisation, is reflected in organisational structure and flows through the strategies and implementation. Hence the SEA process would be an attempt to understand and assess how the principles of non-discrimination and inclusion are operational in the organisation as a whole–in its vision-mission statements, organisational structure, strategies and decision-making, participatory processes and delivery mechanism

4. Principles of SEA

- A social equity audit is an open, voluntary and learning process to help an organisation move towards inclusion.
- The process is organization-friendly and transparent, but not a fault-finding or policing exercise. SEA will not condone any gaps found, nor does it condemn any lapse.
- It is a rigorous process that is professional and supportive at the same time. It is based on mutual respect, an openness to learn, and an understanding of the difficult field circumstances.
- The social equity audit in a community would be a participatory process. It would be facilitative and not extractive. All those who have a significant stake in service delivery will be actively involved throughout the audit, from the initial stages of design to implementing community-led solutions.
- A social equity audit is intended to focus on systems and programme content, rather than on individuals.

Part II: SEA of the Organisation

1. Audit Preparation

The audit preparation begins with an engagement with potential organisations for undertaking social equity audits in their organisations. It provides a time for the organisation to discuss the matter internally and make ready the necessary documents and data to help the auditors facilitate a process of enquiry and reflection on issues of social equity and inclusion.

Documents to be provided by the organisation -

Vision / mission statements.

Plans and budgets documents

Organogram and staff structure (including the governance structure)

Policy documents: staff policy, gender policy, policies on inclusion, etc

Disaggregated data on the staff

Programme areas and geographical coverage and its demographic profile

Annual reports of the past two years, including budget realisation

Reports and other documents specific to the particular programme, including budget realisation

Reports of any OD process undertaken

Minutes of meetings: board, staff, community, network meetings

History and timeline of the organisation

Any other information as required.

2. Audit Process

The audit process involves:

- Entrance conference
- Interaction with representatives from the board and key functionary
- Interaction with senior staff members
- Participation in some planning-monitoring meetings if feasible
- Interaction with programme staff
- Field visits and interaction with community members to tsunami programme implementation
- Interaction with community based organisations if promoted by the organisation

- Exit conference
- Feedback from organisation on the draft report
- Finalisation of the report.

3. Audit team

The audit team would consist of three members including the team leader.

4. Audit time-frame

Sl. No.	Activity	Time frame	Date	Persons Responsible
1	**Pre-audit**			
1.1	Orientation on SEA to the commissioned organisation and signing of MOU with the organisation	One month before the audit begins		SEA Coordinator and the Chief of the organisation
1.2	Documents to the secretariat	15 days before the start of the audit		Chief of organisation
1.3	Documents to be sentto the auditors	10 days before the start of the audit		SEA Coordinator
1.4	Pre- audit research	Prior to audit commencement		Audit team
1.5	Pre-audit Planning Session	Previous day of the audit		Audit team
2	**On site interactions (audit)**	**5 days**		**Chief of the organisation and Audit Team leader**
2.1	Entrance Conference	Day 1 of audit		Chief of the organisation and Audit Team leader
2.2	Field Visits	3 subsequent days		Chief of the organisation and Audit Team leader
2.3	Exit conference	Day 5 of the audit		Chief of the organisation and audit team leader

3	Audit report			
3.1	Report writing as team	3 days immediately after audit		Audit Team leader
3.2	First draft to the organisation/ secre-tariat - all formats to be filled, key questions addressed and report completed in the required format	Within 10 days after the exit conference		Audit Team leader
3.3	Response to the draft to the audit team leader	Within 15 days after the receipt of the draft report		Chief of the organisation
3.4	Final report to be sent to the secretariat - a soft copy and 2 hard copies along with the documents and reports of the organisation collected for the audit	Within 5 days after getting the response from the organisation		Audit team leader

5. Report finalisation

The SE audit report prepared by the audit team will be shared by the team leader with the organisation for their feedback to be given within a one-week period. The final report incorporating the feedback from the organisation will be submitted to the secretariat as well as the organisation. It will also be made available to the donor organisations supporting the organisation if requested.

6. Financial resources

The SEA, being a voluntary process, is commissioned by the organisation itself. The cost of the audit in terms of resource fee for auditors, expenses on field visits, travel, accommodation during audit time and other incidentals would be met by the commissioning organisation. This would be facilitated by the SEA secretariat. A tentative budget is attached. Each member of the audit team would be paid resource fees for 9 days @ Rs.3000/ per day. The Team Leader would be paid for 11 days for additional responsibilities.

Part III Responsibilities

SEA Secretariat

The SEA secretariat shall be responsible for the over all coordination of the audit. This will include:

1. Overall logistics
2. Drawing up schedules
3. Selection of personnel/team members
4. Adherence to the agreed time frames by all
5. Ensure compliance of the audit team to the agreed process steps and formats
6. Ensure accepted standard in the final report
7. Will be the first stop in resolving differences of opinion, and if not, inform the core group.

Commissioning Organisation

The commissioning organisation shall be responsible for:

1. Visit logistics (including accommodation, local travel, field trips, work material, photographic facility and work space). Work material (flip charts, black/white boards, markers)
2. Make arrangements for collective report writing (accommodation and computers)
3. Administration of the budget
4. Adherence to agreed timelines for providing information and comments on the draft and final report.

Audit team leader

1. Ensure coordination between the audit team and the organisation during the visit
2. Ensure compliance of the audit team to the agreed process steps and formats
3. Ensure professional work ethos both intra-team and with the organisation
4. Adhere to the code of conduct
5. Inform the secretariat in case of any need
6. Timely completion of the draft and final report.

Audit team members

Adhere to the code of conduct, which includes adherence to agreed schedules and an empathetic but professional work ethic.

SEA Core group

Reference will be made to the core group in case of any irresolvable dispute or differences of opinion within the team, between the team and the commissioning organisation or between any of the above with the secretariat. They shall be the final arbitrators.

Part IV

This MoU is arrived at in consultations between the commissioning organisation and the SEA secretariat. Any modification to the above should be done in consultation with each other. In case of any difference of opinion the conflict resolving mechanism in the SEA framework can be called into service.

XXX
Chief functionary,
Commissioning organisation

XXX
SEA Coordinator
Date

Annexures

1. A tentative budget
2. Self-regulatory code of conduct for auditors

2. Conflict resolution mechanisms for the audit process

1. Conflicts can be between auditors and the organisation or between the auditors themselves or between auditors and the SEA secretariat.

2. Should any conflict arise, the following is the suggested course of action:

   - First call is the Team Leader's.

   - If Team Leader cannot resolve, or is involved, then the SEA secretariat assesses the situation and takes a call (with or without assistance from the Core Group).

   - If the secretariat cannot resolve the problem, or is involved, then send to Core Group (assumed that this would be in exceptional situations)

3. Fundamental reference point would be the code of conduct and ToR in assessing and resolving conflicts.

3. Auditors' code of conduct

The self-regulatory code of conduct for auditors was developed by the auditors together with the core group and the secretariat, consistent with SEA being a value based process, with global standards and professional conduct.

Organisational
The entire SEA process is to be organisation-friendly and supportive:
- Maintain honesty and transparency with the organisation
- Emphasise that equity is a win-win situation
- Build on commonalities of interest, vision and priorities between the organisation and the SEA team, however few these may be
- Build rapport with the organisation.

Attitudinal
- **The SEA will be conducted with mutual respect and in a spirit of mutual learning**
- Maintain mutual respect within the SEA team, the organisation and all stakeholders
- Respect and value people's time
- Be non-judgmental in transactions, but maintain pro-poor bias
- No condemnation and no condoning.

Professional
- Maintain discretion/confidentiality
- Adhere to the agreed set of standards, formats, questions (as a minimum – can add on, if necessary)
- Back up all statements with data
- Commit and adhere to timeframes
- Commit to the process
- Auditors to present a common face
- Avoid conflict with beneficiaries
- Handle conflict situations with maturity

4. Audited organisations

Social equity audits were conducted for the following organisations (in chronological order)

CASA (Pilot, NGO)
Church Auxiliary for Social Action

Contact Person: Sheela Jones
Contact Details: 4, Church Road, Vepery, Chennai,
                     Tamil Nadu, India-600007
                     Mobile:+91.98.4005.0132
                     Email: casa@md4.vsnl.net.in
                     Website: www.casa-india.org

PARA (NGO, Dalit focus)
People's Action for Rural Awakening

The tsunami response programme 'Punarnirmaan' is a joint programme of PARA and Dalit Bahujan Shramik Union (DBSU)

Contact Person: Fr Thomas Pallithanam

Contact Details: Assumption Church Compound,
                     Pezzonipeta-Poornanandapeta,
                     Vijayawada, Krishna Street,
                     Andhra Pradesh, India-520003.
                     Ph.0866-2579495
                     Mobile: +91.98.4903.6260
                     Email: rmy_thomas1@sancharnet.in
                     punarnirmaan@gmail.com

Women's Collective (NGO, women focus)
Contact Person: Sheelu Francis
Contact Details: E 53,1 5th Street, II Cross, Periar Nagar,
                     Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India-600082.
                     Ph.044-25501257, 25505853
                     Mobile:+91.94.4401.5851
                     Email:sheelu1@vsnl.com
                     Website: womencollective.org

SNEHA (NGO, fisherfolk focus)
Social Need Education and Human Awareness

Contact Person: Jesurathinam
Contact Details: No.30, Karyankudichetty Street, Velipalayam,
                     Nagapattinam, Tamil Nadu, India -611 001
                     Ph.04365-247241, 248622
                     Mobile: +91.94.4314.8907
                     Email: jesurethinam_c@rediffmail.com

CARE India (INGO)
Contact Person: R N Mohanthy
Contact Details: 27, Velachery Road, Velachery,
                     Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India-600042
                     Ph: +91-44-55143770/71, 22448221
                     Fax:+91-44-22447592
                     Mobile: +91.98.4042.2409
                     Email: rnmohanty@careindiatn.org
                     Website:www.careindia.org

SEVAI (NGO, Community Focus)
Society for Education, Village Action and Improvement

Contact Person: Dr K Govindaraju
Contact Details: 133, Karur Main Road, Allur,
                     Thirupalli District, Tamil Nadu, India-620101.
                     Ph.0431-2685227
                     Fax: 0431-2685227
                     Mobile: +91.94.4315.6731
                     Email: try_sevai@airtelbroadband.in
                     karai_sevai@sancharnet.in
                     Website: www.sevai.org

5. Process calendar

2004
December

26   Earthquake of magnitude 9 on the Richter scale rocks Indonesia. The consequent Tsunami travels through the Bay of Bengal, Indian Ocean and Arabian Sea, devastates areas up to East Africa.

2005
March

28   The first draft of the framework shared with the core group.

April

01   Core group's response to the first draft of the framework.

25   Advisory group and core group meetings.

30   Finalisation of advisory group, referral group, core team and auditors' list.

May

02   Wide circulation of draft framework.

06   Last day for collection of inputs/suggestions.

16   Sharing of final framework within core group.

August

25—27   Pilot audit done for the tsunami programme of CASA (Church Auxiliary for Social Action), Chennai.

November

28—30   First batch of potential auditors called for a consultation and training.

2006
February

15   Appointment of Xavier Arockiasamy as National Coordinator.

March

17, 18   Second consultation and training of auditors.

25—29   The first full-fledged SEA for Punarnirmaan, the joint tsunami response programme of PARA (People's Action for Rural Awakening) and DBSU (Dalit Bahajun Shramik Union).

April

6—10   SEA of Women's Collective and SNEHA.

11—13   Review by auditors, mentors, anchorperson and secretariat.

May

01   Secretariat set up in Chennai with John Peter, Associate Coordinator, in charge.

July

16   Pre-audit review by auditors, mentors, anchorperson and secretariat.

17—21   SEA of CARE India.

20—24   SEA of SEVAI.

August

16   Review by core group, audited organisations, auditors, mentors, anchorperson and secretariat.

17   Incorporation of the learnings into the process and the tool by the auditors, mentors, anchorperson and secretariat.

>>>>>>>

A Charter on Social Equity Audit

We firmly believe

Social Equity Audit (SEA), an initiative of diverse civil society actors ranging from grassroots organisations to INGOs, aims at ensuring social inclusion and justice by systematically examining the values, structure, functioning, approach, methodology and activities of organisations.

SEA, as a professional and participatory tool, is primarily a learning process and organisation-friendly.

SEA is a new tool for social audit of not only work on development, relief and rehabilitation but also on organisational culture, since values and beliefs are rooted in culture.

SEA is helpful both to identify the roots of systemic discrimination and exclusion and the means, mechanisms and strategies for addressing them.

SEA enables the organisation to move forward in designing and implementing programmes that will reduce patronage and change power relations between individuals, within households and communities in favour of those who are excluded and discriminated against.

We are therefore committed to the promotion of Social Equity Audit as an efficient and effective tool to promote social inclusion in all realms of social interventions, governmental and non-governmental.

Social Equity Audit Secretariat

This book is about social equity - the quality of being fair, just and inclusive. In a society that is deeply hierarchical, it is not surprising that people tend to form exclusive groups at every level possible—based on caste, class, education, language, ethnicity, etc. in an attempt to stand out from 'the other'. Exclusions are so omnipresent that we have internalised most of them and fail to recognise them in our personal or professional lives. This book is an attempt at helping us identify and understand exclusions in our professional work.

It contains a framework and set of tools that help to hold a mirror up to us to show forms and levels of exclusion that might exist in the work that we do. It will guide you through the context, the conceptual underpinnings and the practical steps involved in conducting a social equity audit.

It will be of interest to development practitioners, human rights defenders and policy makers—and all interested in social justice.