Accompanying Miranda Duncan, I arrived in Cape Town, South Africa, on May 30, 2004, to assist the nongovernmental organization Mediation and Transformation Practice (MTP) in their efforts to further their evaluation research undertakings, especially with regard to the effectiveness of an emerging national system for handling land-occupancy disputes.

I had been invited by MTP and its non-profit arm, the Foundation for Citizenship and Governance Training (FCGT), upon their learning that I would indeed be accompanying Duncan to Cape Town. The executive director of MTP/FCGT, Craig Arendse, and associate, Ampie Muller, were aware of my previous work in South Africa through the research committee of the National Peace Accord and as research director of the Community Dispute Resolution Trust (CDRT), and they sought to harness that experience for the ends of their own organization. The UMSAEP Committee had honored that invitation by awarding me partial support for travel to undertake that work.

As matters developed, my work with MTP/FCGT can be divided into three categories: (1) designing an evaluation of process and outcomes of the national land-occupancy dispute system, (2) process evaluation of local undertakings, and (3) research.

Evaluating National Land–Occupancy Dispute System

The original invitation had supposed that I might be able to undertake some advance work prior to leaving St. Louis, if the dispute-system design team succeeded in a draft by April 2004, but that degree of early development did not occur. Instead, upon my arrival, I was enabled to begin studying a document setting forth terms of reference for investigations of the problem and the previous system of land-occupancy dispute handling, as well as three subsequent reports implementing such investigations in various provinces of the country. Each of these documents and reports cited the relative absence of monitoring and evaluation as a key factor in the eventual demise of the previous system.

Following several days of studying these reports, I participated in a committee meeting of the national design team itself, to provide my views of how a new system might best be constituted and how processes of monitoring and evaluation might be integrated into the functioning of that new system. My contributions and suggestions played important roles in the committee’s progress.
As per my original invitation, since returning to St. Louis I have solicited updates from that committee and from the larger design team as a whole, so that I might continue to advise regarding the roles of performance monitoring and outcome evaluation in a national system for handling land-occupancy disputes.

**Process Evaluation of Local Undertakings**

Once there, I was also requested by MTP/FCGT to conduct process observation on at least half a dozen of its most important projects and to evaluate not only the performance of MTP/FCGT on those separate projects but also its overall organizational structure. Indeed, shortly before my visit came to an end, MTP/FCGT did fairly drastically revise its operating structure.

(In the course of my subsequent personal travel to Namibia and Botswana, I was essentially prompted to carry out quite informally similar performance monitoring on a variety of local undertakings in those countries—the National Museum of Botswana’s infrastructural attempt to involve local Tswana and San communities in the management of Tsodilo Hills, the Xa Xa Conservancy’s attempt to differently regulate access to local attractions, and the Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism’s efforts to privatize certain aspects of its operations.)

**Research**

Since MTP/FCGT includes research and analysis among its services and products, I was asked to meet with several officials of the provincial Department of Community Safety to review promising programs for potential evaluation and to review an extensive list of community problems for potential applied research projects. Since returning to St. Louis, I have reiterated to MTP/FCGT my willingness to undertake with them research and analysis projects in that and other substantive areas.

Similarly, earlier in my visit, I met with my successor as research director of CDRT—Hugo van der Merwe, now long established as research director of the nongovernmental organization the Centre for Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR)—to discuss my South African studies of both those topics. I was subsequently asked by CSVR to make myself available to them as a potential collaborator in applied research.

Finally, I spent parts of two days at the University of the Western Cape, visiting with colleagues in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology and in the Department of Social Work. With the former I took first steps in negotiating their participation in a new comparative study of PTSD prevention with certain UMSL colleagues; with the latter I took pains to learn details of the current state of the UM/UWC project in community development with which I had been associated in its early days last year.