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Abstract: With growing reliance on market mechanisms to solve social problems, many governments have moved from direct housing provision towards subsidising the non-profit sector to build and manage affordable housing. There is an expectation that these housing organisations are professionally managed and commercially astute whilst maintaining their community values. This paper positions non-profit organisational capacity, performance and effectiveness as important yet contested social constructs. Despite a general caution against the inappropriate transfer of business theories from the commercial sector the balanced scorecard approach is suggested as a way of integrating the three constructs. A new typology of non-profit performance measurement is developed and previous research relating to affordable housing criticised for inappropriate quantification and lack of context. Network theory and new institutionalism are used to advocate a paradigm shift from individual non-profit capacity towards understanding the institutional capacity of the housing non-profit sector as a whole. Finally, guidance is given on approaches to building institutional capacity with an emphasis on the need for a joined-up policy approach.
Introduction

Successfully expanding the production of affordable housing by the non-profit sector requires supportive government policies, sufficient funding and the availability of competent organisations. During the past decade there has been considerable debate about affordable housing policy and financing, and the start of a general convergence of approaches to expanding the non-profit sector in a number of countries. However organisational capacity, whilst widely acknowledged to be important, has seldom been clearly understood. It has become the wobbly foundation of market-based approaches to building affordable housing.

The potential gains from improving the capacity and effectiveness of non-profit organisations together with the sharp divide between writers in the commercial and charity sectors can be seen from an impassioned debate in the Harvard Business Review in 2003:

Imagine what an extra $100 billion [€75 billion] a year could do for philanthropic and other non-profit institutions. That’s more than three times the annual giving of every charitable foundation in the United States combined … according to a study we recently completed with our McKinsey and Company colleagues, the non-profit sector could free up that amount - maybe even more - by challenging the operating practices and notions of stewardship that currently govern the sector (Bradley, Jansen & Silverman; p.94).

[Bradley’s] analysis exemplifies the hazards of drawing facile analogies between the practices of major corporations and those of non-profits … the authors suggest that $62 billion [€47 billion] could be saved by increasing “effectiveness”. But it is exactly in the failure to define effectiveness that the analysis breaks down. Profit is profit, and return on capital is the same by any other name. Philanthropic effectiveness, however, is not so easily defined (Kramer, 2003; pp.126-7).

This paper uses desk research and examples from the United States, England and Australia to begin unpacking issues raised in the Harvard Business Review. Concentrating on the delivery of affordable housing by the non-profit housing sector it addresses four questions. What is meant by capacity? Should the lens for studying capacity be the organisation or the sector? How can it be measured? What approaches to capacity building have been tried and which work best? The paper aims to stimulate debate, encourage further cross-national comparison and launch an empirical doctoral research project.

Context

From the 1980s, countries Esping-Andersen (1999) has characterised as ‘liberal welfare regimes’ have moved further towards market mechanisms to increase the supply and the range of housing. The United States, England and Australia have policies promoting home ownership supplemented by a residualised provision of social housing for those in acute need. Expansion of public housing is uncommon and responsibility for the supply of new affordable housing has shifted towards non-profit providers in varying degrees. These organisations are not conventional charities: Paton (2003; p.1) has noted ‘the innovation and dynamism, the spread of business perspectives, the emergence of hybrid organisations and inter-sectoral partnerships’ of the contemporary non-profit sector. Several housing non-profits have moved from being small scale, volunteer run and donation funded to become like commercial companies with professional managers, debt financing, employed staff and snappy mission statements (Light, 2002). Most, however, remain modest both in size and capacity.
The non-profit housing sector has many strengths. It has a greater diversity of organisational types than the public or private sectors and can cater for the specific housing needs of carefully targeted groups. By involving tenants and local people in decision making it has the ability to build community capital and forge strong networks. However, there is a belief amongst some commentators that the non-profit sector could be better managed, that it lacks sufficient organisational capacity for the new responsibilities it has taken on. There follows a brief description of the nature of the debate about non-profit capacity in the United States, England and Australia. An important point to note is that whilst there are debates in all three countries about capacity, the terms used and concerns are often different.

In the United States there is a broad literature on the non-profit sector and on ‘civil society’, especially by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (Salamon, Sokolowski & List, 2003). Pressure for capacity building has come from funders checking their money is spent wisely, clients who want a fair distribution policy and staff joining from the private sector who are more business orientated (Light, 2000). The media pays attention to how non-profits are run following the 1990s United Way and New Era scandals and controversy over payouts following the World Trade Centre attacks (Walden, 2006). As a result ‘the key issue today is not what the sector delivers, but how it operates’ (Light, 2002; p.1, author's emphasis). The non-profit affordable housing sector’s capacity has been criticised by an empirical study in El Paso, Texas. Fredericksen and London (2000) concluded that just one of the 18 organisations, the largest, had adequate capacity. Only 28% produced a strategic plan, 44% a budget, 22% kept volunteer details and 44% sought community involvement: ‘in their haste to contract with not-for-profits to create affordable housing, government officials may not be considering the serious possibility … [they] do not have the capacity to deliver services or effectively administer projects over time’ (Fredericksen & London, 2000; p.230).

England’s non-profit housing sector has expanded rapidly since the early 1980s with government policy progressively switching social housing funding away from local councils, and from the 1990s transferring housing stock, to non-profit ‘housing associations’ (Gibb & Whitehead, 2007). Between 1996 and 2005 housing association properties increased from 941,000 to over 1.8 million (Hills, 2007). The capacity debate in England reflects these fundamental policy shifts and focuses on ensuring public funding channelled through non-profits is spent wisely and housing managed efficiently (More, Pawson & Scott, 2005). There is also a concern to build a regulatory regime which reduces organisational risk, reassuring commercial lenders (Housing Corporation, 2001). Three surveys by the Housing Corporation (1998, 2003, 2006b) of problem housing associations found consistent problems with capacity: ‘the presenting symptoms vary, although behind them all lie failures of governance … leading up to the problems, we see lack of board control, board inexperience and lack of awareness of the organisation’s real position’ (Housing Corporation, 2006b; p.6). Many older non-profits have failed to develop skills required for their more competitive environment, smaller organisations have started projects too big to handle and stock transfer associations have not changed from a public sector mind-set. Fraud and lack financial control have also been problems (Housing Corporation, 2003).

The debate on the capacity of Australian non-profit housing providers is against a backdrop of relative lack of independence from government and small size. The ‘community housing’ sector, although expanding, only accounted for 0.4% of households in 2002 compared to 21% in England (Barbato, Clough, Farrar & Phibbs, 2003). Organisations are small with just four managing more than 700 properties in New South Wales (Bissett & Milligan, 2004) and only a handful building their own assets and raising commercial finance (Gapp Consulting Services Pty Ltd, 2004). There are problems with attracting and retaining staff, and a lack of
a comprehensive sector support infrastructure such as guidance on governance policies and risk management (Robyn Kennedy & Co, 2001a). Unlike residential aged care providers, the non-profit housing sector in Australia has no overarching framework of legislation nor accreditation of organisations receiving public funding (Robyn Kennedy & Co, 2001b). The body that represented many Australian non-profit housing providers has stated that ‘in order to play a meaningful role in the delivery of affordable housing, community housing providers will need to demonstrate the organisational capacity and capability required to partner with private sector players and undertake large scale growth’ (National Community Housing Forum, 2006; p.5). Further reducing capacity, the Forum was closed in October 2006.

Understanding Capacity

Despite the debates in the United States, England and Australia about lack of capacity in the non-profit housing sector, there is no agreement as to what capacity actually is. Paul Light, like many writers, identifies non-profit capacity as being concerned with the internal working of the organisation: ‘raising monies, forging partnerships, organising work, recruiting and training board members, leaders and employees, generating ideas, managing budgets and evaluating programmes’ (Light, 2004; p.15). This is an example of the most popular approach to capacity which is to list a series of ‘attributes’ of organisational capacity, thereby avoiding the need for a precise definition.

Three examples of capacity attributes are given in Figure 1 from researchers who have used these attributes as checklists against which to assess organisational. The typologies will be discussed later in this paper but refer to methods allowing a move from individual attributes towards a quantified total score for capacity. Whilst there are a number of common attributes - strategy, board membership, use of volunteers - there are fewer matches than would be expected. This reinforces the fact that organisational capacity remains hard to define. There are also only a small number of attributes (shown ■ in Figure 1) that relate specifically to the non-profit sector, particularly in the McKinsey model. This suggests either organisational success features are very similar in the commercial and non-profit sectors, or there has been an undiscerning transfer of business school ideas to non-profits (Kramer, 2003).

Despite the discourse of visions, leadership, stakeholders and governance sounding increasingly similar between non-profits and business, there remain important organisational differences. First, commercial companies can measure performance using relatively uncontested measures such as profit, or profit relative to capital or assets. Non-profits have a broader suite of community objectives, many of which are qualitative. Second, businesses operate in competitive markets and have to remain efficient and often expand in size to benefit from scale economies: badly run firms will be taken over or forced out of business (Paton, 2003). Non-profits operate in a supportive environment of light regulation, tax breaks, generally favourable press coverage and community backing for continuity (Hansmann, 1980). Fewer organisations grow large, or are allowed to fail. Partnerships and loose collaboration between organisations are common and direct competition rare. Third, there are differences in management style and resources. Market forces allow successful businesses to attract gifted individuals and normally have a broad range of skills are available in-house. Non-profits often have a few highly talented, dedicated individuals but may lack breadth of skills and some employees have more enthusiasm than talent. Staff turnover may be low leading to greater resistance to organisational change.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typology II</td>
<td>Typology II</td>
<td>Typology III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled attributes</td>
<td>Scaled attributes</td>
<td>Scaled and scored attributes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aspirations**
- mission
- clarity and boldness of vision
- overarching goals

**Strategy**
- overall strategy
- goals/performance targets
- programme relevance/growth
- funding model

**Organisational skills**
- performance measurement
- planning
- revenue and fundraising
- local relationship building
- marketing, PR, legal issues

**Human Resources**
- staff levels
- board composition/support
- strength of chief executive
- management team
- mix of staff and volunteers

**Systems & infrastructure**
- planning/decision making
- human resource management
- adequate premises
- use of information technology

**Organisational structure**
- board governance
- organisation and job design

**Culture**
- performance as shared value
- other shared values

**Leadership & vision**
- existence of board
- community involvement
- community support for board
- mission/vision statement
- board reflects local minorities

**Management & planning**
- procedures manual
- strategic plan
- written goals and objectives
- budget

**Fiscal planning & practice**
- financial statements produced
- budget produced
- good at self generated funds
- good at public/private grants
- good at local fundraising

**Operational support**
- ability to retain staff
- mix of staff and volunteers
- educational level of staff
- good compensation packages
- staff involvement
- adequate premises
- adequate equipment
- funds to support operations

**Political capacity**
- working with public agencies
- impact on housing policy
- relationship with officials

**Networking capacity**
- community involvement
- relationship with private sector
- work with other organisations
- member of a trade association

**Resource capacity**
- number of paid employees
- loans and grants raised
- sources of financial support

**Programmatic capacity**
- housing activities
- community assessment
- construction activities
- project management
- programme evaluation

**Organisational capacity**
- age of organisation
- number of volunteers
- use of information technology
- use of outside consultants
- business plan
- strategic plan
- educational level of staff

---

**Note 1:** Attributes have been re-worded from original articles. Certain categories amalgamated for clarity

**Note 2:** For typologies see Figure 4

**Note 3:** ■ Indicates an attribute suitable for a non-profit but not a commercial company

**Figure 1: Non-profit capacity attributes**

The recent focus on non-profit capacity is not due to an interest in the concept in its own right, but how it can contribute towards better social and community outcomes. Unfortunately the terms organisational capacity, performance and effectiveness have either been used synonymously, or with a lack of clarity. Susan Stevens (2002) provides a model, shown in Figure 2, which helps to unpack meanings for these three contested terms. Capacity is the internal capability of the organisation and the means by which by which goals will be achieved; performance is how success is measured and effectiveness is the impact the organisation has on society. Stevens places these three concepts in a continuum with capacity and performance necessary preconditions for effectiveness. The model reinforces that capacity is not an outcome in its own right, and that the performance measurement process is one step away from achieving social impact.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[means]</td>
<td>[measurement]</td>
<td>[impact]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capabilities and competence of the organisation</td>
<td>achievement of measurable goals or objectives</td>
<td>achievement of desired impact for clients and society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stevens (2002) with additional descriptions added

Figure 2: Capacity, performance and effectiveness

The problem remains that organisational capacity, performance and effectiveness only exist at a high level of abstraction (Wing, 2004). This is best understood by remembering that the terms are social constructs, not objective facts that can be revealed by scientific research. The constructs are neither independent of each other, nor of the people running, regulating or researching housing organisations (Jacobs & Manzi, 2000). Within particular national contexts the construct of capacity may be deeply embedded in particular power relationships or stem from the historical development of housing systems (Haworth, Manzi & Kemeny, 2004). Stevens’ three criteria are closely bound to broader contemporary views of capacity, performance and effectiveness which exist across the public, commercial and non-profit sectors. Perceived non-profit goals are constructed within a framework of whether particular groups of individuals are deemed worthy of assistance, and by whom. For example whilst the cost of housing has often been an issue, in the last decade ‘housing affordability’ has become a more clearly constructed and widely used term and seen as an area in which governments should intervene through the non-profit sector.

It is important to understand the symbolic value of launching capacity building programmes and their ability to increase organisational legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders such as charitable benefactors, bank lenders or potential new non-executive directors (Herman & Renz, 1998; Mason, Kirkbride & Bryde, 2007). ‘Performance indicators have an important ritual quality. Their reverential status implies that the practice is to a large extent a symbolic one’ (Jacobs & Manzi, 2000; p.90). Increased organisational legitimacy is not an entirely theoretical concept and may bring tangible benefits as stakeholders could also be funders - government agencies, private donors or banks. Non-profits seen as successful will attract better staff and greater numbers of volunteers. Researchers need to be aware that capacity building schemes could be as much about perceptions of capacity than ‘genuine’ capacity: a non-profit with a crisply written strategic plan published on their website may allow the document to gather dust. Within an organisation, capacity improvement and the use of performance indicators will be contested between different power groups, for example accountants, board members and tenancy managers (Jacobs & Manzi, 1996).

This constructivist perspective should not lead to the conclusion that the capacity, performance and effectiveness of housing organisations are unimportant, more that that they need to be understood within a deeper, more contextual framework. Constructivists still have a ‘meaningful basis for undertaking measurement activity, albeit one with more modest ambitions’ (Paton, 2003; p.51). Unfortunately depth and context are often lacking in the ‘measurement’ literature, much of which comes from a positivist epistemology which assumes validity to awarding percentages or star ratings for organisational capacity. Performance measurement has become a normalised activity in the public and non-profit
sectors over the last decade, in part due to a spread of ‘measurement culture’ from the commercial sector (Jacobs & Manzi, 2000; Kennerley & Neely, 2002). Problems on agreeing which aspects of non-profit sector performance to measure remain, and will be discussed in detail later in this paper, but it is worth noting that few researchers have tried to assess what Stevens terms ‘effectiveness’. Performance can be quantified (number of clients assisted, affordable properties built): effectiveness is more qualitative (neighbourhoods revitalised, tenant empowered, high quality properties built).

In view of the problematic nature of the capacity, performance and effectiveness of the non-profit sector, what guidance can be given to organisations looking to expand the supply of affordable housing? It should now be clear that there are no simple solutions to understanding and building capacity, therefore adopting the latest management fad is unlikely to work. Housing regulators and bank lenders may insist on production of a set of performance measurements, but these may not be the most appropriate to manage an organisation as each non-profit operates in very different circumstances. Following the work of Kaplan and Norton (1996) in developing a ‘balanced scorecard’, Paton (2003) suggests a similar ‘dashboard’ suited to non-profit organisations as shown in Figure 3:

![Figure 3: Paton’s dashboard template for social enterprises](image-url)

The dashboard has the benefit of integrating Stevens’ (2002) three dimensions of non-profit success by including performance and effectiveness assessments (boxes 1&2) and indicators of capacity (boxes 3&4). It combines shorter and longer term issues, allows for monitoring new projects and uses both quantitative and qualitative information. Importantly it can be tailored to the needs of a particular organisation and is a scalable model that could give more detail for well funded, larger organisations yet have just a few key headings for small non-profits with few people available to collect data. Whilst the dashboard is not a universal panacea, it provides a framework within which non-profit management can develop their own approach to strengthening organisational capacity, performance and effectiveness.
Locating Capacity

Most research on capacity, particularly attempts at quantification, looks at the capacity of individual organisations. This is understandable, but narrow. With partnerships and networking becoming important in the supply of affordable housing there needs to be a greater understanding of the capacity of the sector as a whole. This paper uses the term ‘organisational capacity’ to describe the capacity of a single housing non-profit, including the way it networks within its broader environment. In contrast ‘institutional capacity’ is taken to be the capacity of the housing non-profit sector as a whole within a country, comprising the collective capacity of individual non-profit housing organisations, housing regulators, banks, trade organisations, housing researchers and others. There is growing understanding of this broader definition of capacity by non-government organisations and aid agencies working in developing countries. The United Nations moved in the late 1980s from a focus on improving the functioning of individual institutions in poor countries as they were ‘not seen as independent and isolated actors any longer but part of larger systems or networks. Capacity-building needed to become a much broader concept’ (United Nations, 2002; p.4).

The way we see non-profit housing organisations is shaped by broader trends in the social sciences, particularly the development of new lenses for analysing the role and meaning of organisations. In the early days of sociology, exemplified by Max Weber’s writing on bureaucracy translated into English in the 1920s, political institutions and major corporations were seen as an ‘iron cage’ imposing rational controls on society. By the 1960s behavioural science was in vogue and the analytical focus had shifted from formally constituted organisations to the power of individual choice. The most recent development in organisational thinking is ‘new institutionalism’ which brings back the importance of institutions but places them within a broader, more complex and connected milieu (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; DiMaggio & Anheier, 1990; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991).

Organisational theory is also shaped by shifts in the political and economic system. Healey (1998) and Goran, Healey, Madanipour & Magalhaes (2002) see neoliberal policy changing the way cities are managed, moving away from formal structures such as state controlled public housing towards a dynamic process with more complex relationships. This has been characterised as a move from ‘government’ to ‘governance’ with the latter ‘self-organising, inter-organisational networks characterised by inter-dependence, resource exchange, rule of the game and significant autonomy from the state’ (Rhodes, 1997; p.15). Reaching a similar conclusion, although from a study of globalisation and new technology, Manuel Castells notes ‘organisations and institutions are organised in networks of variable geometry whose intertwining supercedes traditional distinctions … cutting across sector, and spreading along different geographic clusters of economic units’ (Castells, 2000; p.502).

Network theory has started to be applied to housing, particularly by European writers. For example, English non-profit housing networks developed after the 1988 Housing Act forcing housing associations to start using private finance, the partial transfers of stock from local councils, joint approaches to neighbourhood regeneration and government support for tenant involvement (Reid, 1995). David Mullins and others have argued that a new approach is needed to understand housing organisations, taking into account network theory and viewing social housing as a ‘field’, worthy of study in its own right (Mullins, Reid & Walker, 2001). One benefit is the focus on a more joined-up policy approach, emphasising that capacity needs to be built across a number of support organisations and agencies. Unfortunately network theory is seldom applied to discussions of how to strengthen the non-profit housing sector: the focus remains at organisational level.
The networks within which housing non-profits operate, as with government departments and commercial companies, can be scaled along spatial, functional and structural dimensions. The spatial dimension relates to how an organisation networks to gain support and knowledge at neighbourhood, regional, national, continental (for example the European Union) or global levels. Functional relationships may exist with other organisations in the housing sector such as associate or subsidiary companies, fellow non-profit housing providers, public housing departments, commercial house builders, private landlords, housing trade organisations, housing finance providers, housing researchers, donors, consultants and government housing regulators. Structural relationships can be identified based on how the organisation is constituted: with other non-profits, charity regulators, taxation authorities, non-profit trade organisations, non-profit researchers and organisations funding non-profit capacity building including governments, individual donors and charitable foundations.

On the spatial dimension, non-profit housing capacity needs to be considered both within and beyond national boundaries. There is growing evidence of organisational learning and policy transfer between countries. This is despite inherent problems in trying to replicate affordable housing initiatives in countries with different legal, cultural, economic and policy environments (DiMaggio & Anheier, 1990). Ideas pass between countries through research, technology and people. Comparative housing research is popular and often didactic: in a survey published in Australia contrasting financing affordable housing in Australia with the United Kingdom noted ‘Australian policy debates could also benefit from the much broader discussions in the UK concerning key worker and employer provide affordable housing … both countries might usefully look to the United States in relation to use of tax incentives to encourage the greater involvement of institutional investors in affordable housing provision’ (Berry, Whitehead, Williams & Yates, 2004; p.86). Technology, especially the Internet, allows researchers to track the success of housing non-profits in England and the United States by studying housing websites and downloading regulatory returns. People help transmit new thinking on housing: the three key-note speakers at the 2005 National Affordable Housing Conference in Sydney were Christine Whitehead a housing adviser to the United Kingdom government, Dr Michael Stegman formerly of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and Carol Galante of Bridge Housing in California.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the capacity of the non-profit housing sector and organisations linked to it. For example, an expanding non-profit may seek larger bank loans with more sophisticated features, such as interest rate hedging. As a condition of lending banks call for management information and the non-profit may employ more accountants, producing better financial information for both the board and the bank. More financial institutions will enter the market for lending to non-profits leading to lower borrowing costs, financial product innovation, more marketing by banks and the publication of research reports explaining sector risks and rewards. These trends can be seen in England with a 38% increase in bank lending to housing associations to £36 billion [€53 billion] in the three years to March 2005 with an extra of £2.1 billion [€3 billion] of interest rate hedging derivatives and a fall in average lending margins from 0.50% to 0.45% (Housing Corporation, 2006a). With greater incentives to borrow, housing non-profits will improve organisational capacity to make them eligible for loans. In this example the growth in the housing sector’s institutional capacity becomes mutually reinforcing, but it can only be understood by looking at broader networks, not at individual organisations.
Measuring Capacity

With the selective contracting-out of social policy to the non-profit sector, governments manage the performance of non-profits rather than managing the organisations directly (Paton, 2003). This has been accompanied by greater interest shown by the public as volunteers or donors, the ready availability of information on the Internet and the spread of a measurement culture. Unfortunately there is no consensus on which measures to use and dissatisfaction has grown with the distorting effects of financial targets as ‘the more any quantitative social indicator is used for social decision making, the more subject it will be to corruption pressures and the more apt it will be to distort and corrupt the social processes it is intended to monitor’ (Campbell, 1979; p.85).

Concerns with financial targets have prompted growing interest in measuring judgemental attributes such as customer satisfaction, quality and organisational capacity. These are seen as important but hard to measure. Techniques developed in these fields have seldom been subject to rigorous research although there are some interesting assessments of quality monitoring schemes which may act as a near-proxy for measuring institutional capacity. Based on non-profit organisational case study research, Paton (2003) saw mixed messages as to whether quality measurements were meaningful but noted improved internal debate on quality issues, and greater legitimacy for the organisation in the eyes of external stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Discursive</td>
<td>General discussion of strengths and weaknesses of capacity not based on specific attributes</td>
<td>Milligan et al. (2004) - 10 case study Australian housing non-profits Light (2002)(2001) - survey of ‘effective’ non-profits avoiding attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Scaled and scored attributes</td>
<td>Selection of attributes of capacity then a number allocated against each attribute and a weighted total calculated</td>
<td>LaMore (2002) - 37 case study Michigan, US housing non-profits tested against 5 capacity criteria to give a % capacity grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Quantitative</td>
<td>Ratios or scores calculated based on attributes or other values which can be quantified</td>
<td>Charity Navigator (<a href="http://www.charitynavigator.org">www.charitynavigator.org</a>) - web search of 5,000 US non-profits across all sectors with Star rating for capacity and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Capacity measurement typology

Measurements of non-profit capacity are much less common than performance measurement and there have been dissimilar and contradictory approaches. This diversity is surprising given the small number of studies. Figure 4 builds a typology of capacity measurement which moves from qualitative (typology I) through to quantitative (typology IV). Most academic research uses the attribute approach (typologies II and III), described earlier in this paper,
although as already noted there is no agreement about choice of attributes. Moving down the table the apparent precision of results increases with both typologies III and IV able to produce a numeric grade for the capacity of an organisation. None of the typologies other than the first are capable of looking beyond a particular organisation to gain an assessment of the institutional capacity of a sector or of a country.

The pitfalls in capacity measurement are best described by examples from each typology. Paul Light (2002) followed Typology I by using a postal questionnaire to survey 250 randomly selected non-profit ‘opinion leaders’ who were members of United States non-profit trade associations. These individuals identified 250 organisations they considered to be high performing and their Chief Executives took part in a further telephone questionnaire survey. Light found several common characteristics of successful non-profits such as actively engaging with their local environment by collaborating with other non-profits and trying to influence opinion through social and political advocacy. They have efficient internal structures with delegated responsibilities, made good use of new technology and had a leadership style encouraging open communication. Light’s results are not surprising, but his research methods can be questioned. Effectiveness was defined as perceived effectiveness - no attempt was made to measure performance, or the wider impacts on community or society. The only perceptions surveyed were those of the senior executive ‘opinion leaders’ who in turn selected case study organisations which fitted their normalised views. Light’s view of effectiveness was therefore constructed from an unrepresentative reference group who most likely had a business school view of non-profit success.

Typology II is the most commonly used and requires selection of capacity attributes, the assessment of organisations against attributes, then giving a score on an ordinal scale. Fredericksen and London (2000) use a binary pass/fail score. England’s Housing Corporation have a tripartite traffic light system ranging from green for a housing non-profit ‘supported by appropriate governance and executive arrangements’ to red if ‘the governing body does not demonstrate effective control of the organisation’ (Housing Corporation, 2005: p.7). As shown in Figure 5, McKinsey and Company (2001) have four possible rankings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute: Local community presence and involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Clear need for increased capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Basic level of capacity in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Moderate level of capacity in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] High level of capacity in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Single attribute shown by way of example. Table has been rotated by 90 degrees


Figure 5: McKinsey’s capacity assessment grid (typology II)
The McKinsey system is designed for self-completion by organisations, and therefore becomes a participatory and learning process with capacity scores easy to understand. It lists a number of attributes, but does not attempt to calculate a total grade for the organisation. However, problems remain. As with all attribute-based methods its validity depends on the wise selection of attributes and often McKinsey choose attributes appropriate for large corporations. It is a normative process with the description of score [4] making it clear that McKinsey regard it ‘better’ than score [1]. This may not be true for all non-profits: some need to maintain a critical distance from local pressure groups, others depend on their relationship with government more than their community. Finally, non-profits have lifecycles, therefore capacity needs vary over time (Stevens, 2002).

Typology III approaches apply a weighting to each of the attributes allowing calculation of a total capacity grade for an organisation. LaMore’s (2001) analysis of 37 non-profit housing organisations in Michigan is shown in Figure 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Range of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>New properties built, or old properties refurbished each year</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Higher than median for sample = “high”, lower than median for sample = “low”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Meeting time and cost expectations for new construction within 10% budget</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Higher than median for sample = “high”, lower than median for sample = “low”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Between 0 and 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Working with public agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact on housing policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationship with officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>- Community involvement</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Between 0 and 18 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relationship private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 14 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work with other organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Member of a trade association</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>- Number of paid employees</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Between 0 and 15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loans and grants raised</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sources of financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic</td>
<td>- Housing activities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Between 0 and 14 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 32 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Project management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 32 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programme evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>- Age of organisation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Between 1 and 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of outside consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 0 and 5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity compared to productivity</th>
<th>Capacity compared to efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual housing production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High productivity</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low productivity</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LaMore (2001)
Note: Grades for capacity have been changed to percentages to ease comparison

Figure 6: Organisational capacity of Michigan housing non-profits (typology III)
In Figure 6 organisational effectiveness is taken to be the average number of properties built or refurbished each year. Equal weight is given to five categories of organisational capacity with categories broken down into attributes are then quantified. For example the attribute ‘number of volunteers’ is scored from 0 (no volunteers) to 4 (over 25 volunteers); ‘programme evaluation’ is scored either 5 (yes) or 0 (no). The report does not disclose capacity totals for individual organisations although, as an example, the average capacity grade for housing non-profits in Detroit is 71% which is higher than 52% in Northern Michigan (LaMore, 2001). Correlations in the lower part of Figure 6 are based on classifying organisations as ‘high’ or ‘low’ relative to median for productivity and efficiency. Organisations with high productivity have a capacity of 71% compared to 57% for those with low productivity. One counter-intuitive outcome is that low efficiency housing providers have better capacity (67%) than those with high efficiency (63%).

Problems with the Michigan survey are with design as well as outcomes. Housing production is taken as a proxy for organisational efficiency but there is no adjustment for property size, design quality or appropriateness for the neighbourhood or client group. Behind the precise numbers lie a series of questionable judgements. Should networking ability be given equal weight to political management? How valid an attribute is the age of an organisation, with old organisations automatically scored as having more capacity than new ones? Therefore the authors’ conclusion that ‘organisations with higher levels of organisational capacity had higher levels of unit productivity’ (LaMore, 2003; p.1) is unconvincing. Another reading of their results is that larger non-profits build more properties, and have a higher organisational capacity because they are larger and better resourced. This much we can agree with.

Typology IV, illustrated by Charity Navigator in Figure 7, follows the Michigan method of calculating a capacity grade for organisations but avoids value judgements needed when using ordinal scales. Founded in 2001, Charity Navigator claims to be America’s largest evaluator of non-profits, aiming to ‘guide intelligent giving. Our goal is to help people give to charity with confidence. At the same time we aim to help charities by shining lights on truly effective organisations’ (www.charitynavigator.org). Their rationale is that charity rankings help consumers choose wisely, similarly to charts of well performing schools or reliable washing machines. Behind a simple star-rating is a complex set of formulas which calculate ratios using data from Form 990 annual returns to the Inland Revenue Service filed to retain 501(c)(3) tax-free status. In Figure 7, the eight non-profit organisations who develop affordable housing in California have been identified searching the Charity Navigator website. Their efficiency had been ranked on four criteria based on costs: a top rated organisation would use most of its total expenditure for its philanthropic mission, a low proportion on administrative and fundraising costs and incur modest expense for each dollar raised. High capacity organisations would have upward trends in donations and philanthropic spending and good working capital.

There are a number of embedded problems in Charity Navigator’s approach. It reports on only 5,000 non-profits in the United States, identifying just nine Californian affordable housing providers. By comparison a search on Guidestar.com, who list financial information but not performance ratios for all United States charities submitting Form 990s, found 226 non-profit affordable housing providers within 25 miles of San Francisco. Many of the organisations excluded from Charity Navigator are important, such as Bridge Housing Corporation (www.bridgehousing.com) who by April 2007 had developed over 12,000 affordable homes with a market value of US$3 billion (£2.25 billion). Charity Navigator’s bias is towards organisations funded by voluntary donations rather than public grants. However, even if more organisations were included, the methodology is open to challenge.
Using accounting information from Form 990s gives precise ratios but no adjustments are made to reflect individual circumstances and the returns are not always filled in accurately (Bradley, Jansen & Silverman, 2003). Administrative costs might be low if expenses are shared with an associate and fundraising efficiency could be distorted by a large donation.

| Assessment of non-profits in California who develop affordable housing from: www.charitynavigator.org searched on 2nd April 2007 |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Overall Assessment | | | | | | |
| Score | 70.00 | 49.32 | 57.63 | 55.57 | 66.16 | 35.46 | 59.45 | 46.90 | 43.69 |
| Star rating | **** | ** | *** | **** | * | *** | ** | ** | |
| Organisational Efficiency | | | | | | |
| Programme expenses | % | 43.2 | 76.3 | 80.7 | 86.6 | 63.9 | 94.5 | 44.0 | 69.8 |
| Administrative expenses | % | 38.7 | 8.9 | 11.3 | 7.1 | 13.3 | 1.0 | 36.6 | 28.4 |
| Fundraising expenses | % | 18.1 | 14.8 | 7.9 | 6.3 | 22.8 | 4.5 | 19.3 | 1.8 |
| Fundraising efficiency | Per $ | $0.08 | $0.09 | $0.06 | $0.06 | $0.16 | $0.23 | $0.12 | $0.05 |
| Efficiency score | 40.00 | 19.32 | 35.13 | 38.07 | 38.66 | 24.14 | 34.45 | 16.90 | 28.69 |
| Efficiency star rating | **** | *** | **** | * | *** | ** | |
| Organisational Capacity | | | | | | |
| Primary revenue growth | % | 37.4 | 21.8 | 10.5 | 28.0 | -2.4 | 35.7 | 19.4 | 12.0 |
| Programme expenses growth | % | 47.9 | 35.1 | -0.4 | 50.3 | -53.7 | 68.4 | 41.2 | -1.3 |
| Working capital ratio | years | 1.51 | 0.17 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 1.05 | 0.34 | 1.09 | 0.42 |
| Capacity score | 30.00 | 30.00 | 22.50 | 17.50 | 27.50 | 11.33 | 25.00 | 30.00 | 15.00 |
| Capacity star rating | **** | ***** | **** | * | **** | **** | * | ** | |

**Figure 7: Charity Navigator’s star rating of organisational capacity (typology IV)**

Organisational capacity, defined as ‘how well a charity can sustain its efforts over time’ (www.CharityNavigator.org) is on even shakier ground than organisational efficiency. Using Charity Navigator thinking, capacity is a measure of how fast an organisation has grown in the past. This provides no guidance as to whether it can grow in the future as it may have
capacity limits such as a shortage of managers, or land to develop. There is no knowing whether money has been spent wisely as the ratios measure quantity not quality. Even the reassuring positive correlations between Charity Navigator’s measures of capacity and efficiency shown in scatter chart in Figure 7 is not persuasive. In the example from California two organisations, Habitat for Humanity in Bay East and Silicon Valley, score full marks and are awarded four stars for organisational capacity yet zero stars for organisational efficiency. They both have much higher administrative costs than comparative organisations, possibly because they are helping clients who have greater social needs.

Three conclusions can be drawn from this typological approach to capacity measurement. First, as methods move from qualitative towards quantitative their validity decreases. Despite the production of precise percentages and star ratings, quantitative approaches are as much based on value judgements as more traditional discursive research. Second, there is no consensus on best measurement methods or most reliable organisational capacity attributes. Nearly every research paper has proposed a different approach. Thirdly, the weakest surveys of capacity are those that are not deeply embedded in the specific needs of the non-profit sector. One size does not fit all as organisational capacity can only be understood within the specific milieu in which a non-profit organisation operates. As Rob Paton has commented, non-profit performance is a ‘multifaceted, fluid, problematic, ambiguous and contested concept. Performance may sound like some unitary, stable, and objective real attribute … but it is far more elusive than that’ (Paton, 2003; p.6).

Building Capacity

Problems with understanding and measuring organisational capacity have not inhibited attempts to improve the way that non-profits are run. ‘Capacity building involves an activity such as planning, reorganising, merging, downsizing, assessing, auditing, installing, training, recruiting, measuring, treating’ (Light, 2004; p.86). Approaches to strengthening capacity can be grouped in three categories: self help, private initiatives and government policy. The relative importance of each approach will depend on the way the non-profit sector’s role has been socially and legislatively constructed in a country. For example, in the United States and Australia non-profit organisations are seen to be voluntary, philanthropic and independent of the state and therefore capacity building relies more on private, charitable initiatives. In England the housing non-profit sector has become associated with contracted-out social policy and community building: the sector is closely regulated and capacity building seen as a legitimate and necessary task of government.

Self-help is a popular and low cost approach to capacity building. Generally it involves publication of management books often supplemented with business executives providing free advice or acting as non-executive boards members. The last decade has seen the promotion as management tools of accountability frameworks, benchmarking, quality improvement, downsizing, outsourcing, process re-engineering and balanced scorecards (Paton, 2003). Originating from consultants, business schools and management gurus, these ‘management fashions’ have a pervasive effect on the way managers address complex business challenges (Abrahamson, 1996). For non-profits these ideas have washed like ‘tides’ over the sector, often being welcomed uncritically as ‘proven solutions’ whereas their success or otherwise in the commercial sector remains contested (Light, 2000). There has been a dramatic growth in ‘how-to’ books for the non-profit sector, a small number of which are listed below in Figure 8. Many of these are hard to differentiate from books aimed at businesses:
Opportunities and problems with business inspired approach have been rehearsed in the previously quoted debate in the Harvard Business Review in 2003 where an investment banker who works closely with McKinsey management consultants maintained that application of commercial business practices to non-profits would increase their effectiveness and liberate US$100 billion [€75 billion] for good causes (Bradley, Jansen & Silverman, 2003). Countering this, the Managing Director of a charitable foundation argued the dangers of drawing ‘facile analogies’ between businesses and non-profits (Kramer, 2003). Compared to corporations, non-profit organisations vary considerably as to size, history, competence, structure, longevity, reporting, vision, values, regulation and community relationships. Therefore management theories that suggest ‘one size fits all’ for non-profit capacity building should be treated with caution, particularly if that ‘one size’ is a theory developed for businesses. As Paul Light has commented, ‘there is no one best way to design or lead a high-performing non-profit organisation. Rather, there are different pathways to high performance, each with its own strengths and weaknesses’ (Light, 2002).

The need for a nuanced approach to capacity building suggests that as housing non-profits are different to other non-profits they deserve analysis on their own terms. Organisations running programmes to build and manage affordable housing depend less on donations and more on government contracts and subsidy. The subsidies are normally a selection of demand-side support for low income tenants, supply-side grants towards construction costs, tax breaks and planning bonuses. Case study research in Australia indicates successful non-profits carrying out building activity need ‘expertise in property development on their Boards, and dedicated development and project management staff’ (Milligan, Phibbs, Fagan & Gurran; p.124). Similarly researchers in the United States have emphasised the importance for affordable housing non-profits of asset management skills and building strong local networks to help bring stability to poor neighbourhoods (Schwartz, Bratt, Vidal & Keyes, 1996). The requirements for successful capacity building will differ between a community housing cooperative building three new homes, a European housing non-profit managing 100,000 properties and the Red Cross.

The second capacity building approach involves private initiatives. Trade, research, lobbying and professional associations gather data, issue research publications, host websites, run conferences, provide training, accredit managers and may establish a reward programme to publicise good practice (Light, 2003). Organisations include the European Network of Housing Researchers; the National Association of Housing Cooperatives and the Coalition for Nonprofit Housing and Economic Development in the United States; the Joseph Rowntree

---

**Figure 8: Self-help for non-profits**

---


Foundation and the Chartered Institute of Housing in England; Shelter and the Community Housing Federation in Australia. These organisations are important both in improving the capacity of individual non-profits and building the institutional capacity of the affordable housing sector. They act as vital nodes in the housing network allowing dissemination of new ideas and good practice by bringing individuals together.

In the United States private capacity building initiatives predominate. Non-profits have few resources for internal development and focus their limited income on social causes. Grantmakers, particularly charitable foundations, have moved to specifically fund non-profit capacity building schemes such as paying for consulting or training management (Blumenthal, 2003). Many foundations are well resourced: the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation had a US$33 billion [€48 billion] endowment in 2006 (www.gatesfoundation.org: 15th April 2007). The David and Lucille Packard Foundation are major funders of CompassPoint in California who ‘work with community-based nonprofits in executive transition, planning, boards of directors, finance systems and business planning, fundraising and technology’ (www.compasspoint.org: 9th April 2007). Other similar organisations include Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (www.geofunders.org) and the Alliance for Nonprofit Management (www.allianceonline.org). Potential problems with private capacity building initiatives are that assistance comes at a price with donors wanting to see measurable improvements in capacity, and research suggests capacity building schemes in the United States improve the governance of well governed organisations but make little impact on those that really need assistance (Alexander & Weiner, 1998).

The third capacity building approach is direct state intervention. Since 1997 the United Kingdom government of Tony Blair has aimed to reduce social exclusion with the non-profit sector playing ‘a crucial role in delivering public services and in building strong, cohesive and self-determining communities’ (Home Office, 2004; p.7). This dual approach expanded the non-profit sector both as an alternative welfare delivery channel and to increase participation in civil society through greater volunteering and user involvement in local decisions. The view is that the government and the non-profit sector have a ‘mutual interest in building the capacity of voluntary and community organisations’ (HM Treasury, 2002; p.22). In 2004 ‘ChangeUp’ was launched as a generously funded ten year capacity building programme with initial grants of £80 million [€117 million] for 2003-06. Responsibility for implementation was handed in April 2006 to ‘Capacitybuilders’, an arms-length agency tasked with ‘improving the capacity and capability of [non-profit] organisations that offer services to the front line’ (Capacitybuilders, 2006; p.3). One month later a new ‘Ministry of the Third Sector’ was formed, combining charity regulation and responsibility for raising capacity and increasing volunteering.

Lack of capacity for English small and medium sized non-profits was identified as a significant problem, not helped by a fragmented approach across different departments and levels of government (HM Treasury, 2002). In December 2003 a non-profit consortium won a competitive tender to run ‘Futurebuilders’. Resourced with £125 million [€183 million], Futurebuilders aims to improve non-profit organisational capacity by a combination of loans, grants, consultancy and promotion of best practice. Between July 2004 and March 2007 some 185 organisations were assisted, with 85% of funding made through loans and 80% for property related work (www.futurebuilders-england.org.uk). Futurebuilders has a number of interesting features which deepen institutional capacity: it is administered through a non-profit organisation rather than by government and could be replicated by other organisations. As 70% of loans have been made to non-profits who have never borrowed before it builds their future capacity to raise commercial loans.
It is too early to judge the success of the government initiated capacity building approach in England. There has been considerable innovation, particularly the involvement of the non-profit sector and avoidance of ‘one size fits all’. By building both institutional capacity and organisational capacity there are signs of a joined-up policy approach, something that is lacking in the United States, Australia and many other countries.

**Conclusions**

The $100 billion windfall for United States non-profits promised in the Harvard Business Review is a mirage. Non-profits neither should nor could transform themselves into corporations as they would lose their ability to build not just houses but sustainable, liveable communities. Organisational capacity is a difficult and contested social construct, impossible to measure with precision despite several attempts by writers trying, often crudely, to transfer business tools from the commercial to the non-profit sector. Being a complex construct does not make non-profit capacity irrelevant: it is no more challenging, and no less important to modern societies, than ideas of poverty, discrimination or quality of life.

How can we strengthen the wobbly foundation of market approaches to producing affordable housing? There is a need for more research on capacity, particularly placing it within the dense web of networks that link fellow non-profit organisations, regulators, financiers and academics. These must be a clearer understanding of how these networks operate at all levels: local, regional, national and supra-national. This paper has suggested that our thinking needs a paradigmatic shift from organisational capacity to the more holistic, integrated notion of *institutional capacity*. Whilst it will be hard to measure and impossible to quantify, there are encouraging examples of how institutional capacity can be built. Governments, charitable foundations, non-profit leaders and the research communities all have a part to play. Greater capacity for the non-profit housing sector as whole, not just individual organisations, is essential if the sector is to rise to the considerable challenges - and opportunities - offered by neoliberal housing policies.
Further Research

The small number of empirical studies on non-profit housing provider capacity can be judged from the frequent calls for further research (Eisenhardt, 1989; Fredericksen & London, 2000; Mullins & Riseborough, 2000; LaMore, 2001). This paper is the first step on a doctoral research project from 2007-2009 to build capacity theory ‘from the ground upwards’ by comparing a small number of non-randomly selected organisational case studies. Case studies are useful for increasing understanding in topics where previous studies have been limited, contemporary developments are moving quickly and where it is important to understand an organisation in the context of wider societal changes (Yin, 2003). The inner-workings of nine non-profit housing providers will be studied with organisations grouped by three typologies based on whether their dominant values are community-driven, business-driven or state-driven. Organisations will be located in the San Francisco Bay Area, the county of Greater Manchester in England and east coast Australian cities. Data will be collected from publicly available documents and semi-structured interviews with a range of employees and board members. Results will be triangulated with newspaper articles, reports, regulatory returns and by interviewing representatives of government housing bodies and trade associations. Using data templates and noting views expressed during interviews, comparisons will be made across organisations and typologies in a search for patterns.

The research will examine how non-profit housing networks work with particular reference to how they can help strengthen institutional capacity. Are the capacity networks of similar shape and importance in the United States, England and Australia? Is there learning between organisations in the same (and different) countries, and how does this happen? Has convergence of affordable housing policies caused an isomorphing of housing non-profits’ organisational form? There will be an examination of how organisations monitor their capacity and performance, the perceived success of capacity building programmes and a consideration of both the substantive and symbolic role of non-profit measurement. Most significantly, the research will seek a deeper understanding of the institutional capacity of the non-profit housing sector and whether the skills and networking capabilities of organisations are contributing to, or holding back, the delivery of affordable housing.
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**Note**

Exchange rates for this report have been taken as: €1 = £0.68 = US$1.33 = A$1.64.