

SEMINAR ON COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

**A Discussion of a paper on "Policy and Practice of
Community Participation in the US Agency for
International Development"**

**prepared for the
Social Sector Policy
Analysis Project
operated by the
Academy for Educational Development
for the
Agency for International Development
R&D/E**

PJ-ABK-710

ISN 76138

Seminar on Community Participation

**A Discussion of a paper,
"Policy and Practice of Community Participation
in the US Agency for International Development"
Prepared by William J. Nagle**

for the

Social Sector Policy Analysis Project

operated by

**The Academy for Educational Development
for AID/R&D/ED**

Contract No. PDC-0682-C-00-9080-00

**October 9, 1991
Academy for Educational Development
1255 23rd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037**

MODERATOR WILLIAM J. NAGLE: How did this paper come to be? What was its impetus? Two years ago I co-authored a paper for the World Bank titled "Community Participation in World Bank Supported Projects." The World Bank has recently created a learning group on participation and has selected 20 projects that will pay particular attention to the participatory development aspect.

More importantly, the OECD Development Assistance Committee focused on participation in their spring sessions. Appendix A to my paper is the OECD discussion paper on participation. There is also an increased amount of interest among some of the other bilateral agencies. The most important reason for A.I.D. to revive participatory development approaches is reflected in two other appendices: The Statement on Participation by Asian NGOs, and the Arusha African NGO Charter on Popular Participation. The Arusha meeting in February, 1990, was the largest and most significant gathering of African NGOs to that time.

It is a very demanding statement. It places demands on both northern NGOs and, in particular, on donor agencies. The Arusha declaration alone would have been enough impetus for A.I.D. to take another look at this question.

A.I.D. was by far in the lead on participatory development in the late 70s through 1980. There was no other bilateral agency or UN agency that was doing as much and producing as much thoughtful material on the subject of participation than did A.I.D. at the time.

Except in water and sanitation, and in some health areas, A.I.D. has, for the most part, lost that leadership. But it could rather quickly and easily regain it if it chose to.

[The participants introduced themselves. Some made additional comments on their particular interest in the seminar.]

Carolyn Long, Vice-President of InterAction, a membership organization of 130 PVOs, said InterAction had committed itself to track the learning process on popular participation at the World Bank. She said she was recently told by an A.I.D. official that A.I.D. did not need to adopt a similar process because it was far beyond the Bank on participation. Therefore, she found this seminar particularly interesting.

May Yacoub introduced herself as the social and behavioral scientist responsible for community participation at A.I.D.'s Water and Sanitation for Health Project (WASH). She said that for WASH, participation is not the icing on the cake, it is really concrete in which they cast very expensive project inputs. For WASH, participation is very serious business because the staff regard as very important the whole sustainability of the infrastructure and the whole aspect of people using it willingly and integrating it into their everyday way of life. "It is the cornerstone of what we do."

Frank Method is the A.I.D. monitor of the Academy's Social Sector Policy Analysis project under which the community participation paper was written. Until recently he was with the Program Policy Coordination Bureau as division chief on social sector policy. He has just joined the staff of the R&D/Education Office. Because it was at his initiative that the study was undertaken, the moderator asked if he would explain in some detail why the study was undertaken and the importance he attaches to it.

FRANK METHOD: Three things caused me to be interested in this topic, in addition to it growing fairly organically out of some other work that we've been doing. First was some long conversations with Bill Nagle and others about the fact that terms that were last heard in the late '70s and early '80s and then disappeared – empowerment, participation, voice and choice and whatnot – all of a sudden have started reappearing around here. Just like meeting old friends that we haven't seen for a while, we know that they have changed but we are not quite sure how they've changed. We have got to talk about that.

Other terms are coming on – governance, accountability, et cetera. Are these the same terms, or are these different concepts, or what? Bill had the time and energy to want to explore how these terms are being used today and I said sure, why not, let's see where that goes.

Second, among the things I've been involved with over the past two years is the World Conference on Education for All. Participation as an objective was embedded substantively in the text of the various recommendations, as well as in the process of most of the preparatory activities and follow-up activities. Participation also was prominent in the rhetoric and in the objectives for the World Summit for Children. One of the things I observed and began to think about was the importance of participation at the high levels—at the policy level. I was struck by the degree to which getting more of the powerful stakeholders into the same tent, at the same table, and speaking at least on the same subject (if not with the same voice,) allows you get a chance of moving the policy agenda.

I think a lot of what we had talked about previously with regard to participation had something to do with helping the powerless find voice. I've been interested in thinking about what participation means when you begin to apply it to agenda-setting at the macro level, at the government level, and at the national level.

One of the things I was glad to see coming out of those meetings was the terminology of "society overtaking the state." I thought that was beginning to go somewhere and I wanted to explore, with others, where that went.

The third was the growing importance, which somebody observed here, of demand factors as the driving force in the allocation of development resources. I think that much of participation in the past, as I have understood the term, has meant participation as a

means to improve the way in which we supply resources or respond to a demand that already exists. I have, therefore, been interested in participation as it relates to demand.

These are questions in my mind that are coming up. How are these terms changing their nature as they come back full circle? How do we look at this at the macro level and how does participation relate to the demand side of the agenda?

JOHN AUSTIN: I am an environmental engineer with A.I.D.'s Office of Health and have been connected with the Water and Sanitation for Health (WASH) Project for the last 11 years. Community participation has been important and has gained importance as WASH has progressed. Those of you who haven't seen our "Lessons Learned" publication might want to look at it because it shows the importance of community participation in ten years of WASH experience. One reason why WASH has been successful is because it emphasized community involvement.

As soon as we saw the new A.I.D. democratic initiative, we realized it is just a different way of saying community participation. Some of the bureaus back it and others don't. We will see what our new PPC does with community participation. We hope you are indoctrinated today so that you go home with the right words.

We are actively involved with participation in many places. We expect to continue. It is in the WASH project and it is going to stay there.

ROBERT BERG: Some years ago I sanded commas on a piece of legislation that we thought would be-all and end-all which was called "Basic Human Needs." And at that time a question was asked of the key Congressional drafters: Why did you keep Title IX in the New Directions? The answer was sentiment. It was the first legislative victory for participation, but we wanted everybody to know that all of New Directions was participation. So, it was an intentional redundancy, just out of sentiment, for that first legislative mandate.

NAGLE: The floor is open, but I have a specific point I want to raise: A number of you have alluded to A.I.D.'s new democratic initiative. It is one of Administrator Rosken's three – now I guess four – announced new initiatives. John Rigby is here representing the Africa Bureau's Democratic Initiative Project.

On the second page of the paper I wrote: "Within A.I.D. at this writing, one cannot discern any compelling need or desire to assign high priority to community participation issues. However, some A.I.D. officials speculate that the newly announced democracy initiative could prompt a renewed interest in participation and grass roots involvement if grass roots involvement is regarded as a part of a democratic process that deserves to be nurtured. The OECD/DAC paper notes that participation in grassroots

organizations 'can give people experience in democracy and empowerment which, in turn, would be a foundation for democratic life in the society as a whole.' At this time A.I.D. staff charged with elucidating the policy and program implications of the initiative are inclined to focus its application on issues of governance."

Now that the program has moved out of the conceptualizing phase into implementation, it seems to me that the application may well go beyond governance to include community participation. I would appreciate it if those of you from A.I.D., in particular, could speculate on that question for a few moments.

My question is, outside of the WASH program, what opportunities are there in A.I.D. right now for participatory approaches to development? The democracy initiative may be providing at least the occasion for a renewed look at the issue. Are the people in A.I.D. who have conceptualized the initiative in the last few months still limiting the subject to governance? How are the missions reacting to the idea?

TIMOTHY BORK: In our view, good governance is based upon participation. The Africa Bureau does not have as a stiff definition of what it is doing in governance. As a matter of fact, our first debate in the Africa Bureau took place over what we were going to call our program — whether we were going to call it governance or democratization. We ended up calling it democratization for a lot of different reasons. But governance is a part of our democratization strategy. So, I think we have a very broad view of that. Our problem is trying to corral all of the various groups that have an interest in this, rather than going over them, so that they are providing useful and important input to an objective that we can achieve.

The thing I wanted to add to this is that in reading your paper, and listening to people, I think that it is important to realize that the entire agency is focusing on policy-based assistance. I think that what has happened in the Agency with respect to this issue, regardless of the governance and the democracy issue, is kind of a natural reaction to years of policy-based assistance. Once again we are faced with this issue of ownership. Who owns these policy-based initiatives? And I guess I am being a little disorganized in what I am saying here, but when you're dealing with a sectoral level as we do in Africa, you are not really too far away from those sanitation projects. It is very close. You have to be awfully intellectually stubborn not to see that sectoral policy-based assistance programs are very, very sensitive to local environments. I think they are. If you look at our health program in Nigeria, the very purpose of that program was to get resources out to the localities. I was there recently and saw the results of some of those programs. We are planting resources where they had not been before, and we encourage the government to do that. And that enables a more participatory environment.

I would like to put a more positive cast on our democratization effort which I think is a very fertile area. I do think it lends some opportunities for participation. And, also, I think that we overlook the whole policy area. I think the Agency is now searching for a way to get more participation in that arena. An example would be in our private

sector, the exercises we go through which bring in the people. In any community, people are interested in the private sector, and for a long period of time go through an exercise in developing a consciousness of what the private sector is and what the options are, et cetera. So, I think that there is a lot of opportunity now for participation. I do not see any negativism. I am a very critical person, so I don't want to sound like I'm trying to tell you how great A.I.D. is. I am not doing that at all. I see no negativism towards participation. I think when it is brought up in review of a project, it's considered a positive feature. I think that we encourage it in all of our projects to the extent we can. It is just finding out how to do it that is difficult.

One final note: There is a resurgence of interest in the private sector. I know we all have our own definitions of what the private sector is – private sector, in the broadest sense, and not the public sector. I think you may see some movement towards that by Congress, and by A.I.D. itself. This is really more in line with the view that the private sector, in general, is where sustainability and growth is going to come from. There is a frustration with governments, whether they are democratic or not, about their ability to deliver assistance. And there is a desire to try to put growth into the hands of the people. I think there is literally a lot of thought in the Agency towards moving some of our assistance away from governments to the private sector.

MAY YACOOB: I would like to pick up on the point of the very important movement that has been going on in maybe the last ten years – that is the shift of the government from being the provider, the ultimate provider of everything from health services to immunizations to holes in the ground to the trains, to the government taking on the role of promote. Thus, community participation becomes an important piece in that whole puzzle.

And fortunately, from our perspective as practitioners, we always jumped straight to the communities, feeling that's where it is all about, that's where it all begins, that's where it all ends. And in looking back at the number of projects where we jumped straight to the community, we realized that the bottlenecks were not really the communities; the bottlenecks were really the government and the institutions that had no understanding of what it means not to be a provider any more, but to be a promoter. They just don't understand what this is about.

So, when we talk about participation, it's a lot more than just reaching to communities in the periphery, but rather to whole institutions, governments, policy making from Washington, and how they affect communities. I think that would be a much more useful approach to think about and take for the future.

DAVE GROENFELDT: I'd like to have a narrow definition of community participation because it's so broad and it goes up into the institutional levels, government levels, and policy levels. At least in the irrigation sector, if you really are concerned about participation, you have to start with the Ministry of Finance. If there is not a financial

incentive to the government agency that runs irrigation systems to encourage a participatory approach – they need the help of farmers because their own agency doesn't have the funds to do it – you are not going to have participation.

This gets too complicated to talk about. So, I like to look at it as an imbedded process focusing on community participation at the grassroots level: how do people interact? What are their problems? What are their incentives at the local level? I find it frustrating to try to tackle it all at once.

MARTIN HANRATTY: I would like to pick up on what you said on the context, and the point that you brought out on the conclusions to your paper – that all of the elements are at A.I.D. for following through on this, and all that is needed is an informal group to start.

It seems to me, with the agency-wide statement that not much has worked in the last twenty years of A.I.D.'s programs, that we have to try some things that are new. Basically, we have thrown out, in an organizational context, the participatory development approach that A.I.D. took up in the '70s and '80s. Something has to be done to bring back that participatory development approach, and it has to be done formally.

The second thing is that I've always thought that community participation that went right to the village level was a loser because you can't encourage people to continue to stand up to a system that continues to exploit them. For example, in Cameroon we are attempting to change how they market fertilizer. What we found when we went into Cameroon was that the Agency that is identified as marketing fertilizer was the rent seeker, that they were extracting rents all the way down the line and they did not want to give up that lucrative business. So, that you have to go in and absolutely restructure the organizations before you can get community participation.

Right now A.I.D. is in the process of talking about privatization. Unless we can come up with some sort of new focus on participatory development in the context of restructuring our ideas – what the state does and what the non-state activities are – then I think it is going to lose again. It has got to be put into that broader context, along with the changes that are occurring in our understanding, and the consensus that is developing about what development does.

ALICE MORTON: I think that I agree with the points that have been made both by Tim Bork and Martin Hanratty in that, as far as I'm aware, within the present dialogue – and Jeanne North and I were both recently at a meeting in the Africa Bureau where this came up very directly – the sort of "new wave" approach which is embodied in the general phraseology of democracy initiatives and governance seems to be leaning, as Tim is saying, toward, perhaps, throwing out government from the concept of governance –

talking about participation in a very different way from the way in which we used to be talking about it.

There is, perhaps, nothing wrong with that. I think two things are important: one is that we shouldn't get bogged down in definitions, because I think A.I.D. and everybody else does that a lot. And we can waste a great deal of intellectual effort and time doing that. But I think the other thing that I would like to say is, oddly enough, something in praise of the state, which is to say merely that we are looking at the role of governments, under the Implementing Policy Change Project, to see what happens when a policy change is either "induced" or "voluntary." What happens, and how is that change managed? It seems crucial that we are never, in reality, looking either at the state alone as an actor, or at another series of stakeholders alone as actors. It is always an interactive process in which the state has a role. The process and its outcomes are always complex and contingent.

I think that statements that are made using reified concepts like the "predatory state" versus some other [good] entity or category – say the private sector – tend to overdraw contrasts which are then really not very useful. I think what is, perhaps, more useful in whatever disciplinary context you may be dealing in, whatever bureaucratic context, is to think of the interaction, and not try to blank out, as it were, one part of the equation or the other.

PAULA DONNELLY-ROARK: I'd like to go forward with some of the things that have been said.

In the past ten years the whole idea of participation has changed tremendously. And this paper has really given a good focus on what A.I.D. was doing in the '70s and shows that they brought it a long way. But, essentially, they dropped it in the '80s. What happened in the '80s, though, was that a number of NGO's in Africa – with which I am more familiar – and also in Asia, took it up. Certainly, the meeting at Arusha was an outgrowth of that.

Recently, I was at another meeting that was at an outgrowth of Arusha. It was a Pan African Congress for community participation workers. There were about 35 people there from, I believe, 11 nations. There were three people from the outside invited. One was from Bangladesn, one from Sri Lanka, and myself from North America.

Because they wanted very specifically to combine analytical frameworks and action frameworks, they felt that the best analytical framework to work from was the book by Marston (1984), published by ILO, where he divides participation into four different types of activities. And that's really helpful, because when one person says participation, they might be talking about mobilization. When another person says participation, they might be talking about empowerment. And they are very different processes with very different objectives and very different outputs and results.

Although I don't like to get bogged down in definitions, I think perhaps that pursuing it from an analytical framework which lets you look at things objectively is very helpful. What they did with this was to say that in Africa they were promoting what they called SPO organizations and this was a specific separation from NGOs or PVOs. An SPO is a self-reliance promoting organization. Some NGOs and PVOs may be SPOs, but not all of them. A government entity might be an SPO. And to go back to the analytical framework, the process they used was an empowerment process. And then to go to your point about micro vs. macro, this empowerment process can be used by policy-level national ministers; it can be used by people working in health and sanitation at the village level. To me, that is a very helpful framework from which to work.

NANCY DIAMOND: Paula Donnelly-Roark has successfully deconstructed participation. I would like to deconstruct unity or local participation in the community. I don't know where people have worked, but I worked in Africa, and I have to say that there are not homogenous interests at the local level. So, we are talking in very big terms. I mean, maybe it's a step forward to talk about community participation, but within that there are many interests, and I think if A.I.D. is thinking about it, then they had better figure out whose interest they are supporting within the village or local community. So, I think both terms [unity and local participation] are important to break down, because they are too vague.

BERG: I tend to think that in the '50s and '60s there were a lot of semi-naive approaches. Then came Title IX in 1967. Basic Human Needs (BHN) came along in '73 with Owens and Shaw's book which I think is worth noting, and the intellectual base for it was almost entirely the Camilla project. There really wasn't a lot that came of BHN. The first empirical evidence that came along was the DAI report on participation and sustainability in agriculture. I tried to get the Administrator and the Deputy Administrator to have a meeting of the Executive Staff to discuss that, but they didn't see the point. They just didn't see that this was important. By the end of the '70s people really got serious about it. The empirical evidence was fairly strong. The projects and programs with strong participatory bases woven into them performed a great deal better than those without such a base. Then a new administration came in and people were literally fearful. I was still head of evaluation as the evidence was coming in. My staff was fearful about printing these findings because that was not the accepted wisdom.

A.I.D. in the 1980s had a tremendous amount of anti-intellectualism where the answers were clear regardless of what the questions were. If you castigate activities without looking at evidence, you send a message clear through the organization that we aren't interested in this, that, and the other, because we tag it as welfare, and we tag it as meaningless.

In fact, in the '80s a major change did take place which I think is worth noting, and that is that the economic downturn in the Third World did force a change of strategy. In the '70s we did premise a growth in the social sector budget, and that

allowed experimentation and a lot of things to go ahead. That growth did not take place in the '80s. There needed to be a refocus on policy. But to be focused on policy to the exclusion of participation was wrong. And, indeed, the error in the '80s was first talking about capitalism and entrepreneurship as "the" answer. Today, the error is in talking about democracy as "the" answer when, in fact, the answer is probably more associated with a variety of things, especially pluralism. Pluralism is something we should have been fostering and continuing to foster much more seriously than we are now. I think the downgrading of the WID office is an unfortunate sign if you are interested in pluralism, because that means downgrading a facet of pluralism. Certainly the notion that participation was something that the mushy-headed were interested in made it a part of the "welfare orientation," just as basic human needs was part of the "liberal virus." This anti-intellectual setting created a bias against really looking at the evidence.

Now, I think that there is a chance of including democracy, not as a be-all and end-all in itself, but as a key part of pluralism. And if we could look at that and look at such other facets of pluralism as the PVO community, there is no reason that PVO assistance in particular, and participation in general, should not be acceptable and valid strategies.

NAGLE: I am going to ask Tim Bork if he would like to comment on Bob Berg's remarks.

BORK: Well, I think he is accurate about what happened in the Agency. In my own view, I think we are shifting now towards what we call the "private sector." We haven't really defined it yet, but believe me, there is interest. Are they going to call that Basic Human Needs or are they going to call it the private sector? What are they going to call this? It is really going back again. It's a reaction to looking at assistance to governments and seeing what's happened, and knowing that you could have all of the great policies in the world, but if you don't have anything to implement them with, then what are they for? So, I would agree with your analysis. I think there is an opening. Intellectually, I don't know how we'll get there.

It is interesting, because the very question that came up in my mind when you watch this is, are we returning to the Basic Human Needs? Well, that isn't going to be acceptable, so what is it going to be, and how is it going to be articulated?

NAGLE: I want to just interject an introduction to the last person who came in. Coralie Bryant told me that she was going to have to be late. Dr. Bryant has been involved in this participation issue for a long time. When she was teaching international development at American University she wrote an article for the Rural Development Participation Review, which came out of the Cornell Project. And the title of it was "Organizational Impediments to Making Participation a Reality: Swimming Upstream in A.I.D." Corky is now at the World Bank, and has been very involved with the World

Bank Learning Group on Participation. Therefore, I was particularly interested in having her here at this discussion.

So, Corky, as soon as I give Jeanne North a chance to make her comment, I am going to ask if you wish to make an initial comment. We will give you a couple of minutes to do that and then we will get back into general discussion.

JEANNE NORTH: Just responding to the question of where this interest and participation exists in A.I.D., I see it so many places that I thought I might just give examples of these perspectives. One of these, as Alice mentioned, is the perspective of the implemented policy change project. This project focuses on what the public sector must do in order to implement policies. A lot of the time the challenge to government is to enable private sector people to do what is needed – sometimes the job is to facilitate or develop incentives, and so forth. Interaction is definitely required. So, when you are looking at managing governments, you are also looking at farmer response, small business response, what they need, what their incentives are, and so forth. This seems to strike quite a responding chord, I think, in the minds of a lot of A.I.D. people who realize that there must be a public sector role in implementing policies, even when the emphasis is on the private sector.

Another perspective is the emphasis on popular demand for government change. Governments can, through their wisdom, insight, and enlightenment, understand what they must do. But being humans, they tend to react to demand. And the question is, how do you develop demand in a non-democratic society? How do you develop demand for government response? Some people are saying we do this through giving money to associations willy-nilly, no matter who they are. We spread money around to voluntary groups and this will result in a popular demand. Others emphasize democracy. A still different notion, I think, is the one that many of us are emphasizing as important: to achieve particular objectives in sanitation or irrigation or fragile lands preservation, participation is required. From a pragmatic point of view, if the people who are making decisions to commit labor and resources are not involved in the decisions, one can't expect that the objective will be achieved.

Another perspective on participation, one that Alice Morton mentioned, is to forget the government altogether. Think of constitutions and terms of agreements that decentralized, private groups make with each other to accomplish work.

I think people seldom give enough emphasis to the participation of A.I.D. recipients in planning. We give a lot of lip service to that, but, in fact, I think our words betray us. We hear a lot about how we're now doing this, and we're now doing that, when, in fact, these things can't happen unless the people in the host country want them to happen, commit themselves, put their necks out on the line, and risk their time and resources. And if we pay a little more attention to our verbiage, that might help us in actual participatory action between A.I.D. and national groups.

CORALIE BRYANT: The Bank has been working on the governance paper as well. It is fair to say that the Bank has been as seized with that topic, as all the bilateral organizations have been. I have been working on that paper. This discussion of the relationship between participation and governance came up throughout. I think it's actually, on one level, self-evident that participation is about the way that one increases accountability. Part of what we all are trying to do in coming to terms with the changing role of the state, and all the issues imbedded in this concept of governance, is to increase accountability, openness, and predictability. Any social scientist will say that accountability is imbedded in, and starts with, the ways in which people participate in the civic polity. After you've said that, a hard discussion begins about all of the different ways that people do, or don't, participate. Furthermore, one must ask what instrumentalities are available to bilateral and multilateral donors for increasing accountability? (I won't bore you with all of that because you are so knowledgeable.) I do think that **accountability** is an important concept that I hadn't heard discussed and it certainly has become important in our thinking at the Bank.

These things always come back to projects, because although we do policy-based lending – and I've been saying mantras about that as well as you can – the project is still a very sturdy vehicle. One of the interesting projects under the rubric of public sector management reform is strengthening the role of Congress. This project happened to be in Chile, and will be strengthening the role of Congress in budgeting. If you want effective public expenditure, fiscal policy, and financial policy, you want a strong Congress. You want one that can ask the hard questions, that can analytically unbundle what you are talking about in these sorts of policies. Getting change at that level has multipliers because of what it means for public education on hard policy choices confronting the people who are making budgeting decisions. This example is a way of backing up to say that beyond all of these abstract issues is a very complicated issue of how one chooses the lending instrument for improving governance. I would contend that governance has always been a major topic; it's just that the hooks for getting attention to it in bilateral and multilateral agencies change. What's happened, of course, is that the world has changed and has pushed the issue onto the public agenda. The change in Eastern Europe is a demonstration of how much people want, and are demanding, change. The question is whether we are going to be fully responsive, with new, creative thinking about what kinds of institutions can be developed so that people can have more **accountable** public institutions. Obviously the private sector is part of that story.

That brings me back to the final view that governance is a relational quality. It isn't only public sector management, and it isn't only private sector development. It really is about their relationship, the balance, and attention to institutions linking macro and micro levels.

MODERATOR NAGLE: what are some of the questions you would pose for discussion in the remainder of this meeting or in future meetings?

DONNELLY-ROARK: When I read the paper it started me thinking about whether there was anything in the WASH experience. Certainly not everybody is going to be doing water and sanitation, but is there anything in the WASH experience that is specifically replicable? What are the learning points from other groups? And I did some thinking about that, and I think there are some things.

VOICE: And how the current time lines for projects and program implementation do not match those of developing nations and how that inhibits the participatory process.

NAGLE: That is excellent. That goes right to the subject of Corky Bryant's 1980 paper and, indeed, of Alice Morton's paper in which they both tried to address the obstacles. And it is at the heart of the World Bank's learning process. There are, within the Bank, many of the same impediments. Questions like: how much of a constraint is the amount of time that a loan officer has to design a project? How much more time would that loan officer need if he or she developed a participatory project? Does the present reward system at the Bank present a major obstacle?

MORTON: I think it might be helpful to talk about how we would know if we were doing whatever it is that we do, defining this thing. I hate to use this word because it is over-used recently, and we do a lot of it, but what would be the "indicators" of successful implementation or creation of the kinds of institutions that Corky is talking about?

HANRATTY: I would like to have a general discussion of people outside of it. If they had their druthers and could change the world today, what would they like to see in maybe five years? Where do they want to see the Agency five years from now in terms of participatory development?

NAGLE: It reminds me, Martin, of the classical Peter Drucker question which you can apply to any institution, agency, division, whatever. If this institution did not exist, would we feel compelled to create it? And if we did, how would it be different than what we now have?

JOHN RIGBY: I want to echo what Alice Morton said. I think "indicators" are very important with A.I.D., especially in Africa. They must have indicators for Congress. Decisions on allocations of resources are all made on that basis. I would be interested in hearing whoever has something to add on the topic of whether A.I.D. and the World Bank, particularly in the environmental field in Africa, have been able to get far without grassroots participation in conjunction with these environmental action plans? It is something very specific and it might be useful to at least talk about that.

BRENDA BRYANT: Along with the notion of timing, I would like to see explained the seeming contradiction between A.I.D. as an organization, and its ability to take risk and share control, and how that relates to the real potential.

VOICE: I think one thing that needs to be addressed is the fact that A.I.D. is one of many, many variables that can turn into social and economic change, and that so much of it does come from popular movement. What role do we have in identifying those popular movements that are already moving along on their own impetus, and where we can step in to help them?

LONG: Well, it's what you were just saying, that what we see from the NGO perspective is the development of civil society in countries – NGOs, farmers' movements, women's associations, et cetera – and this notion of the increased democratic space that people talk about which is occurring widely in Africa. I would like some treatment of A.I.D.'s role vis-a-vis supporting the development of civil society, and perhaps challenging whether a project approach is the way to continue providing assistance to developing countries? Or is it not more a program or institutional support/institutional development approach to various groupings in society that then take over the development process. I think as long as we superimpose this project approach over a set of players that are already active, we then alter the process, the dynamic process, in which people are engaged. So, I think that finding a way in which A.I.D. could be supportive of that natural process, rather than imposing a different way of looking at things, is something that is very critical.

A second point I would make is that, as I said, a group of us from InterAction spent the morning critiquing the Bank's process questions. And while we have some things to say about these questions, I do think a debate is going to follow this seriously. But I think those questions, while somewhat formulated, would be very valuable to consider vis-a-vis A.I.D. as well. There are so many different levels of experience in this room and different orientations that it's hard to get a grasp on how to go forward with the discussion.

METHOD: I have two things on my mind, one of which Carolyn caught, I think, with the civil society. I was wondering whether we were talking about a change in our understanding of what community participation is, and what skills are relevant to that. Or are we talking about a reassessment of the state and a change of perception of the political environment? Are we talking about how the state-of-the-art has changed, or has our perspective of the actors changed?

NAGLE: I think we need a little bit more discussion about what is changing in the political environment around the participatory process. Is this something that's

happening just within the practice of the development professionals or is something changing at the national level, and the global level?

A number of issues and questions have been raised in the last few moments. Some of them, perhaps, can be addressed in the second half of this seminar. Others will provide a basis for discussions at future seminars. I just wanted to mention that, with Frank's approval, I am doing an annex to this paper. I am looking at three large PVO's that, over the last two decades, have been doing a lot of community development and community participation, in the hope of gleaning from them some "lessons learned." What works and what doesn't work? We are looking at Save the Children, World Vision, and at the Christian Children's Fund.

[After a 10-minute break, Frank Method and John Austin of A.I.D. co-chaired the final session of the seminar.]

METHOD: Let me suggest where we hope to be after we discuss this for another hour and a half.

Those of us participating here from A.I.D. are, as everybody knows, in the midst of a reorganization. We are in a rather fluid situation as to what precisely our mandate is. We are listening very carefully to this discussion, and one of the questions is what does this mean for an organization like A.I.D.? Where should we go from here? I don't know that any of us are going to be able to say anything very definite on that in the next hour, but I hope that our thinking will have been enlightened.

I'd like to throw a little bit of a challenge back. To what extent is it correct to assume that A.I.D. is the appropriate focus for our advice and recommendation as to how to proceed? Is A.I.D. going to be as central to development over the next decade as we have been assuming it was over the past couple of decades? Is A.I.D. really the big horse on this, pulling the wagon, or is somebody else? And if it is partially A.I.D., plus others, who are those others, and how does whatever it is that we are talking about doing include all of the people that need to be helping to pull this together, or to support it, or to contribute to it, or whatever? I don't say that defensively, but I think I am accurate in saying that in most of the country, and most of the development agendas over the next decade, A.I.D. certainly will not be the only, and in most cases it will not be the biggest of the funding agencies, or the catalytic agencies, who are trying to be helpful in achieving development. So, we need to think about what that means?

I agree with Tim Bork in that during the early '80s, you really did see quite a number of terms and concepts pushed aside. I think the development case was initially that the lack of good participation explained the development failures of the '60s. Particularly, the case was made that greater participation was needed in a non-democratic society, because in such non-democratic societies the information and control signals weren't accurate, and what was being done wasn't fully legitimate. So, initially,

participation was needed in a non-democratic system as something of a corrective. That was the development case. You couldn't get good project development without better participation. There was a more political case, coming from groups that were among the main critics of development. The dependency argument from Latin America and other places was that greater participation is necessary to get greater community empowerment, empowerment of people, and that empowerment is intrinsic to political change. And coming out of that will be a better society.

I think that the development set, particularly the U.S. development set, shied away from that, because the assumption which was made fairly explicitly by many of the political case proponents was that the end result would be some kind of a social democratic state; not a democratic state, but a state in which power flowed to a fairly unitary state.

To a lot of people's surprise, from the left all the way across to the right, it did not, in most cases, result in a viable socialist state. It resulted in the opening up of the state and its democratization.

We are now in a position where we have to make a choice between whether the successful process of democratization, as we are observing it in many countries, validates the emphasis upon participation and community development, or does it obviate the need for concerted attention to community participation – participation at the community level? In other words, does the fact that countries with which we are working are moving toward more democratic societies puts us in a position where we can say, well, market forces will take care of it, the democratic process will take care of it, we as development professionals no longer need to focus upon community participation. We can leave it to these other kinds of forces and revert to working with macroeconomics, infrastructure, trade, and other considerations. I think that's the choice, as I see it. Can we make the case that continued emphasis upon participation is both good development practice and good political empowerment practice; that it is essential to the sustaining of the democratic system? And I think the degree to which we are successful in making a case for it will determine whether we, in fact, have programmatic working room to continue to emphasize it.

I think a lot of people, from the left to the right, are genuinely surprised that the emphasis upon participation resulted in a democratic system – democratization of systems – rather than a successful development of a more social state.

AUSTIN: Will changes in the political environment affect community participation? We are starting with Marty [Hanratty] and his group, which is going to be whatever PPC [Program and Policy Coordination] is going to be in the future, and our group, down more on the implementation side. We have to find out how we are going to fit together.

With Frank [Method] just moving into education, he has got to size up the system at R&D [Research and Development] now. I think that in running the WASH project

we can continue to do whatever we've been doing and nobody is going to bug us at this moment. But when we start looking at the bigger things – what the policy group is going to do – then we have got to go slower.

Marty, do you want to make a few comments? You commented at the break on the speed with which we might move – that we need to know if the right people are going to listen to us.

HANRATTY: I guess the comment that I had was that there is a feeling amongst a very select group of my colleagues that a substantive basis of our vision about what development is has been lacking in the Agency for maybe three or four years. There was a period when there was quite a bit – as somebody mentioned before – of anti-intellectualism. There has been a lot of sloganeering. There has been some reasonable analysis and some questionable analysis about the impact of our programs in the '70s and '80s. All of that is combined to create a vacuum at a time when the Agency is being bombarded by special interest groups to do this and to do that, to do a thousand things, as well as individuals in the Agency who do not know where they are going because there is a major restructuring of the organization going on.

All that says is that if you ask a question now, it is likely that you won't get an answer. And if you do, you may get a negative answer just because we don't want anything more on our plates.

One of the things that we are beginning to think about very carefully and that will and probably begin to occur over the next six months, is the Office of Strategic Planning, which will begin to take a look at developing a vision – an overlying vision of development -- primarily based on human productivity as the key engine to development. What this vision does is get us to a human-based development program that allows new structures and organizations.

There are two issues on the plate. The first is to develop that vision and to vet it through the Agency, to debate and discuss it with our colleagues, and to get some sort of a consensus on it from both field- and Washington-based staff.

The second is to go after the question of whether we are a development assistance agency or a foreign policy agency? Those other things have been tearing at the fabric of the Agency over time and diverting us from having to focus on what our mandate is. The vision would be determined by the determination of how that mandate might come out. That is going to be in the process. I would imagine that it would take at least a year of serious scholarship, discussion, and debate within the organization.

Not to say that the issue of participation isn't absolutely critical, but in developing what we are even talking about we may not be able to react immediately and say we should do this. We may have to play it cool. The most important thing in negotiating for policy change, as in a waltz, is the timing.

VOICE: Is that sort of discussion going on?

HANRATTY: Yes, it started two days ago. Right now it is at our strategic planning office. It will be at the AA level. We are developing a cable for all field missions which lays out a policy agenda for A.I.D.. That will be cleared by all of the Aas. It will be sent out by Katherine Morgan to the field and it will be discussed with mission directors. Basically, what it will be is a revolving agenda of items that we will begin to look into to get some decisions on. You are aware that we have 31 different objectives. Some of those are foreign policy objectives; some of those are development assistance objectives. In some countries, foreign policy objectives override everything else. And in some cases some would argue that there is an inconsistency between the development objectives and the foreign policy objectives. They compete. What we want to do, as honestly as possible, is to broker it within the Agency and to get people at least to see the trade-offs, and then possibly make some decisions.

AUSTIN: Jeanne North, you've been heavily involved in this stuff. What do you see is useful input? Or what can we get into once the cable is out and we can respond to it? Are there any ideas that your group has already put together? Has your group started to talk about increasing the role of community participation and how it may impact, with the restructuring in Research and Development?

NORTH: No, I don't think we have, although being a group of social scientists it is implicit in our thinking, but it hasn't been explicit.

JENNA LUCE: The WID office has started to discuss that. We came to a consensus on that during our strategy meetings a couple of weeks ago. So there is an emphasis on trying to coordinate, through our institutionalizing efforts within the Agency, and reaching out beyond the Agency to grassroots organizations. They will then reflect changes back to the mission level which will then, hopefully, reflect the changes back to headquarters. We want to coordinate our policy efforts and also integrate WID into policy levels as well as into grass roots organizations.

MORTON: This may be theoretical because I'm not quite up to date with the reorganization, but one of the things that was done in the Africa Bureau under strategic planning was to take account of the fact that A.I.D., in many cases, was not only not the biggest donor, but might even be the littlest donor, irrespective of how closely in bed A.I.D. was with the World Bank and the IMF in particular countries.

I guess what I'd like to do is address the first part of your question which is, to what degree is A.I.D. an appropriate focus for addressing issues such as participation, pluralism, democracy, and so forth, if it is not the prime player? And I think the answer

is that A.I.D. has played, and continues to play, a catalytic role. I think you can have any number of sets of evidence that in some odd ways A.I.D. has acted as intellectual vanguard in the development arena. Even at times when the foreign policy agenda tended to seem to be overriding. So I personally feel that one needn't give up because A.I.D. may shrink, or may change its perspective. But one has to then be very careful with the timing and do a certain amount of social marketing.

AUSTIN: So the point is that, even though dollar-wise we may not be the big kid on the block, because of what we have done, because of the reputation and catalytic effect we have, we need to provide the leadership to those who will have the money.

HANRATTY: Just on a personal note: If the United States is going to have an aid program that does not include participation, that, to me, is an unbelievable statement. For a country, in which participation is basically so much a part of our very fabric, to finance a program that isn't based on participation in some way, as a basic underlying principle, is just not a U.S. assistance program. But that's my own personal view. It's not always held by other people in the Agency. The trouble in A.I.D. is the fact that it has not been debated. There has not been a vehicle to debate it sincerely in the Agency, where views – differing views – are put on the table. And it's a transparent debate. There's been too much jargon, too much clouding the issue with "this boss says this and another says that." Policy needs to be made by the Agency, not by components of the Agency.

NORTE: I think we can do a lot better in thinking about what is the role of a donor agency, be they big or small, in promoting community participation in another country. I think there are a lot of things that donors can do – providing empowerment through finances, for example, or comparative experience, and they can certainly do no harm. Often times we enforce incentives that overlook the community. We can promote democratic participatory processes in the work that we finance, and so forth. But, after all, it is, in fact, a social contract within that country we're talking about. And, it ultimately has to be those people making whatever changes there are. I think we need to think much more clearly about not only the analysis of what should be done, but also what our role should be in that.

BERG: I have great sympathy with those of you who are struggling with these policy interests and questions because I don't perceive a U.S. foreign policy vis-a-vis the Third World. Scrowcroft recently addressed the Council on Foreign Relations. He mentioned Asia in one sentence. That was his total thought about the Third World and the "new world order." Now, you go hang a policy on that which covers Africa programs or anything else. The Administration is still working on it; there is still a debate in the State Department over whether the "new world order" is going to include the Third World, and if so, on what terms? Do development and the environment figure in the kind of security

we are looking for in our new world order? So, yes, a bilateral program fits within a foreign policy context, but we don't have a foreign policy context!

I almost think that first of all one has to see if participation is a good thing. It might be good to get the evidence on it. I am not necessarily so sure, Frank, that we can always say it's a good thing because it leads to the ends we are looking for. The thing about these pluralistic developments is that we don't know what is going to happen when we educate girls or – what people do in life. A pluralistic society just has a better quality to it, you know. We think it is a good thing; it's a yeasty society, and that's a good thing.

The challenge for funders is almost as though a benefactor gives you funds and says you have got to help the missionaries who are working with the Eskimos or something like that. And then you as a foundation have to justify helping civil rights in Mozambique and say why that is consistent. You may have to have a whole list of argumentation as to why working on pluralism and working on participation is an economical, Bush-like approach. If we can't have sector lending and program lending, we might have a major impact with less cost through this kind of intervention. A political approach or rationale may also need to be crafted.

In the last couple of days I interviewed a couple of political international institutes, one of which said there is an Assistant Administrator at A.I.D. who says, we're not really sure whether democracy is helpful to development. I said, do they take the opposite tactic: we shouldn't have democracy in order to expedite development? So the case needs to be made that participation is going to answer some of the demands that are being placed upon you. Wherever the policy winds up – whether the policies are based on foreign policy considerations or because somebody had a dream the night before and comes in and says, this is what we're going to do – I think the critical point is, at least internally, being sure that whatever strategies are being advocated, they make good sense and respond to what people around the world want. I must say that that is a very difficult test for A.I.D.. (I do recall very clearly a mission director who went out and did public opinion polling as to what people wanted.)

There is a lot of empirical evidence that buttresses the sustainability argument. There is strong evidence that participatory programs and projects are far more sustainable. Now, if the U.S. delegation is under demand at Rio [at the UN Conference on Environmental Development in June, 1992] to say something about how we are enforcing sustainable development, it would be nice to be able to say we are working on development strategies which we believe are far more sustainable than what we've done in the past, and in part that means participation.

DONNELLY-ROARK: I just wanted to comment. Bob [Berg], you were saying that working within an economic framework we can show that participation has positive effects. And certainly, I think we've all taken that sustainability orientation to prove that, within the economic framework. To go back to something that Frank [Method] said

earlier, I think UNDP has made a major contribution in the last two years by shifting the perspective from economic development to human development. And I think that that is an important shift to keep in mind, because I think that's where it's going. If A.I.D. decides to stay with the economic models, it will be left behind, I believe, because the focus is now on what the people within the countries themselves want. It is an empowerment focus. The focus on human development, I think, is a major change, a major vision that will help us all in the future.

AUSTIN: These changes are being made by the multilateral agencies that you are working with.

DONNELLY-ROARK: Right. And UNDP has now published its second human development report. I assume all of you have seen it. If by chance you have not, I think it's one of the most helpful references to have on your desk at this moment.

METHOD: I would strongly commend that as well. I think it really goes to the point of whether we are talking about participation as a means to some other end or whether it is part and parcel of what we are trying to do. I think that regarding the issue that Bob [Berg] raises — as to whether we need to do research or affirm our consensus as to whether participation works and is beneficial — the relevant question is, what if? I think we have situations in which it is viewed that participation has worked, and we now have governments that we like, and so let's pump money into them. Look at what is happening in Eastern Europe. Nobody is seriously saying, "let's slow down this process until we get better participation," because we say, "right, we've got the product, you know." And anybody that says "hey, wait a minute, slow down, we've got a better process," is brushed aside.

MORTON: I want to take up essentially the second part of what you said, which is that as you watch the process of the disintegration of blocks of states and as you watch, indeed, the disintegration of states themselves, you must observe and analyze carefully. For example, great care must be taken when you try to work, as we are, in places that are very topical like Haiti, where we were somewhat unwillingly dragged into supporting a very democratically elected President who soon was deposed. One of the things that you realize is that although there may be a nascent pluralism, that doesn't mean that people know what to do with it. And whereas you don't want to get into the business of exporting blueprinted American democratic procedures, or organizational types and styles, that is, in fact, what we appear to be doing in some regions under the democracy initiatives emphasis.

I think, again, that it is a matter of deft footwork in trying to convince those whose major incentive is to move the money. That game hasn't changed that much. It is to move the money to support, as you say, the governments we like or the proto-

governments that we would hope to like, and to make sure, for some brief shining moment, that they stay in power. So, it seems to me that even those who are the most, shall we say, inspired and ideologically oriented towards saying "fine, the market will take care of what you got rid of," can be persuaded that this may not be sufficient. Whoever is making decisions might be persuaded that there is, indeed, a learning process that must take place. You probably shouldn't use that term – you could come up with something better – but there is a learning process taking place and we can learn from it.

I mean, to market it to the current administration in A.I.D., you probably don't want to call this research, and you don't want to call it a learning process. There are lots of PR kinds of things that you would want to do, I think, to gain positive attention to the role of participation. And you would want to watch the timing. But I suspect that nobody really believes that everything is great in Albania, Bulgaria, and so on, nor that it will remain so. And we are, as an agency, as a country, sending people out to teach people how to have legislatures, to teach people how to be financially accountable and how to conduct elections. And so I think that within that context there is also room for looking at what this really means about how participatory and pluralistic and yeasty and sustainable and developmental these societies are.

METHOD: Thank you. I would like to come back before we close this afternoon to the question that you raised on what terminology we use to discuss what we're engaged in. I think that is important as we figure out where we go from here.

C. BRYANT: Just two very brief comments, picking up on Alice's [Morton] earlier point. You are way ahead of me, Alice. It does seem to me that there are advantages in smallness. I know that's hard because it might have felt like more fun in the earlier days when A.I.D. was the biggest player. But there are advantages in the catalytic role when one is smaller – think for a moment, in the panoply of international organizations, of the relative size of UNICEF compared with the Bank. And you'd say oh, well, yes, but UNICEF has the advantage of being small. Exactly. And that is where a catalytic role comes in. I haven't seen – I could be wrong – but I just haven't seen A.I.D. seizing that advantage when talking about its own leadership – leadership both in conceptualizing, and in design, as well as the intellectual leadership.

Now, that leads me to two other quite different thoughts. We need to address how to proceed with repositioning the way we think about participation so that it helps inform the strategy of the Agency. I'd watch out for a dichotomy that says A.I.D. must choose between being a development agency or a foreign policy agency. Nobody wants the Agency to be simply an arm of narrowly defined foreign policy. There was a wonderful book written by Baldwin called Economic Statecraft a couple of years back. One of the points he made was that international policy is going to be changing so much that the real competition will be over innovation and economic statecraft. The more I read that, the more I thought, it's interesting, but this guy doesn't realize that development and development management are a battle about economic statecraft.

There is a very catalytic role for positioning yourself as the place where one thinks about what a "new world order" really means for the Third World. And, precisely because some people haven't figured that one out, there is an opportunity.

Now, if you think A.I.D. is being reorganized, let me tell you about the reorganization at the World Bank. One of the issues in the Bank is avoiding the diversionary impact of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union on the Third World.

On a different level, I would watch out about participation as an umbrella concept. It has all kinds of definitions. It is possible, at one level, to think of participation as being about "voice" or about "exit." Those were two of the concepts in the governance paper we used, drawing from the Hirschmann book.

Markets are a form of participation in the sense that if, in fact, one cannot get voice at the supply stage, then provide exit so that one gets voice with one's pocketbook. I mention this because I don't think people have always thought about markets in relationship to participation. Professor Hirschmann says he wishes he had made rather more of the "voice" component, and you are talking about voice a lot of the time. But I wouldn't overlook the fact that the generic meaning of the term in all of the debates about hierarchies versus markets is that latent point that markets are another way that we participate. Think about how you participate. You participate in a variety of ways, and one of them is through markets.

BERG: You know, donors sunk tremendous amounts of money into Ghana and they have all kinds of exit possibilities. But the fact is, it still has a low savings and investment rate. Why? That's a political statement by people, the only one they're allowed to vote on. They have no confidence in their country. So, it seems to me that we should have made some of that investment, expanding their options beyond the market.

C. BRYANT: Right, yes, that's true.

BERG: And the opposite case is that in India we're getting skunked. There is nothing going on there that I think is extremely important. Ralph Smucker and I were told when we worked on the Michigan State University study, by key people at A.I.D., that our best program is in science and technology in India. This is the thing of the future, we were told. So, I went and talked to the Minister of Science and Technology and said, what's your best foreign aid program? And he said the Soviet Union. So, I think we are stuck with a small amount of money and the macro policy of government when we should have been out with the people. That's where we ought to be with our investments.

C. BRYANT: All right. So the catalytic role would have been to position yourself very differently.

BERG: Even \$100 million in a participation development program in India would have been a hell of an investment. We are stuck now. It is a prototypical case. No foreign policy goal, no possibility our investment level really leverages the country, and we have wound up with no relationship whatsoever to speak of.

ELLIS TURNER: There are a lot of questions from this discussion that are still out there that I would like to hook on to, but a couple I want to hit real quickly because I know we are short on time.

I think, Frank, you raised the question of is it enough to start democracy and then stop? Having worked in the United States on environmental and hazardous waste clean-up projects, I think it's instructive just to point out that the United States with its democratic system – with the flaws in it, but still a democratic system – is still struggling for ways to find a higher level of community participation to answer a lot of the questions that we have about our own quality of life and the resolution of environmental problems. I think that our own acceptance of the importance of community participation could hopefully, in itself, lead one to jump beyond the question of how do we justify community participation. I think there's an implicit faith that it works. We've bought into it. We've bought into it for a long time and I don't see that it's fruitful for us to keep asking the question, does it work and is it worth it. Because if you do, then you start asking, to what end, and then I think you fall into the trap that we fell into in the child survival program of trying to develop a limited program and remove all the risk. With support for democracy through community participation, there are tremendous potential benefits, but you cannot be absolutely sure that this process is going to produce these ends without risks. If you do try to control the community participation process, then you are really setting yourself up for all kinds of failures. It is completely contrary to empowering people to develop their own goals, and put their own motivation behind achieving those goals, and then try to control the process or not give it full support. It is almost bound to fail.

So, I think if we try to go through an analysis of community participation, in the way that the Agency is now doing economic benefit cost analysis on every one of these issues, including participation, I don't think we'll ever get to a state of providing good development assistance. And I think if we want to influence A.I.D.'s use of community participation – and I think the Agency won't try to do it itself – then we need to find a way to justify the programs not by doing the cost benefit analysis or by having the discussions just internally. I think A.I.D. needs to look outside and tap the development community, and get some support from the development community as to which directions to take. That may be through an advisory committee; it may be through some boards. There are a lot of different vehicles. But I think it's such an important issue it would justify that level of opening up the Agency for external input and discussion.

If you don't, then I think there is never going to be an ability for the Agency to really feel what the development community thinks is the right approach and how to go

about it. There is constantly going to be bickering about definitions, about how to justify the outcomes and programs. I think you need to feel the development support that is out there and open up to this kind of discussion that we are having now and let that work itself into the Agency.

METHOD: Are you saying that the Agency has to engineer its own mandate?

TURNER: I think it has to engineer a receptivity to listening to the development community and to try and get some guidance from the development community as to what directions it should take, what indicators it should use, and how to help the development community guide the process.

NORTE: I wanted to say that I think that the question that is disturbing me is whether A.I.D.'s primary objective is to promote American business, for example, or development. This is not to ask, are we talking about foreign policy. I think we will always be talking about foreign policy if we speak of a government organization's international role. This leads me to the question of mandate. It seems to me that sometime we are going to have to come to the issue of a new mandate from the society. We have been swishy on this point over the years. Were we an anti-Cold War agency or were we a humanitarian agency, or a global economic agency? But it seems to me that we need a renewing mandate now which calls for a different kind of participation in the States. This isn't to disagree with the idea that if you are enabling other people to do things, you have to have them participate in the analysis. I agree with that. But I think A.I.D. needs to worry about its own domestic mandate now.

HANRATTY: Just a few points that were brought up in the conversation. One is the issue between human development as opposed to human productivity. UNDP has brought up human development, which is really a scale that shows you where countries are and the condition of population. I think the Bank's World Development Report that focuses on productivity is an extremely useful one, because it gets right back to what we were talking about before in terms of the economy. Productivity is enhanced in market economies where people invest money in health and education. It's enhanced where people can organize.

DONNELLY-ROARK: But human productivity for what? And then you have to go into the human development question – human productivity, of you're going to operate from the perspective of the people, has to take into account the question of how do they classify their ideal productivity, their values? If the marketplace is the only value then people are splintering off from it because they don't want it. This is happening not only in Africa, but in this country. So, I agree with you that human productivity is really

interesting and necessary, but if you look at it only from an economic perspective, you are going to lose everybody.

HANRATTY: Obviously I am an economist.

DONNELLY-ROARK: Obviously I'm a sociologist.

HANRATTY: The other thing is, there's a distinction that was mentioned before, between the markets for public goods and the markets for private goods. There are a lot of things that governments will have to do in terms of managing markets. We're not talking about a situation where governments don't exist any more and only markets exist, or a complete laissez faire society, because markets in themselves require some sort of government intervention, in moderation.

For example, in the markets for public goods such as agriculture research, we have found over the last thirty years that institutions have been developed that are supply-side driven and don't really meet the demands of the people who need their services, who need the technologies. We have been trying to bridge that gap for years. Finally people are going in and saying, you have to restructure the whole organization, change its incentives, change the way it's budgeted, change the way that it plans and carries out its research activities, and the way that people are rewarded. It means mobilizing those people who use the services, farmers, people who market products in foreign markets, or local markets that need specific characteristics. So, there is a great deal of institutional development and change that has to go around before you can really get people empowered to do something because they've been closed out.

And finally, the question of savings and investment rights in Ghana. I guess if I were in Ghana and I saw the way the country has been managed over the last 20 years and I'm a family that has a planning projection of generations, I certainly would be pretty skeptical about investing heavily in the government. But in those very countries it's the people that have operated in informal markets, that have been exchanging goods and services for years, that are never picked up in the savings and investment figures. I think we may be underestimating by using official statistics on how economically viable some of these nations certainly are.

GROENFELDT: We haven't talked about the environment and natural resources thrust within A.I.D.. I think it fits very nicely with community participation. John Rigby mentioned participation in environmental action plans. But I think even traditional community participation levels are very useful in natural resource management and natural resource planning, particularly for protected areas where there is an interest in preserving the resources of a national park. And how do you do that? One of the ways you do it is to work with the populations in the vicinity and help them organize so that

they can control or police themselves or their exploitation of the resources so it is more or less sustainable.

I think A.I.D. has a role in this because it's not something that you can farm out to environmental NGOs. They don't have development experience. There really is a need for development expertise in handling participation and there are things that can be done even with bad policies. I mean, you have a backdrop of bad policies at the national level, in the same way that you have a cloudy day, so your plants aren't going to grow as fast. But I think there is still a lot that can be done, and I think the natural resource emphasis gives a new meaning to participation. No, we are not doing irrigation projects any more and, yes, we are doing participation in WASH, but it's a small sector. The environment is still on the upswing, and I think there is a lot to be done in integrating participatory approaches into sustainable natural resource management. That's it.

METHOD: Let me see whether I can capture what I thought Ellis Turner was saying. Unless A.I.D. takes the lead in stimulating further debate on participation and what it means, we're not going to find coming back to us the kind of professional advice and guidance that we need in order to shape our agenda. Am I putting words in your mouth?

TURNER: I think what I want to say is that A.I.D. has a catalytic role and I think, through WASH, we can illustrate a lot of examples. In fact, I think we can probably illustrate that we've had as much impact on other organizations as we've had on A.I.D.. So, I think there is definitely a catalytic role that even an A.I.D. project can play.

What I was saying about the internal debate is that there needs to be a consistent approach to a process, a consistent idea of what the community participation process looks like, and a consistent means as to how to implement that process through A.I.D.'s programs. It's not to enter into the debate of whether A.I.D. should be foreign policy or should be development. I think it should be largely development myself. But I don't really mean to enter into that debate. The issue is how to fine tune the process of community development, and to try to define some criteria for where community development is appropriate, and how to go about it. I don't think it is always appropriate to go in with the same strategy.

For instance, I think you can find plenty of examples where, as David [Groenfeldt] mentioned, even with bad policies and bad institutions you can find places where good community development has done a lot of good. And there are a lot of water and sanitation projects that have been done at the community level, in terrible government situations, which have done a lot of good at the country level. That doesn't work backwards and affect the country, at least in the beginning. I think that's not to say that you shouldn't undertake those efforts.

On the other hand, sometimes those efforts, like in Tunisia, illustrate to people that community participation is a good thing, and that it develops a grassroots swell and support which in the end, ends up changing the whole institution. And so it becomes a catalyst in its own right. So, I think we need to recognize that there is not one answer. There's a tendency in A.I.D. to look for silver bullets and to say we've got the one approach and the one process which is always going to get us to "X" goal. And I think what we need to do is to go back and say it's a process, and by starting a process you lose control over it, you don't know where it is going to end up. Maybe we can come up with a better process and better criteria, and provide some guidance to the Agency as to how to apply that process. And I think that if we do that, then we can do a lot of good and maybe that's through some kind of an advisory capacity.

METHOD: I think I agree with you, but I am struck with the fact that you started out talking about community participation and ended up talking about community development. I think that that's an open question and we need to talk about it, think about it, and pursue it. Will we make progress on exploring our options on participation by trying to get a sharper definition of community development, by looking at what we can do to open up institutions and processes more and more generally.

DONNELLY-ROARK: I wanted to comment on both what Ellis [Turner] and you were saying, Frank [Method], and it was the question that I had raised earlier and we didn't get around to. I think this paper is very interesting and very relevant to all of the things we are thinking about in our various capacities. Bill [Nagle] has identified two of the reasons that WASH was able to be successful. And I started thinking, why were they successful? And I identified one more, and I think they are all very applicable – not just to water and sanitation. They can be applied to other project areas. I think they can also be applied to the more macro debate that we are having here. And I just wanted to go over them.

First of all, what you identified is senior-level support. They have developed a cohesive team and they have had that senior-level support. John Austin has made sure that they've had adequate support from A.I.D., and Ellis has made sure that they've had adequate support from their home company.

Another thing is that I think they really made an ongoing effort to operationalize. Bill, you identified that also. They did a lot of training. They really tried to get rid of the spacey kind of words that we tend to use when we talk about participation, which is when economists really get angry at sociologists, and start saying, let's quantify. They have really operationalized that. Those are the two major things that I saw you identifying as successful.

The third one you implicitly talk about, but you don't identify, and I think it's very important and very relevant to what we are talking about here. Ellis was talking around it. And that is that they hook into – WASH hooks into when they're successful (and

they're not always successful) – the participatory processes and institutions that are already there. They help build the capacity and they go with the flow, no pun intended. That is what every group can do. And I think that is so important. It goes back to what you're saying about community development vs. community participation.

METHOD: Or community, for that matter.

DONNELLY-ROARK: Right. Or let's just say participation. We are no longer trying to initiate something to help a project look good. I think the name of the game has changed, and participation will be that ability to support the already substantial processes and resources that exist. And to me, in my own experience with WASH, that's the third element that they've done well. If we talk about where we're going next with this group, I think that would be an element that everyone could explore. How do you do it at all different levels, and for all different sectors? There are a lot of ways that you can look at it.

JUDY NICHOLSON: I just want to throw back another question to the WASH people, building on exactly what you said now, and taking it one step further. If, in a visionary kind of thing, you had the reins in your hands at this moment, and given what we are talking about today, how would you start – what would be your first or next step in moving this along to make use of these kinds of generic lessons that were very interestingly stated here by Paula? I don't know if you can answer this just now, but I think it's well worthwhile to take a stab.

TURNER: That's an awfully tough question. One thing that I feel fairly certain of, and that's what I alluded to in my earlier remarks on WASH, is that you can't expect to accomplish development unless your organization embodies the principles of good development. And, I think the Agency – and this is a tall order because it has already gone through one more reorganization – maybe needs to go through another one before too long, to change its management style. I think you have to have a participatory style in the Agency in order to be able to do development and community participation well, on a consistent basis.

NICHOLSON: Was it there when you started the WASH project?

TURNER: No, it wasn't. And we built it in. I think that John [Austin] was instrumental in building that in. When this project started it was a hand-pump hardware project.

NICHOLSON: So, therefore, why does it have to be there before you start something else again?

TURNER: It doesn't have to be there initially. But it would certainly help. I was just alluding to the fact that in such a big organization, it's tough to turn a big ship around, but it can be done. And there are certainly plenty of examples from corporate U.S. where the same has been done. But to me, a change in the management structure is a key factor, and it will impact on a lot of things, things that we probably can't even imagine right now. But if you want to do community participation consistently well, then you have to have participation in the organization.

NAGLE: All kinds of PVOs in the world have been doing participation without being very participatory in their own organizations.

HANRATTY: I have a question on the environment. Environment is one of the leading critical areas in which we are trying to develop policy. It is taking a long time. But in the drafts that I've seen, one of the key areas we are asking missions to focus their attention on is environmental education and group formation as the first step in action and in correcting those problems.

This reorganization in A.I.D. is not necessarily just moving things around deck chairs. We are also talking about some very major structural process changes. And one of those changes happens to be in the way we define projects, what a project will be.

What we're looking at is a much shorter project paper, getting rid of the PID stage in a project. Going from a concept all the way to a project paper. That will be controlled by bureaus, not by central arms in the Agency. It will flow from an agreed-upon bureau level strategy and a mission statement on what they want to do. But the critical thing is that these will basically be action plans. They'll talk of what the problem is – what the objective is in terms of the mission being involved in it – what they think their trajectory will be – what they hope to accomplish at the end of the first year – what they think they may be moving into in the second year – and it will be a process for every year. You will be bringing in people who participate in the project to review it, and to critique where you're going and to try to make mid-course changes in it. To me that is a very, very different sort of a concept of project implementation than we've had in the past, which has been more of a bridge-building approach. You have all the design specifications up front, and you move through time and expend resources to get to a particular point. So, that might afford an opportunity for much more participation, both internally as well as externally, in how you expend resources at the implementation stage of the project.

There is another issue which is a pet concern of mine that has been there since I was first in the Peace Corps and then in the Ford Foundation. It's that you have a

number of PVOs, a number of foundations supporting PVO activities, both U.S. and indigenous, who are experimenting all over the place on new ways to solve the problems. WASH is part of that. And there really isn't an effective intermediary that takes those sort of pilots and allows them to be tested across a broad geographical area before they're adopted by a government. So, a lot of times governments are buying an economic pig in a poke. They say, I don't know all these inputs that go into this project, but it came from a donor so it has to be heck of a lot more money than I can afford.

They are also looking at a political pig in a poke because they're looking at social organization in sometimes democratically oppressive regimes. They look at a project in only a small area and say, what if we expanded this all over the country, what does that mean to the way we're organized in government? So, somebody who takes those models and tries to expand an experiment at a national level has always been needed. That's where A.I.D., as a smaller organization, as a more substantive organization, has a real role to play. That's where we have some advantages, I think.

METHOD: Good way to end it, I think. We obviously could take days and days of further discussion here, but I think that in the spirit of using participation to open up people's agendas that it is appropriate to leave lots of things hanging in the air for further discussion and further agendas.

I have found this very useful for A.I.D.. I think that there will be further discussion within the Agency. I assume that the lead on this will come more from the strategic planning group and others, perhaps offices such as yours, John [Austin]. I, for one, would like to sit in on and follow these discussions.

I hope that this is also an agenda, or a baton, or a challenge, or whatever, that is going to be taken up by other constituent groups around the table for various key projects – certainly by the WASH project, and certainly by projects implementing policy reforms. There is room within those for leadership. Clearly there is a need to stay in touch with the Bank and what is going on over there, rather than going blindly down separate trails. And for those of you working with the larger development community, certainly the SID group and the IDC group, those working with the NGOs, what you're doing deserves to be followed and encouraged, and we'd like to be kept informed.

I would like to thank everybody for being here. I have enjoyed it.

PARTICIPANTS

John Austin
S&T/HP/H/CD
SA-18, Suite 1200
US Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523
(703) 875-4613

Robert Berg
International Development Conference
1401 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-3111

Timothy Bork
FR/PD
NS, Room 3941
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-0011
(202) 647-5991

Judy Brace
Project Administrator
Social Sector Policy Analysis Project
Academy for Educational Development
1255 23rd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 862-1914

Brenda Bryant
Creative Associates
5301 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, DC 20015
(202) 966-5804

Coralie Bryant
World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W., Room J2165
Washington, D.C. 20433
(202) 473-4453

Brian Cavanaugh
CARE
660 First Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Nancy Diamond
AID Resource Access & Development
R&D/EID
SA-18, Room 622D
US Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523
(703) 875-4737

Paula Donnelly-Roark
7001 Westmorland Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20921
(301) 270-3374

Peter Furemhoss
AID Resource Access & Development
R&D/EID
SA-18, Room 622D
US Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523
(703) 875-4532

David Groenfeld
Association in Rural Development
1915 I Street, NW
3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 223-2533

Martin Hanratty
POL/SP
NS, Room 3889
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-0071
(202) 647-7071

Rita Klees
S&T/HP/H/CD
SA-18, Suite 1200
US Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523
(703) 875-4993

Caroline Long
InterAction
1717 Mass Ave., NW, 8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 667-8227

Jenna Luce
PPC/WID
SA-18, Room 714
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-1816
(703) 875-4668

Keys MacManus
The Futures Group
One Thomas Circle, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 775-9680

Melanie Marlett
POL/SP
NS, Room 3889
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-0046
(202) 647-7059

Frank Method
R&D/ED
SA-18, Room 609
US Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523
(703) 875-4221

Tom Morris
POL/PAR
NS, Room 3947
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-0046
(202) 647-8558

Alice Morton
MSI
600 Water Street, S.W., NBU 7-7
Washington, D.C. 20024
(202) 484-7170

Josette Murphy
World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W., Room J3061
Washington, D.C. 20433
(202) 473-4124

William J. Nagle
Director
Social Sector Policy Analysis Project
Academy for Educational Development
1255 23rd Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 467-8752

Judy Nicholson
International Development Training Inst.
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue
#950
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 659-8747

Jeanne North
AID/S&T, Rural Development
1601 N. Kent Street, Room 606c/SA-18
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 875-4587

John Rigby
Association in Rural Development
1915 I Street, NW
3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 223-2533

Ellis Turner
WASH
1611 Kent Street, Suite 1001
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-8200

May Yacoob
WASH
1611 Kent Street, Suite 1001
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-8200