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Executive Summary

In a more liberalized and globalised economy which is affecting every aspect of our life, the role and responsibility of the state is getting minimized towards its citizens. This particular change has led to the growth of civil society organisations, especially the NGO sector – in providing basic services to the people, administering development programmes and mobilizing people to claim their legitimate rights from the state which is no longer serving the needs of its people. Such critical engagement of NGOs with people’s issues has prompted the state to question the legitimacy of NGOs from different angles; one of them is transparency and accountability (TA). Thus, the legitimacy to question the faltering state and public institution is feasible only when the NGO sector demonstrates supreme accountability mechanisms and practices.

Secondly, TA has the potential to increase the trust and commitment of stakeholders because it can prove an organization’s effectiveness and demonstrate whom the organization represents, thereby increasing the legitimacy of NGOs. Apart from this, TA practices can prepare the organisation to address potential risks involved in policy advocacy, strengthen the position in policy advocacy and protect the autonomy of NGO.

Thirdly and the foremost reason why we stress on TA is that being transparent and accountable is integral to the foundation and life of NGOs; accountability and transparency are core values and the essential basis of their formation and source of their alternative vision of the society. The present research on TA within Forum of Collective Forms of Cooperation (FCFC) – a development cooperation initiative is located at least at three levels mentioned above. In addition to these, the debate on TA calls for an adherence to the values by NGOs as independent entity and transfer those values to the wider network as part of Collective Forms of Cooperation (CFC). In these contexts FCFC took an initiative to look through some TA practices. The research reported here attempted to capture the TA practices among the members of FCFC. These members are called as Collective Forms of Cooperation (CFC). By looking in to genesis, formation, ideological premises and perspective, Governance, structure, and systems Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (PME), leadership, motivation, team building, participation, development cooperation process, HRD and Redressal Mechanism of CFCs, an analysis is carried out to understand the kinds of TA mechanisms that are practiced within CFCs.

The basic data – both primary and secondary – were collected for the analysis through participatory research processes (inputs, meetings, questionnaire, regional and national consultations, etc). CFCs participated in the consultations, defined several terms
(Accountability: is a set of values by which social and financial obligations are fulfilled and shared with internal and external stakeholders, thereby organisations accept responsibility for their action, conduct and impact. Transparency: is a state of being visible and accessible to the stakeholders in a relevant way. In this process of openness, organisations would not reveal those things which are detrimental to the larger community).

The trends of the above-mentioned elements of CFCs reveal that the approach and ideological premises during their formation period covers relief, welfare, charity and movement building. The birth of some of the CFCs coincides with turbulent Indian economic reforms of the nineties while others have already crossed two to three decades of development work. The motives of forming networks are embedded on partnership, collective lobbying and advocacy and managerial purposes. The perspectives behind the genesis of CFCs cut across the ideologies of Marx, Gandhi, Tagore and the ideals of Christianity. Some are pro-state and some are not. But almost all of them do not favour market dominating all other institutions. This has led them to vouch for rights-based approach.

The governance and its functionalities are both exclusive as well as inclusive. The vision and mission statements refer to programme as well as organisational governance. Some of the boards are studded with the presence of luminaries from public life. Women leadership is promoted. The nature of formation and function of CFCs in most cases determine the overall structure of the organisation; like some remain just with CFCs structure; some along with CFCs, handle independent programmes and some are conglomeration of many CFCs. In some CFCs the structure looks flat or made flat; in some cases hierarchy exists. The nature of the structure also determines the directive, facilitative and participatory elements of programme intervention.

The findings on systems in CFCs include PME, leadership, motivation, team building, participation, community building process, networking and human resource development. As far as PME is concerned, more or less most of the CFCs have same set of methods to carry out the task, but the basic perspective tenets of PME process may have some difference. The leadership at the organisational level, and community level except in few cases, is a matter of concern. Another major issue across CFCs is, due to gaps in leadership, and less attractive emoluments, the low motivational level and high turnover of staff. Team building and the process of evolving teams are decided by task-oriented approach. Building a team is considered as a strategy rather than as value. With respect to participation process, it is considered by a few as a value and some as strategy. The community building process swings across the pendulum of development to assertion of rights to transformation.
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Networking, what we call development cooperation, is one of the connecting factors that actually brought these CFCs together. The tendency to cooperate and collaborate in some cases was present before EED (the resource-sharing agency) initiated it, helped to establish more institutions with specific focus and had strengthened the collective spirit; made the CFCs to cross their boundaries. At the same time, the tendency to transgress boundaries and fixed notions of networking needs more experiments, ownership and clarity.

The important aspect to bring in change basically emerges in the way we develop our human resources. In this regard, the recruitment procedures are in some cases open and based on written policies; in some it is exclusive. For rights-based work, a perspective-driven recruitment policy, capacity building and empowerment are basic requirements. Empowerment of staff should be addressed, not only hiking the financial benefits but consciously putting enabling systems and values. Finally, it was hard to see within FCFC members, an institutional mechanism for redressal which is based on policies and values.

These trends call for reflection from the side of CFCs. The findings of the research places six key organisational features – Mission and Ideology, Paradigms, Governance, Programmatic Approach, Institutional Framework and Programme Implementation by juxtaposing at least two extreme traits of these elements. If we take these key features for our reflection and try to mirror ourselves (rather than magnifying limitations or problems) it may inform us about our good practices and limitations and indicate where we stand in terms of TA practices. It may even guide us to cross milestones and reach destinations in TA practices so that we may really become the true representatives of our communities and vanguard the social change process the way we desire.
Foreword

For a few, the globalised world looks flat or they tend to call it ‘global village’. However they see or in whatever name they call, the disconnection is evident. Whether it is policy makers or people, they irreversibly get affected by such theorization and the result is faulty diagnosis and wrong course of prescription for societal maladies.

Our world, for some time now, is dominated by neo liberal economic changes; to influence and counter such economic and political context and policy process was the key interest in forming development cooperation in the world of voluntarism. For collective forms of cooperation (CFC) increasing the relevance of voluntarism from the perspective of civil society and enhancing the developmental impact was the need of the hour. Therefore, there was a need to ‘learn, adept and adapt capacity’ among partners in development cooperation. With the increased role of the market and aggressive supremacy of the state (only in terms of suppressing the dissenting voices), civil society organizations, especially NGO’s (Non-governmental Organizations) started seeking larger space in public policy advocacy debate. Meanwhile, perceptions about NGOs have also started changing as ‘shepherds of development’ to development actors who undermine national sovereignty and democracy. They were charged to be one who has no direct relation with people or their claims are much larger than the real situation. In nutshell, ‘whom do they represent’ to get involved in public policy debate was sort of an existential question put against them. These questions invariably targets their legitimacy to represent and credibility and right to question the state by sitting on the other side of the table.

Hence, there was a need to develop a framework for advocacy and lobbying to ensure accountability as a core value within NGO function. Many organizations usually see accountability in terms of programme efficiency to sharing of information related to financial transactions. For NGO’s involved in public policy advocacy and dialogue, accountability and transparency are core values – the essential foundation of their formation and basis of their alternative vision of the society. So, accountability as a value is inherently an integral and dynamic to an organization. Effectively transparent to its various stakeholders is not only prerequisite, but also provides a platform for public policy dialogue. Such accountability mechanism that normatively is inherent in any organization needs to be strengthened for mutual learning and sharing. This would not only enhance organizational model and internal governance systems but will also improve quality and concept of programmes of FCFC members. Such approach and efforts would certainly enable NGOs to safeguard their rights to mobilize people, confronting anti people policies,
develop alternative development paradigms and be accountable by balancing multiple responsibilities to various stakeholders.

This particular study has attempted to understand and document such accountability mechanisms, which actually strengthen the accountability process of CFC. Also it would prepare CFCs against potential risks involved in policy advocacy. The study does not provide technical solutions or a toolbox approach nor does it set grounds for accreditation mechanisms.

The study looks into various aspects of CFC’s; a) Genesis and formation b) Ideological perspectives c) Organizational structure and d) Systems as key dimensions for accountability mechanism to adopt rights-based approach for their policy advocacy programmes and participating organizations.

CNI-SBSS, which commissioned this study, is happy to present this report to the members of FCFC and the development actors involved in the public policy advocacy. I am sure such accountability mechanism grounded in core values would strengthen quality of their programmes in ensuring alternative to globalization, based on neo-liberal economic policies.

In solidarity,

**Shailendra Awale**

*Chief Coordinator and Secretary, CNI SBSS*
Messages...

An effort worth replication...

CNI-SBSS has been one of the most active members of FCFC for the last three years. When entrusted with the task of carrying out the study on the “Normative Frameworks for Transparency” practiced in different CFCs, SBSS had no hesitation to accept the challenge. It was a challenge indeed. We were uncertain how the process would go about in terms of participation of the CFCs, methodological implications of study and the required expertise needed for such a difficult study, which demands to touch the very essence of particular organizational realities.

However, with the whole-hearted cooperation of most of the CFC partners all over the country, this study has been completed. Heartfelt congratulations to CNI-SBSS for its daring and untiring efforts during the last one and half years to make this study possible.

Completion of this study is an expression of mutual learning and growing in solidarity among ourselves – the CFCs.

Sailesh Chakravarty
Honorary National Convener
FCFC
Accountability and Transparency in Development Cooperation

In the development scenario, the general feature that is observed across the globe is development through cooperation. NGOs are supported by donor agencies, bilateral and multi-lateral agencies in their endeavour to change the lives of people. This support is usually in the form of financial resources and to some extent on technical expertise. This concept of development though cooperation is being widely practiced and recognized.

The fundamental feature of this critical collaboration is the component of shared responsibility, seen as capabilities. A collaborative relationship involving two or more stakeholders addressing a given problem is based on a set of mutual perceptions: that each is a legitimate actor; that each is capable of contributing to the problem and its solutions. To the degree that such collaborations actually occur, there should be some evidence that all stakeholders entering the relationship are endowed with some perceptible attributes which is applicable to the problem at hand.

Over the years, voluntary organizations across the globe have been contributing to solve and find solutions to the problems. This work of voluntary organizations in leading and facilitating efforts to improve the lives of the poor in developing countries is also not a recent phenomenon. Over the years, their role has gained greater importance and is being increasingly recognized by the Government, international agencies, bilateral and multi-lateral agencies and others.

With their increasing role, the amount of funds that is being mobilized has also increased manifold. This has also increased the demand for greater accountability and transparency from the sector. Those who fund, regulate and work with NGOs have expectations for certain activities and outcomes on the part of an NGO. NGOs’ continuing existence often depends on its fulfillment of such expectations.

There are various tools and mechanisms for demonstrating accountability to the various stakeholders. Financial Audit; Social Audit; Gender Budgeting, Donor Reporting are some of them. However, there is greater need for internalizing accountability as the core value of an organization. Developing proper systems and processes within an organization and strengthening internal governance is therefore of paramount importance. This will help in maintaining accountability of the highest standard, which is vital for sustainable development cooperation.

Anne Bohrer
Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e. V. – Asia & Pacific Desk
Accountability: the value implication for NGO sector

The NGO sector has experienced tremendous growth both locally and globally. A massive growth of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) in the past years is changing the institutional landscape of countries all over the world. Also referred to as Third Sector organizations, non-profit organizations, civil society organizations and voluntary organizations, NGOs are establishing a powerful institutional presence. These organizations are primarily voluntary in nature and tend to engage both their supporters and constituencies on the basis of values or some shared interests or concerns and have a public benefit purpose. In this pursuit of public benefit purpose, the most important asset of the NGOs is ‘Public Trust’. However, public trust in NGOs is neither tenured nor permanent. It takes many years of hard work for NGOs to build up a good reputation and only one bad move to lose it. Thus, NGOs need to exercise the responsibility of being fiduciaries of public trust. *The sole mechanism for gaining, retaining and enhancing public trust is accountability.*

Accountability is the basic principle of responsible practice for any institution, be it a public organization, a private enterprise or an NGO. In case of the NGOs, the issue of accountability assumes utmost significance because of the involvement of Public Funds as well as Public Trust.

NGO accountability can be defined as: “the process by which an NGO holds itself openly responsible for what it believes, what it does and what it does not do in a way which shows it involving all concerned parties and actively responding to what it learns.” Slim (2002: 12). Accountability is no more a matter of simple financial accounting or reporting to donors about funds received and expenditures incurred. Ensuring the accountability of NGOs involves first of all creating the conditions which will allow for open expression of views, transparency, free dissemination of information and the rule of law which is very crucial to the effective functioning of every NGO.

What needs to be underlined here is the fact that the issue of ‘Accountability’ goes beyond mere compliance. Accountability is, more than any thing else, an internal issue and has to be dealt with by the NGOs internally. The value and practice of accountability should be ingrained within the organizational system of NGOs in order to ensure the effectiveness of development work, thereby enhancing public trust and credibility of the organization.

**Sanjay Patra**

*Executive Director, FMSF*
The Sufi Bayazid says this about himself:

“I was a revolutionary when I was young and my prayer to God was: ‘Lord give me the energy to change the world

“As I approached middle age and realized that half my life was gone without my changing a single soul, I changed my prayer to:

Lord give me the grace to change all those who come in contact with me. Just my family and friends, and I shall be content.

“Now that I am an old man and my days are numbered, my one prayer is,

Lord, give me the grace to change myself.

“If I had prayed for this right from the start I would not have wasted my life.”

The history of NGO accountability reads like the story of Bayazid who till reaching the evening of his life prayed to God to change others. He had forgotten the ‘simple’ fact that changing or being truthful to oneself is a prerequisite to bringing change in the milieu around him. In the same breadth, NGOs have been advocating that the state and related public institutions should be accountable to their constitutional duties and to their citizens while giving less or no importance to their own accountability practices. In this journey, somewhere one of the fundamental existential causes for the birth of NGOs is their

The legitimacy to question the faltering state and public institutions is feasible only when the NGO sector demonstrates supreme accountability mechanisms and practices
responsible to be honest to its claims and being supremely accountable to what they believe, utter and do in an environment in which the credibility of the public institutions is in great question.

Meanwhile, recognizing the growing strength of NGOs and its threat to the legitimacy of the state propelled the state to question the legitimacy of NGOs and its style of functioning. The reaction came in the form of developing policies and code of conduct for better ‘functioning’ of NGOs; the media also promptly publicizing the misconducts and malfeasance, brought pressure on the NGOs to develop systems to make them transparent and accountable. Thus the reasons for discussing NGO transparency and accountability (TA) are manifold. They are:

- Being transparent and accountable is integral to the birth and existence of NGOs. Accountability and transparency are core values and the essential foundation of their formation and basis of their alternative vision of the society.
- The legitimacy to question the faltering state and public institutions is feasible only when the NGO sector demonstrates supreme accountability mechanisms and practices.
- Accountability may help NGOs to counter criticisms like NGOs are “secretive, undemocratic in their decision-making and have less than rigorous standards of governance” (Adair 2000: 11).
- Accountability has the potential to increase the trust and commitment of stakeholders (SustainAbility and the Global Compact 2003: 3) because it can prove an organization’s effectiveness and demonstrate whom the organization represents, thereby increasing the legitimacy of NGOs.
- Accountability can increase organizational performance and learning (Brown et al. 2003).

The issues and concerns of the Non-governmental sector is not only challenging but it is also uncongenial for the reason that it is dictated by ironies of our realities. For instance, usually it is cited that the debate over NGO accountability has started occupying public space for its i) rapid growth, ii) ability to attract huge public and private funds, iii) stronger voice and increased power they wield in shaping policy, iv) crisis of legitimacy to represent the general public and criticize the state, v) backlash of counter-attacks on the NGOs themselves and vi) third wave of democratization. It is said repeatedly in various studies that the above said reasons have in fact created the need for NGOs to think and debate about accountability. This is purely an irony because the compulsions for the debate is largely external, negating the normative commitment of NGOs towards accountability which is ideally integral to the very existence of NGOs. Secondly at the global level, the push for NGO accountability has come from different forces, and the internal effort was
The NGO accountability is measured with different mechanisms; ranging from self-regulation to common code of conduct developed by government or larger civil society groups

Third-party actors have also played a prominent role in the emergence of NGO accountability: Michael Edwards, Director of the Governance and Civil Society Programme at the Ford Foundation, has published on the topic since 1992, in cooperation with David Hulme. Another early advocate for NGO accountability was David Sogge (1996). More recent influential contributions to the debate include SustainAbility’s the 21st Century NGO (2003) and One World Trust’s Global Accountability Report (2003).

One size does not fit all: Accountability mechanisms

Many institutions and individuals, over the years, as mentioned above, have attempted to address the issue of TA in various ways. These initiatives have given way to variety of different measures being developed for use in NGO accountability implementation and verification. These include:

- Certification systems
- Rating systems
- Self-regulation
- Codes of conduct
- Infrastructure and management capacity tools and
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E).
**TRANSFERRING VALUES**

a) **Certification Systems**: Certification systems assess NGOs according to a set of criteria and accredit them.

b) **Rating Systems**: Rating systems for NGOs operate much along the lines of putting down indicators and accordingly institutions are rated. For example American Institute of Philanthropy and Charity Navigator is one such rating system.

c) **Codes of Conduct**: This form of self-regulation entails “public statements of principles or standards of performance to which a number of agencies voluntarily sign up and against which each agency states it is willing to be judged” (Leader 1999: 1). Codes of conduct got a widely promoted start with the rise in humanitarian agencies working in conflict areas since the late 1980s and the preparations for the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. They were developed as a measure to help ensure that aid was not fuelling conflict (Leader 1999: 2). Codes of conduct are often self-regulatory, although they can be audited externally. Examples of codes of conduct include the codes of the Australian Council for Overseas Aid (ACFOA 2000), the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC 2004, in use since 1995), or the Credibility Alliance in India (Pinto 2003)

d) **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**: M&E has been introduced primarily in donor-funded operations, particularly in foreign aid. It ideally involves the determination of a number of relevant measures and targets that enable observers to assess whether the organization has met its program or project objectives; benchmark collection; regular internal and periodic external assessment of its target vs. actual measures; and periodic or final reports on how the organization has performed (ideally, yet rarely, these reports will be made available to stakeholders and the public). M&E is one of the most widely used and accepted methods to help ensure NGOs act responsibly.

e) **Disclosure of Statements and Reports** The disclosure of statements and reports was already part of the traditional approach to accountability and retains its validity under the new approach. Often, state authorities require it (Ebrahim 2003: 816).

f) **Participation**: NGOs can implement this process-based approach to accountability to several degrees, from the dissemination of information, public involvement in projects, beneficiaries being given bargaining or veto power, all the way to beneficiaries carrying out their own projects and activities (Ebrahim 2003: 818).

g) **Social Auditing**: Social auditing is a process that integrates many of the above-mentioned mechanisms, in particular disclosure statements, evaluations, participation and codes of conduct. Although it is an innovative approach, it has not found wide use among NGOs (Ebrahim 2003: 822).

Approaches, methodologies and mechanisms related TA differs for more than one reason. Diverse understanding of civil society and its relationship with the state, historical background of civil society organisation in a particular country, the nature, and size of NGOs etc are some of the reason why there are differences in the kinds of accountability mechanisms which are in practice. The following section is a short note on the concept of
NGOs within civil society realm. Understanding the concept of ‘NGOs’ and ‘Civil Society’ is necessary as these terms are explained and operationalised in variety of ways which in turn brought out varied response to the debate on accountability.

**NGOs in Civil Society**

Civil society as a concept is neither straightforward nor new. Civil society is commonly understood as the population of groups formed for collective purposes primarily outside of the state and marketplace. (Van Rooy 1998: 30) Or as an intermediate associational realm between the state and family populated by organizations which are separate from the state, enjoy autonomy from the state and are formed voluntarily by members of society (White 1994: 379).

The roots of the idea of civil society are various and scattered. From the position of the 18th century Scottish enlightenment, Adam Ferguson viewed civil society in terms of the growth of moral responsibility, as a socially desirable alternative both to the state of nature and the growing individualism of emergent capitalism. On the other hand, G.W.F. Hegel argued that if the emergent organizations of civil society were not balanced and ordered by the state, they would become self-interested and unlikely to contribute to the common good. Both types of approaches shaped the early evolution of the concept of civil society. Alongside such ideas, Alexis de Tocqueville’s 19th century account of the positive role played by associationalism in the United States brought an organizational focus to the idea of civil society. He stressed volunteerism, community spirit and independent organizational life as a form of protection against state domination of society, and indeed as a counterbalance which could help keep the state accountable and effective. These latter ideas in particular have become highly influential today in discussions of social cohesion in Western societies and among international development donor agencies (Lewis, 2004).

These notions behind the concept of civil society and NGOs as they are understood, defined and interpreted in several senses emerge out of certain ideological currents (Bond, 2006: 362). Let us briefly look at them as they can inform those interpretations of civil society as a concept which in turn draws conceptual boundaries on NGOs too. This does not stop here. Like a snow ball effect, it impinges on the way the concept and practice of transparency and accountability is understood and defined; this is the primary concern of this research report.

The major politico-ideological currents (in brackets, their political traditions are given in brackets) which define the civil society as concepts are:

1. Global justice movements (socialism, anarchism)²
2. Third world nationalism (national capitalism)³
3. Post-Washington consensus ((lite) social democracy)⁴
4. Washington consensus (neo-liberalism)⁵
5. Resurgent rightwing (neo-conservatism)⁶
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According to these ideologies and to what ideology one is ready to subscribe would determine in what way one might define civil society and would locate NGOs. The term NGO is really a catchword for an enormous variety of structures, pursuing diverse strategies, of widely differing sizes, aims or missions, and defies definition because of this diversity (Mencher, 1990). The term, ‘non-governmental organization’ or NGO, came into use in 1945 because of the need for the UN to differentiate in its Charter between participation rights for intergovernmental specialized agencies and those for international private organizations. As Maxine Weisgrau notes in her excellent study in India of Rajasthan NGOs, it is a term used rather loosely to refer to any organisation that is not a direct division of a national government (1997). Non-government organisations (NGOs) have emerged as an important element of contemporary Indian society. They have been variously described as the ‘third sector’, ‘civil society’, ‘non-profits’, ‘voluntary sector’ etc.

Several terms and names referring to NGO sector actually stems from streams of ideas which define and reflect some sort of ideological underpinnings of NGOs. For instance the term “third sector” is coined with certain changes in NGO sector. With the drastic decline of government role in ensuring basic services to its people and fast disappearing people’s credibility over public institutions coupled with the dominance of market ideology, the NGOs are used as instruments of delivering public services by various stakeholders, especially in the case of North America, European countries. This has prompted some people to baptize NGOs with the phrase “third sector”. In the case of India, things are not different.

One of the main reasons for the Indian state for considering NGOs as ‘service delivery mechanism’ or ‘service contractors’ or ‘public-service contractors’ emerged from the fact that it started believing that NGOs or in government’s term – voluntary sector - as very efficient, effective and reliable agents and partners of social development. At the same time, it is natural for the state to expect that with more resource in the kitty, NGOs should develop appropriate strategy to be efficient and effective which is possible by maintaining certain standards and behaviors. The concept of efficiency and effectiveness is also based on clearly defined inputs, outputs and NGO intervention. This is where the governments set off discussions on TA. Moreover, when the necessity of transparency and accountability is discussed in the NGO sector in relation to efficiency and effectiveness, it is considered more as a strategy than as an integral value of civil society in which NGOs are one of the prominent players.

In such linkage, the danger is that it brings about project mentality, ignoring the complex historical, political, economic and cultural processes and power structures at work in real world. Similarly it fails to acknowledge the heterogeneity that exists among

---
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Volunteerism, community spirit and independent organisational life are some of the core characteristics of civil society which protect communities against the domination of state
individuals and interest groups in all institutions, including NGOs. This approach in TA dialogues tends to pigeonhole TA mechanisms by prescribing/suggesting a universal formula. Actually development cooperation/networking among NGOs can never be based on any universal formula. Such an attempt would be nothing but abstracting the existence of an organisation from social, political and cultural milieu. For the same reason it is suggested that even an accountability mechanism should be evolved independently by the respective organization taking its context into consideration. In other sense, for the autonomy of the NGOs and larger civil society to be maintained or protected, it is an imperative to be free of any TA mechanism promoted by the state.

**United we stand: Transparency and Accountability in Development Cooperation**

‘Man is not alone’ or ‘man is a social animal’- these old adages suggest that man cannot live alone. Organizations are not different. Organizations, however independent they are there is always a necessity to associate either with group of individuals or with some form of associations and organizations. In a larger spectrum whether it is the group of top rich countries or forums like World Social Forum, everything revolves around the concept of network. Though the process of associating and networking is many centuries old, the new and more comprehensive form of networking is at least half century old.

Basically networks are structures that link individuals or organizations who share a common interest. Perkin and Court (2005) defines network as formal or informal structures that link actors (individuals or organizations) who share a common interest on a specific issue or who share a *general set of values*. Actually the value of network itself has been long recognized in the international development field as well. This acknowledgement comes in part from drawing upon the local resources of developing countries, including the social capital that these countries possess. The UN development programme counts 20,000 international NGO networks around the world (2002). Today, networks are a firmly entrenched facet of virtually every aspect of society. We have entered the age of network. Networks are being formed for a wide array of purposes. The proliferation of networks is closely related to some of the demand of the changing situations.

- **While the force of the global capital is getting united, it is necessary for the victimized, oppressed and those at the receiving end of neo-liberal policies to come under unison to voice their demands and assert their rights.**
- **The multiplier effect in networking helps organizations achieve farther reach and**

---

Development cooperation among NGOs can never be based on any universal formula. Such an attempt would only abstract the existence of an organisation from its social, political and cultural milieu.
**TRANSFERRING VALUES**

greater impact in relation to their own organizational goals when they participate in networks
- Through networks members or member organizations receive and feel sense of solidarity
- Increasing visibility of issues, good work, good practices and contributions.
- Networks and networking benefit the members by increasing their access to information, expertise resources etc.

Apart from these benefits network may have context specific benefits and characteristics can play an important part in helping to create a policy process that is research rich, inclusive and accountable. In short member organisations become a part a network since they believe in certain values (collectiveness, togetherness etc) and in the course of network process, networking itself becomes a value where resources are utilised effectively for a greater impact, cross learning, facing obstacles collectively etc.

**Transferring values**

The very existence of non governmental organisations sprouts from the values with which they justify and legitimize their presence in public domain. In the larger canvass, they are part of civil society which is supposed to possess and believe in certain values and ideological commitment towards the public/people. Basically values in NGOs permeate the actions of founders, trustees, donors, volunteers, workers and many others (Jeavons, 1992).

Fundamentally, values serve as the moral guide and have the potential to be played as a strategy to fulfill the objectives of an organization (Jeavons, 1992). It has been argued that a key distinguishing feature of organizations within the voluntary sector is that they are ‘value-driven’, hold ‘core values’. They are also perceived to have at their foundation, ‘shared values’ which are shaped and held by their founders and leaders.

Paton argues that they are ‘value-based’, in that they have a distinct value system founded on commitment, and the active participation of members (Paton, 1992, pp. 3-12). Jeavons posits that, “private, nonprofit organizations, with a public-benefit, have usually come into being and exist primarily to give expression to the social, philosophical, moral or religious values of their founders and supporters” (Jeavons, 1992, pp. 404). He argues that nonprofit organizations are distinctive by virtue of their integrated commitment to core values such as integrity, openness, accountability, service, charity, honesty and respect

---

**When the force of the global capital is getting united, it is necessary for the victimized, oppressed and those that are at the receiving end of neo-liberal policies to come under unison to voice their demands, assert their rights**
for others. He also argues that the failure of voluntary organizations to articulate the social, moral or spiritual values on which services are based undermines their credibility and the extent of public trust in them. It also jeopardizes their public support (Jeavons, 1992). Commitment beyond self, worth and dignity of the individual, responsibility, tolerance, freedom, justice and responsibilities of citizenship are some of the values. O’Connell argues that whilst these values are not necessarily exclusive to the non governmental sector, the degree of commitment to these values is significant amongst the non governmental sector.

The kind and nature of ‘core value’ or the ‘shared values’ may differ from one organization to another but one of the most important as well as the supposed to be the cross-cutting value within NGOs is the adherence to transparency and accountability (TA). At least for more than a decade now, the demand to be transparent and accountable by the public, private and government institutions from NGOs has increased phenomenally over the years. NGOs, INGOs and many others have started responding in myriad ways to this demand.

Treating TA as a value is not only desirable but it should be treated as non-negotiable elements of organisational life. Especially in network/development cooperation process it should be an essential as well as the foundational character as it involves many organizations where transferring such values is important not only for efficiency and effectiveness of network programmes but keeping its credibility intact. As far as transferring the values are concerned usually the leading organization takes the primary role in sharing within network partners on the necessity of being transparent and accountable. It instills the perspective and ideological position among the partners and helps them in developing appropriate and relevant TA mechanism and may set up systems within itself to sustain those mechanisms -- as developing and sustaining TA mechanisms involve its own cost which usually may not be possible with the resources available to its small and grass root level partners.

END NOTES

1. Moving around the world, starting with the fall of the Berlin Wall, democratization became perceived to be a cure-all. As democracy implies accountability, and because NGO activity automatically challenges governmental authority, the ‘third wave of democratization’ started affecting NGOs as well

2. Main agenda of this is ‘degloabalisation-from-below,’ anti-war; anti-racism; indigenous rights; women liberations; ecology; “de-commodified” state services, radical participatory democracy

3. Main agenda of this is increased (but fairer) global integration via reform of interstate system, based on debt relief and expanded market access; democratized global governance; regionalism; rhetorical anti-imperialism; and Third World unity
4. Fix ‘imperfect markets’; add ‘sustainable development’ to existing capitalist framework via UN and similar global state-building; promote a degree of global Keynesianism; oppose US unilateralism and militarism

5. Rename neo-liberalism with provisions for ‘transparency’ self-regulation and bail-out mechanisms; co-opt potential emerging-market resistance, while offering financial support to US-led Empire

6. Unilateral petro-military imperialism; crony deals, corporate subsidies, protectionism and tariffs; reverse globalisation of people via racism and xenophobia; religious extremism; patriarchy and bio-social control

7. Italics by the authors of the report
Around 70 organizations in India have been partnering with Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e.V. (EZE/EED), a German Protestant Church-based development organization in the form of networks, forum and federations. Out of these, there are at least 18 networks which in turn partner with organizations ranging from 10 to 450 organizations. In the context of the research reported here, an attempt was made to see how these networks are formed, operationalized and sustained – specifically in relation to accountability practices. These networks are called ‘collective form of cooperation’ (CFC). The concept and nature of CFC are explained subsequently. The major connecting factor of all these networks is, of course, EED even though there are some other linking threads.

Since the early eighties, EED has been supporting an increasing number of partners and programmes, which go beyond local approaches carried out by individual NGOs. Such models of cooperation are termed as Collective Forms of Cooperation (CFC). CFCs have emerged either from an independent initiative by Indian NGOs or from a dialogue between Indian NGO partners and EED about possibilities to improve and qualify development cooperation. Accordingly, the guiding motives for forming the different CFCs have been and are diverse and are often interlinked in more or less complex ways. Three major motives or interests can be defined as follows:

- Developmental: the developmental interest to enhance the impact and political influence of NGO development work in India
- Partnership: the partnership related interest to strengthen the capacity and relative autonomy of partners in the south by delegating authority, responsibility and functions from EED to the partners in India and
- Managerial: the institutional/managerial interest to facilitate administrative procedures between EED and its partners in India

Over the years the concept of CFC, both in policy and operational terms, has been developed further within EZE. This has mainly been done in the form of separate agreements with partner organizations (Memoranda of Understanding). There are no comprehensive policy papers, policy guidelines and/or operational instructions available.
In retrospect, a Complex Forms of Collaboration may be defined as an arrangement whereby:

- Local development actors (mainly NGDOs) come together on a common platform (e.g. in the form of a network or forum) in order to achieve information exchange, mutual learning, capacity enhancement and lobby and advocacy activities;
- A local autonomous registered body (e.g. institute, collective, NGDO, Church organization) takes over - in functional and/or legal terms - various stages of project cycle management from EED vis-à-vis the members of the platform.

This model of development cooperation has already gone through an evaluation by EED between July 2001 and May 2002.

**Typologies of CFC model**

**Network/Forum/Federation**

A group of independent, legally registered NGOs of similar or different sizes, each with FCRA registration, form a network/forum/federation together. The network/forum/federation is either registered as a new legal entity with FCRA registration, or one of the NGO members function as legal holder for the network/forum/federation, or this function rotates among the members after defined time intervals.

**Package**

A strong, established NGO (registered with FCRA no.) with a large area of coverage (regional or national) functions as the central project holder (CPH) for a group of small, legally registered NGOs with FCRA no., supporting them in the context of a package programme. The CPH coordinates and facilitates planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the individual NGO programmes, consolidates programme plans, reports and accounts, provides capacity building, develops joint programmes together with the small NGOs and enables them to build up joint programmes together with the small NGOs and enables them to build up joint structures for exchange, planning, decision making and action. Moreover, the CPH is the counterpart for EED and channels the funds to the individual NGOs. In addition, the CPH may have a disposition fund to support small project initiatives by informal groups which are not (yet) registered and have no FCRA no.
Collective Forms of Cooperations have emerged either from an independent initiative by Indian NGO or from a dialogue between Indian NGO partners and EED to improve and qualify development cooperation

Complex Programmes/Small Projects Fund
An established NGO (registered, with FCRA no.) with a regional area of coverage is the Project Holder (PH) of a complex programmes with local and regional elements as well as sub-programmes carried out by small local NGOs, CBO and PO. The funding happens either on the basis of a more or less detailed programme budget and/or through a Small Projects Fund (SPF). The SPF is usually managed by a committee on the basis of a defined set of criteria. Apart from these models, it is also mentioned that there should be some common consensus on certain non-negotiable core values, which all CFC should commit themselves to. Some of those are gender equality, participation, decentralization, transparency, people centeredness, accountability, justice and collectiveness. Even the formation process should consider and practice several features.

Steps and Process of the Study
As mentioned earlier, in the mid of 1980s EED evolved a new concept and practice of development cooperation with partner organizations. This came to be known as the Complex Forms of Cooperation (CFC). The CFC continues to exist individually for more than two and half decade now. It was only during 2002 that an external study of the whole endeavour of CFC in its totality was conducted. The study observed that the “CFC (model) is programmatically and organizationally meaningful, effective, potential and powerful endeavour for development cooperation. The evaluation also articulated the need and scope for further enhancement and strengthening of the CFC model. This enhancement and scope for strengthening the CFC was articulated strongly for the first time by the CFC partners in the Goa meeting of the CFC partners. The participants strongly articulated the need for a platform for continued sharing, learning on the experiences and insight between the CFC partners. The suggestion on building a Forum of CFCs (FCFC) was strongly endorsed by the participants.

The mission of FCFC is to work as an effective network of CFC partners, for mutual exchange and learning, in order to improve the quality of the policies, concepts and programmes, as well as the organizational models and internal governance systems of the FCFC members. In pursuance of this, the proposed study on
**TRANSFERRING VALUES**

*Normative Framework of Transparent Functioning* was undertaken. The national meeting of FCFC, which took place in Chennai from 16-19 December entrusted CNI-SBSS to take over the study on normative framework when it expressed its willingness to coordinate the study. Under the leadership of Dr. Shailendra Awale, R. John Suresh Kumar and Monijinjir Byapari would coordinate the study.

**Purpose of the Study**

CFC or civil society organizations are widely recognized as key actors in the process of development. Given the crucial nature of their potential role as a civil society organization, it is necessary for these functionaries to strengthen themselves to effect social changes. Therefore, through this participatory study the network wants to study a few things, which are given below:

- An attempt is made to learn and share among FCFC partners (without any value judgement) about the various normative frameworks developed throughout the years by different organizations to ensure effectiveness and transparency, with particular reference to CFCs.
- An attempt is made to learn about the strength and limitations of different frameworks without being organization specific and thereby making an attempt to develop a frame of reference to work further on the existing normative framework by any organization to work more effectively in today’s challenging and changing context.
- This participatory study may help us to:
  a) Understand the different CFCs from the organizational perspective.
  b) Understand the interface/ relationship between management and development perspective within the organization.
  c) Identify the factors contributing to the quality of the policies, concepts and programme as well as organizational models and internal governance systems.

**Process and Administration of the Study**

As it is basic to recognize the diverse nature of CFCs, the research team carved out a systematic process and steps through which the research was carried out. First of all a *concept note* was prepared on the basis of the discussion which took place in FCFC meetings. Later, *questionnaires* were sent. After receiving the filled questionnaires, two *regional consultations* were organized. After the consultation, the team visited the CFCs. Questionnaires were sent to 17 organizations, out of which, 11 organizations filled their questionnaires and nine organizations participated in the workshop. An extensive case study collection of 10 organizations was done in a phase of 6 months. The case study was written as per the variables for the presentation in the national consultation. In order to get an expert view, the research team also went to FMSF office and further discussed on the
The concept of development cooperation took its roots when it was increasingly realised that in the world of development process, no longer individual organisational efforts would bring the desired impact.

Research Design

The ‘factors’ chosen for the study were little abstract; like set of values, guiding principles, obligations and transparency and accountability, that are difficult to quantify. Therefore, qualitative research design was adopted to study ‘Collective Forms of Cooperation’ (CFC). The objectives of the study are to understand CFC as an organization, understand the management and development perspectives and identify the factors contributing to the quality of policies, programmes, internal governance systems and the organizational model.

The unit of analysis is ‘Collective Form of Cooperation funded by EED’. The respondent to give information on the unit of analysis is the senior functionaries of CFC/partner organizations, supervisory staff and the community members. The method data collection is interview, focus group discussion and observation. Data was collected with tools, interview guide and focus group discussion guide. This primary data was supported by the questionnaire administered to CFCs and records, reports and publications of each CFC.

Scope of the study

The scope of the study was to understand the ‘CFC vision, mission, roles and
responsibilities’, holistic view of Collective form of Cooperation, legislative (governance/board/trust) and executive legislative functions, structure of CFC to obtain and process the information, strategy and operational decision making system, financial management pertaining to systems and processes and not numbers and not questioning the activity/cost benefit analysis and analyze the CFC over a period of time, broad view of the change process from independent identity as NGO to CFC and the CFC response to the change process.

Limitations

The study is not comprehensive to bring experiences of all the partners of CFCs. The data depends on the nature of openness and ownership of the participating organizations to the study. Sensitive part of the financial issues like amount of money spent on different heads, overspending on one account head and under spending on other account, cost benefit/effectiveness analysis, submission of statements, etc. were out of the purview of the study, nevertheless, the study team accepts our inadequacies and fallibility.

Concepts and definition of variables

While administering the research study, we have constantly used terms like CFC, FCFC, normative, normative framework, transparency, accountability, governance, ideological and perspective premises, environment, structures and systems. This brief write-up introduces the general understanding of some of the terms and how we as CFC have defined these terms taking our contexts, experience, approaches, methods and our commitment into account.

Normative and Normative Framework: If there has to be a basic normative feature of human existence, it shall be life with dignity. Dignity and dignified life is the inseparable aspect of human existence. If one does not want to stretch oneself to understand what the word ‘normative’ means by taking human existence with dignity, then the case can be made simpler with the following example. For instance, if somebody wants to drive either a two wheeler or a four wheeler, it is very important that the person should possess a driver’s license. He should undergo adequate training to understand the basic mechanism of a vehicle, different instruments which make the vehicle move and traffic rules too. This basic knowledge will qualify him to acquire a license to drive; so one can become a driver only with a license. In other words, possessing a license is the basic norm or criteria to become a driver.

Of course one may say it is also possible for somebody to drive without even possessing a license by learning the art independently. Certainly, it is possible as long as the concerned person does not want to involve himself in a structure; the fact remains, how long and how far it would be possible in a worldly existence. In other words, if he has to become a
designated driver in an organizational or institutional set up, he ought to show or submit his license, only in such a case he may be given the job. In the same way, we in civil society are all also placed in a structure which demands at least a few normative behaviour and practices. This is precisely the reason why we are here and are talking about normative practices, investing our energy and resources to tell the world about the culture of transparency and accountability within our structures and systems.

Academically speaking, ‘Normative’ is usually contrasted with positive, descriptive or explanatory norms and when describing types of theories, beliefs, or statements. Descriptive statements are falsifiable statements that attempt to describe reality. Normative statements, on the other hand, affirm how things should or ought to be, how to value them, which things are good or bad, which actions are right or wrong. In social sciences the term ‘normative’ is used to describe the effects of those structures of culture which regulate the function of social activity. ‘Normative behavior’ is a term used in sociology to describe actions intended to normalize something, or make it acceptable. Normative ethics is the branch of the philosophical study of ethics concerned with classifying actions as right and wrong, as opposed to descriptive ethics. Normative ethics regards ethics as a set of norms related to actions. Descriptive ethics deals with what the population believes to be right and wrong, while normative ethics deals with what the population should believe to be right and wrong. The phrase ‘normative framework’ refers to those parameters, which would be employed to derive our set standards.

CFC: Proper understanding can be reached on FCFC only when we understand the acronym ‘CFC’. The concept of development cooperation and networking came into existence and started taking its roots when it was increasingly realized in the world of development process that no longer individual or individual organizational efforts would bring desired or expected impact on the society. The alternative approach has been to bring like-minded organizations under one networking thread so that the impact will be more sustainable. There was also need to mutually support the other, build shared understanding of values, so that the largely inimical external environment could be addressed effectively.

In the context of our resource-sharing partner – EED, the process of development cooperation and networking, it was thought that it would bring more synergy and ease out the cumbersome process involved in resource sharing and reporting on the progress. (This was the time when at the partners’ level the philosophy of consortium funding also was developed). In short, CFC is a strong and formal network of different organization who agreed to come together and work collectively with shared understanding of vision,
mission and values.

**FCFC:** According to the founders, FCFC is a non-institutional and non-hierarchical initiative. It promotes and strengthens the practice of the value of collectiveness without intervening into the autonomy of the individual CFC-Partners. It provides a platform for mutual dialogue, exchange and learning from the experiences, insights and perspectives of each other for the cause of enhancement and strengthening of the scope and opportunities inherent in the CFC models. At the first instance, an initiative of the CFC-Partners in India gave an explicit invitation to EED to be an integral part of the processes in the forum. The members of the forum consist of representatives of all the CFC-Partners as well as the involved staff members of Middle and South Asia Desk in EED. The honorary convenership of the forum comes from one of the CFC-Partners for a three year term, which is rotational too. The overall purpose of the forum is to enhance and strengthen the potential of the CFCs with regard to programme, organization, financial management, capacity building, networking, issues-oriented advocacy and patterns of support to development endeavors. FCFC also facilitates exchange visits between CFCs, encourages and supports CFC members to carry out action research on newly emerging issues or challenges and promotes mutual support among CFCs.

**Partner or member organizations:** Partner organizations are registered or unregistered organizations that are receiving resources and support from CFC. They may or may not have formal membership in the governance of CFC. Their entry and exit is based on compliance of value framework of CFC and decision of CFC.

**CBO:** These are community-based organizations having localized presence. Some of them may have organizational form or may represent as group without formal structure. They are supported by CFC.

**People’s Organization:** These are issue-based organizations of various groups and individuals committed for a certain command cause. Often, they are not registered and are membership based. They are supported by CFC members for articulation of responses for policy advocacy.

**Values:** These are foundational principles of an individual and organizations. From these, their vision for alternative society arises. Often, they are non negotiable but can be revised as organizational change process.

**Ideological and Perspective premises:** Under this, the participants categorized the vision, mission, and values were discussed; whose agenda is fulfilled within resource sharing partners (RSA), FCFC and CFC; and mapping why should we call ourselves as a collective.

**Structure:** the kind of hierarchy developed and
encouraged, which states the roles and responsibility.

*Normative framework:* is a tool to understand ourselves organizationally, to develop collective policy and practices based on shared guiding principles within and outside CFC, partner organizations and communities.

*Accountability:* is a set of value by which social and financial obligations are fulfilled and shared with internal and external stakeholders, thereby organizations accept responsibility for their action, conduct and impact.

*Transparency:* is a state of being visible and accessible to the stakeholders in a relevant way. In this process of openness, organizations would not reveal those things which are detrimental to the larger community.

*Environment:* prioritizing issues within CFC and FCFC; what are the blocks to utilizing the resources; practices to analyze the external situation and developing response mechanism. With these understanding and commitment to the definition and practices after the two consultations, CFC members agreed to receive the research team in their own setting. In the process, the research team visited nine organizations and their partner organizations in their own settings.

These definitions after the questionnaire and consultations were useful when the team visited the CFCs in their respective localities. The visits helped the researchers to understand organisations better and conduct the dialogue in a more participatory process which in turn led the team to go into the deeper organisational elements, discussed in the following chapter.

**END NOTES**

1. The details on evolution of CFC have been extracted from a communication circulated by Erika Maerke, former Head of South and Middle Asia Desk of EED titled “Collective Forms of Cooperation (CFC): Background, Context and Guidelines—a post-evaluative synopsis and reflection” 2003

2. Package programmes were initiated with AFPRO, VHAI, Gandhi Peace Centre and after few years with CASA as well


4. Refer report circulated by FCFC Secretariat ‘National Meeting of FCFC: A Resume’

5. The concept note was developed to a preliminary description of the proposed study. It provided guidelines as to why we are undertaking this study; the historical background of the study as well as highlighting on the definition of normative frameworks, the approach of the study, the purpose, the methodology and the scope and limitation of the study. After preparation of the concept note, it was shared with the Northern zone FCFC and FMSF for further dialogues and discussion. In the first week of May 2006, the concept note was shared with the rest of the CFCs inviting their comments and then finalizing it.
6. The questionnaire was prepared to ascertain some basic understanding about participating organizations; like, organization’s legal status, development experience, perspectives, objectives, strategies, issues addressed, leadership, decision making, participation, performance appraisal, environment, accountability and transparency mechanism, PME process, human resource development, ideological standing, reporting and communication process.

7. The workshop gave an opportunity for all the CFCs to come together to deliberate on the study. To arrive at a common understanding on what it means to be accountable and transparent, the workshops started with an input session from Prof. Rajshree Mahtani on understanding non-profit organizations from management perspective. Ms. Madu and Mr. Sandeep from FMSF presented the use of social audit; Mr. Sanjay Patra made a presentation on Social Accountability and Dr. Uma Ramaswamy made a presentation on Organizational Development Process in Non-profit Settings. Dr. Sudhakar, as an observer, brought focus to some of the discussions. The inputs brought the meaning, understanding and prevalent notion on transparency and accountability to the discussion of the participants. The workshops, in fact, created the space for participating organizations to recap the kind of normative structure, systems and practices evolved within the organization. It was revealing for most of them. The workshop also gave an opportunity for the participants to affirm the necessity of a study like this. The gathering also helped them to define what normative framework is and the other terms associated with it. For the research team, the concept evolved more as they interacted more with the participants. The gaps in the questions were identified and some of the terms were contextualized in the context of FCFC and administering of extensive case study of all nine organizations was finalized.

8. SPAR, PIDT, CASA, CNISBSS, INSAF, AFPRO, ODAF, SCINDeA, NEERA, DPG AND DIACONAL MINISTRY,

9. Except DPG and INSAF other organizations participated in the workshop

10. For the Regional level workshop 4 representatives from each CFC were requested to participate; two representing the CFC and 2 representing the network organizations of that particular CFC.
The trends observed and documented here may not have captured every feature of a CFC. Nevertheless, an attempt is made to present an overall picture of CFCs. These trends have been noted down intermittently across the CFCs and may not be present in all organizations.

Historical Background of CFCs

The historical background of CFCs revolve around the nature of formation, duration, the process adopted while forming, its relationship with the resource sharing partner (EED and others), founding member(s), intentions of the founders, and ideological shifts over the years. The attempt to create organizations, in some of the cases, has started with a group of individuals coming together for a common cause, with one person leading the process. For instance, in the case of NEERA, Rev. Samuel Amirtham with the support of some individuals started Palmyrah Workers Development Society (PWDS) – the parent organization of NEERA. This is, to an extent, true with Peaceful Society (PS) too; even though the formation years of PS are a checkered one. This feature cuts across even in the case of SPAR, ODAF, and SCINDeA; and may be the same with other CFCs which are not part of this study. Some of these organizations and their founders initiated their work with a study to understand the reference communities, the geographical locations and issues to be addressed.

Some of the CFCs were in the mode of working with other organizations with similar interest. This predates the EED’s initiatives on development cooperation. Some of them started networking only when EED brought up the idea. EED had its own reason for floating an idea like this. In few cases, all EED-supported organizations came together to start a network. In few other cases, a particular EED-supported agency played a key role in bringing other agencies under one umbrella to establish a network. Another point to be kept in mind is that all these CFCs and their partners are not necessarily the partners of EED since their inception. In one instance, a group’s individuals who had strong organic relationship with a particular organization came out and initiated their own agencies and
these individuals when they pondered over partnership they came together and felt the need to have common sharing, common vision, and collective action and shared understanding. In such a feeling of commitment, networks have given birth to a new era of development cooperation. In one case, EED itself had played a very active role in structuring and facilitating a movement and mobilization-oriented organization into development-oriented institution. In very few cases, where the project holder was not the parent organization, one of the partners had to handle the responsibility of receiving funds. Later, the partner organization took that responsibility, once it became independent with a separate FCRA account and other legal requirements.

Networks sometime took more than two years to complete the network formation process. In one incident it had to be completed in a few months time. The other feature, at least in one case, the secretariat of the CFC functioned only as a post office for channeling funds and resources; later with organizational change process consciously developed systems for appropriate management of resources and shared understanding of values. Historically, all CFCs have gone through ideological and perspective change phases including faith-based perspective to development-oriented perspective, planning and strategy. A particular CFC came into existence by replicating another successful and time-tested CFC process. The initiative also ranges from micro to macro level planning and intervention process. Except one CFC out of the ten cases, all are registered as society. In some cases, the parent body is registered not the network. In this case, when the network partners attempted to register the network, it was not allowed as there is no legal provision for a group of organizations to come together to create an organization but they could do so if they had wanted register as a group of individuals, which they did not want to pursue.

One CFC since its early days had the strategy of working with several organizations, which it later made as its vision; working with civil society, especially with NGOs, is its vision mandate. This vision as well as a strategy has led to many issue-specific initiatives that have already become full fledged programmes with a proper institutional set up. So far five independent organizations are working on managing specific programmatic interventions. Some of the CFCs do not have direct programmes; on the other hand, some have huge direct programmes which may be greater than the entire network programmes put together.

### Ideological Perspective

The inspiration to embrace a particular ideology has originated from metaphysical, non-worldly experience to some practical notions. In many cases, subscribing in definite terms to the ideas and virtues of great leaders is also a fact. These ideological positions and commitment have complimented the functions and functional nature of CFCs and contributed to their growth and quite often have triggered conflicts also. Some of the core ideological positioning is given below.
Power to the people not only intends to empower people in terms of some skills but builds resources and structures within the community to sustain the empowering process. In this endeavour, the organization builds resources and infrastructure and leaves them in the hands of the people.

Product power and people power has been the ideology of a CFC which has gone through different phases in its existence. Once it had designed programmes to favour people power at one point of time and product power at another. Apparently, at present, the CFC is giving its best attempt to bring power to people through product power i.e. unless people are able to put on their skills and products in the market, it will be difficult for the people to gain confidence about their skill and to assert their social, political and cultural rights. So, it is very important that their economic right should be ascertained. Thus, product power leads to people power.

Justice and Rights: Approach towards development intervention in most of the progressive NGOs is based on rights mode. Later developments and issues in the rights-based mode have made civil society to add justice aspect to rights approach, which has made CFCs also to design programmes with justice and rights combination.

Subaltern for subalterns: It is not enough if we talk about the progress of subaltern in programme impact. They should be the decision makers. This proactive notion has helped subalterns to come together to enter into development cooperation process. In other words, subalterns working for the rights and justice of subalterns, basically it is the coalition of the oppressed. On the other hand, in some cases the governance and leadership may not be from oppressed but structural and programmatic arrangements are made for the oppressed to be promoted and represented.

All these ideological positions should be ably directed by vision and mission statements which posses fairly complementing elements. On few occasions, CFCs have brought changes in their vision and mission statements and the values they stand for. Organizational development and change process have enabled CFCs to undergo changes as per the demand and need. Some of the vision statements are bold and some are broad.
Bold in the sense that they dares to take on the social, political and cultural traits of the society which restrict human potentialities; the broad vision statements tend to include every issue wherein an NGO may intervene.

Some of the vision statements categorically refer to the target communities which will be the primary beneficiaries of the development programmes. At lease one mission statement clearly states its fascination for task-oriented approach over process-oriented approach. In some cases, within the CFC, partners in spite of their ideological differences (each partner may subscribe to Left, Gandhian, faith-based and development management approach) have agreed to work together because the common interest is to ensure people their rights. In such case commitment to rights-based approach has brought different ideological streams together. In one CFC, the ideology and structural formation of people’s organization has given a channel or route for people to move ahead in the organizational ladder to represent their views and put forth their demands as developing and supporting PO has emerged from the basic ideology of the organization.

The structure of every CFC is different hence the ideology also differs. Such structural variations have in some cases made the CFC to adopt the ideology of the parent organization as theirs. For a particular CFC austerity is a cherished value. Stakeholders of this CFC proudly abide to such virtue. In some cases, the ideology of the founder or the leader flows through the CFC and another CFC has a perspective to work through institutions and building institutions.

**Governance**

Governance is such an important process in organizations which actually enable the values to get transferred in organizational functionalities or at least good governance practices support the structure of the organization to be flexible, able, and innovative so that the system can actually function in the desired manner. In the case of some CFCs, governance comes from external parent organizations where structurally there is less space or no space for the senior managerial staff of the organization to make choice, control and complement. This arrangement invariably leads to vulnerable governance structure, governance practices and process.

In some cases, partners also claim some stake but which is very minimal depending on the governance wisdom of the founders of the organization. Some luminaries and people of high social standing are there in the board where there is no partner representation or community representation. In few cases, administrative mechanisms are developed and programmatic management structures are in place to enhance participation of the partners to complement governance process. At least in a particular CFC, the structure from the bottom to the top is
framed out in a way that community representation or people from the lower part of hierarchy can come up and represent in the board and be part of highest decision-making structure. In another case, the governance consists of partners and they constitute the governance mechanism. In a few cases, the governance intentions consciously and proactively promote women leaders, activists and women-headed organizations and networks. Across the CFCs, it is noticed that proactive steps are being consciously taken to encourage women leadership, bringing more women members in decision-making and supporting women activists.

For a few CFCs, the representation of community in the board should not be considered as a token gesture. Their skill and capacity should be built in such a way that they will be able to contribute positively to the board proceedings. If they remain as mute spectators to the process, then there is no point in keeping such representation in the board. As mentioned, while every CFC is registered as a society, there is only one trust. But this trust for more democratic decision making and guidance to the development intervention process has expanded the horizon of the Trust deed and incorporated various features to enhance the governance where the ideas of stakeholders from different structural placing could represent their views and express their opinions.

In most of the cases, the board has a definite number of members who meet periodically, receive reports, and actively participate in the community interface activities. In a few cases, the luminaries may not participate in the entire board meeting. Some may even be there only for name sake.

**Organizational Structure**

The organizational structure cannot be separated or exist independent of the governance. In most of the cases, the ideological perspective and the people who constitute the board determine the kind of structure. The structure across the CFCs is not similar. It is flexible and has adopted variety of structural arrangements to operationalize development cooperation in different frameworks. They are:

- **direct implementation:** the CFC apart from working with partners and network, has its direct programme
- **one-to-one partnership:** the CFC directly works with a partner for a specific cause, the partner may or may not have any relationship with other partners of the CFC
- **networking as a single unit**
- **variety of issue-based networking** within a CFC (this is called CFC+ structure where
many CFCs were formed; with each CFC focusing on different issues)\(^{18}\)
- single networking unit, promoting and supporting activists etc.,
- networking with partners and being a partner in the network\(^ {19}\)

These structural variations have allowed diverse structural arrangements to emerge within the larger spectrum of CFCs to formulate strategies, transferring values and triggering greater impacts on development cooperation. They are:
- Development cooperation as strategy and value has been experimented and extended to non-EED supported initiatives by some CFCs. In other words, those CFCs which have understood the advantage and plus factors of development cooperation have willingly taken the idea as a value and strategy to experiment further.
- Many CFCs are registered and a few are not.\(^ {20}\)
- In a decentralized structure, it is expected that the parent organization plays a minimum role in the day-to-day functions of the partner or network. But at least in one case, the parent organization shares its resources at the same time; some of its staffs are involved in everyday affairs of the network. In the same CFC, structurally-designed organizational set up gives more space for direct implementation of programmes by the parent organization. In actual quantifiable terms, the size of the directly implemented programmes is colossally bigger than the programmes managed through networks.
- In few cases, the structure based on some ideological standing has given scope to encourage building institutions.\(^ {21}\) With such approach, the question here is how far the parent organization could transfer the values of development cooperation to those institutions which have become independent.
- Identifying the people represented and being accountable, transparent to them (like whom are we representing and who are our stakeholders.)

**Organizational Systems**

The fundamental truth is that an unambiguous ideological perspective, governance and structure should be complemented by muscular and sturdy organizational systems, which are pursued by the stakeholders for a purposeful functioning of the organization. This is the reason why the research team spent as much time as possible to unearth, understand and document different systems developed by the CFC over the years and adhered unfailingly by those who committed to the organization and its vision. Keeping this basic
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Structural variations have allowed diverse structural arrangements to emerge within the larger spectrum of CFCs to formulate strategies, transferring values and triggering greater impacts on development cooperation
understanding, the team could collect some details on systems like PME, leadership, motivation, team building, team work, decision-making, participation, community building process, networking or development cooperation process, human resource development which includes recruitment and induction, capacity building process, empowerment and redress mechanism. This part of the discussion looks into some aspects of these systems.

Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

“The NGO could be claiming to do XYZ and actually be doing ABC.” This may happen or may be happening to organizations. To avoid such a situation, organizations which believe in effective development intervention process develop good management systems to ensure that the organization does exactly what it claims to do. Such arrangements call for compact and efficient PME mechanisms. In CFC functions, PME is considered as the core function of the secretariat of a few of the CFCs. This is possible with a structural provision for PME in the secretariat. The planning is integrated to the larger organizational level and an activity i.e. planning is seen not as an isolated activity but it is the starting point to make collective decision making where all stakeholders are involved. In this very process, people also come to know why a particular programme is designed, how that particular programme is planned, where it will lead to and who will participate in the process, etc. In this way planning operates as a spark for other related processes. In some planning methods, the process takes into account the future course of the programme whereby an element of forecasting is done. Forecasting of programmes enables the organization to make appropriate contingency plans to address unforeseen crisis or unexpected change(s) in the plan. This planning process includes financial allocation for each programme at the planning stage with maximum ceiling on the allocation. Finance manual describes the procedures, roles and responsibility. In another incident, the structural nature of the CFC brings everybody together on one single platform to plan and report. Planning of activities sets indicators for the impact and evaluation exercise.

In some of the CFCs, the governing board members participate actively in programme planning. Participatory Strategic Planning (PSP) is one of the ways through which some of the CFCs do their planning where the staffs from various levels actively participate in
Vision, Mission, Role, Strategies and Programme (VMRSP) building process. A particular CFC, with directors and senior leadership in its board, has developed a Common Minimum Programme (CMP) across the network partners. Some of the CFCs have ten year plans divided into three to four phases, where each phase is expected to fulfill objectives. These phases are further divided into six monthly planning and cash flow as per the need. At least one CFC has developed such a plan which is supposed to be dynamic wherein the organization should update it at least once in six months so that it can tell whether any change is taking place because of the development intervention administered by that organization in a particular reference area. This database also serves as one of the mechanisms to review the programme. In this CFC, every planning is perspective driven with a campaign mode and impact-oriented approach. The campaign mode holds a view that no event would take place in isolation. A particular event or activity should lead or link with the subsequent activity. After a specific period, all these events and their impact should culminate and bring impact on an issue.

These diverse planning processes are monitored in several ways. There are formal and informal ways of monitoring the activities of the network and its partners. In few instances, demand-driven monitoring exercises are also done. The structure of the organization has given space to create committees to monitor the activities. These committees even look into the purchase of goods and the ways in which the purchased things are utilized. Checklists are also in practice to monitor whether the programmes are taking place according to the plan or not and its impact. Some CFCs release the funds only on the basis of submission of reports. Using technology to monitor the running of programmes; a web-based online monitoring tool (custom-made application) has been developed in one CFC, where partners who are in charge of programme implementation can upload their activities instantly. This is in fact a multi-purpose tool; it serves in monitoring, reporting and evaluating the progress on timely basis as there is no need to wait for formal evaluation process.

It has been noticed, at least in a few cases, that evaluation and review process have made organizations to take decisive course correction and changes resulting in either modifying or entirely changing the way the organization functions or the ideological positioning or the programme design. Some of the CFCs have developed a strong accounting management module and these modules are seriously adhered to. In fact, a CFC evaluates its financial and resource utilization systems and methods independent of programme evaluation. In the same CFC, the senior leadership has strong financial background. The particular financial position is placed over the programmatic personnel and it also gives

Planning should be perspective driven. Campaigns and impact-oriented tools are integral to it. In campaign approach, no event takes place in isolation; actually one activity leads to the other for greater impact
guidance to the others who are responsible for the programmatic part of the organization. Some of the CFCs have given less scope for self-evaluation process. Few of the CFCs appraise the staff performance through various methods. One such unique method is a well thought and well-planned appreciative enquiry process based on human lab techniques. At least one CFC is regularly reporting to the partners in the network and partners also do the same. This CFC has the habit of reporting to the larger CFC forum about its activities and keeping everybody briefed about its progress.

Leadership

It is obvious and without any second thought one can say that while looking at the diverse ideology and historical journeys of all these CFCs in the context of multiple linguistic, social, cultural difference of Indian society, the nature of leadership of these organizations cannot be similar. If not unique, they are varied having individual strengths and weaknesses. The leadership as quality and process is seen at least at three levels – CFC, organizational and community. There are formal and non formal leaders. In few cases, a strong facilitative leadership is present. CFC formation has consciously promoted subaltern leadership. Some CFCs have created structural arrangements to encourage and support women leadership. Till very recently, one CFC had no women leader in the higher organizational structure, on the other hand, its contribution in building women leaders at the community level is exemplary.

At least in half of the cases, the leadership is permanent (leaders have not changed at least for a decade) where the devolution of power or promotion of second-rung leadership is a worrying factor as well as a critical issue. So claim over horizontal organizational structure across these CFCs looks doubtful and superficial. Burden of ideology is also a hampering factor for why the leadership is neither growing nor given adequate space. For instance, as many of the development organizations tend to believe that everybody is equal, actually this has become dysfunctional and created lack of clarity in the role. In some instances, it has been noticed that due to the staff’s inadequate capacity or not-so-friendly environment, the second-rung leadership is grown to the expected level. In one case, the leadership has always been exclusive and remained within sanguine relationship.
In some CFCs, because of the high turnover of staff, opportunities are always available for other staff to get promotion and to grow further professionally. At the same time, high turnover of staff is also a recurrent problem for these CFCs. Some capacity building process and organizational responsibilities given to staff have also helped them acquire leadership qualities or to sharpen their skills to become future leaders. Some leadership, at least programmatically, does not possess any ‘power’ because of the unassertive secretariat which structurally looks weak and doubtful in terms of transferring values and future vision building process. Some of the CFCs have received leadership from the parent organization because of a sort of organic relationship of the leader with the parent organization. Some leaders focus only on efficiency and effectiveness of the programmes, which in turn gives more importance to task-oriented approach towards programme implementation. Change in a few of the CFCs has brought in change of perspective, values and objectives also.

Motivation
The motivational factors for a person to work with a particular organization are actually a grey area which needs further exploration. At this juncture, it may be noted here that considering the high turnover of staff or inadequate capacity of the staff in a few CFCs, exclusive and permanent leadership, and not so high emoluments, staff may not have any positive factor which motivates people to work with a particular organization. At the same time, one should not postulate that serving the grass communities is the motivating factor (most of the developmental professionals who are in their mid-career and may not work with grassroots level communities on day-to-day basis). Such conclusion will lead only to superficial understanding of staff motivation. Having observed this reality, it should be stated that there are some provisions for rewards for good performance in many of the CFCs. Some time the ideology also turns out to be like a burden as demands of life, family and peer-group pressure is high and those involved find it increasingly difficult to balance.

Team Building and Team Work
Looking at the way ‘team work’ as a concept and process is defined and understood, it may said that team work per se may not be the reason for why people should work in teams but there are strategic values and requirements that act as compulsive factors for organizations to keep their personnel in teams.
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In most cases, the leadership looks permanent where the devolution of power or promotion of second-rung leadership is a worrying factor as well as a critical issue.
Among some of the CFCs, structurally sanctioned provisions are there for team work; teams work on a rotatory basis specific issues. In very few cases, understanding and appreciating the team work through human psychological process is encouraged. Overt emphasis on creating a horizontal structure where everybody is treated as equals has in fact diffused hierarchy and inadequate role clarity. At least in one CFC, there is no space for team at all. In some CFCs, there are structural arrangements for teams to work for a longer period of time where hierarchy is defined and clarity of role is there. Even within the team, responsibility is shared which is actually programmatic responsibility rather than on the basic values of teamwork. Some times, participation being a core strategy brings people to work together. Task-oriented and output-driven teams are also formed. In few cases, success and failures are shared collectively; failures are not probed individually.

**Decision-making**
The nature of structure helps or hinders the decision-making process. Devolution of powers to design and execute programmes has helped people take decisions. Staff as collective is empowered to take decisions. Some organizational structures enable each staff to take part in decision making. On the other hand, structurally there is no provision for participation or collective decision making but still attempts are made to include everyone in decision-making process.

**Participation**
Participation as a concept and process is understood dynamically across CFCs. Apart from treating participation as a core value; CFCs encourage participation of stakeholders in decision making which serves as a tool for building their capacity. Mechanisms like common minimum programme also provide a platform for the partners to participate in each other’s plan of action and to get to know their work. Some structures give token importance to the process of participation. A particular organizational structure has created space for stakeholders from grassroots to participate in developing strategy for development intervention. While in most of the development process, participation is considered as a value, one of the CFCs considers participation not only as a value but considers it as a management tool and strategy. There is a strong need for PME, demand for efficient programme management and impact; all these systems can be sustained at an expected level only when there is participation and space for everybody to participate and
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**High turnover of staff may be due to exclusive and permanent leadership, not-so-high emoluments, incapacity of the staff, etc**
be a part of every process. Sometimes, a strong hierarchy also hinders participation; at the same time when hierarchy is diffused everybody participates with less clarity on role, which invariably turns out to be dysfunctional process.

Community Building Process
At the end of the day, the existence of an organization is justified only through its methods and success in building communities which develop according to the vision of the organization. CFCs in this respect adopted different methods to build communities. They are:

- Forming and sustaining Community Building Organizations (CBO) and people’s organization with varied geographical boundaries
- Building communities which actually resist against all kinds of exploitative forces and they usually do not hide their resistance. It is always open and vigorous and it may even resort to confrontationist approach. This approach gives way to mobilize people en mass and bring them under a movement
- Building communities through institutional model. Actually when the community members reach a stage to assert their rights and market their skills, they are encouraged to register as a society and function within the institutional parameters
- Community-building initiatives are taken based on the situation and context and it is necessarily based on collective visioning process at partners’ level
- Community-building initiatives are sometimes carried out through service provision model
- Communities are also built with a focus on making them self reliant; so capacity building process, participation, decision making, etc are geared towards that purpose
- A very few community-building initiatives are processed through service provision model.

Networking or Development Process
Development cooperation (DC) as a value and strategy to yield effective results needs strategic partnership, careful planning, mutual trust along with progressive thinking and proactive steps. As a concept, development cooperation was the need of the time when it was conceived as an idea, more than two decades back. Having understood this idea, CFCs have evolved various ways through which they have developed partnership. It was

Overt emphasis on creating a horizontal structure where everybody is treated as equals has, in fact, diffuse hierarchy and result, in inadequate role clarity
mentioned earlier that some of the CFCs were started even before EED’s initiative on networking. Some readily took the idea when it became known that EED supports such initiatives.

Progress has been made in the DC process through several mechanisms developed by CFCs over the years. They are:

- MoU, set criteria and process for exit and entry of partners (only a few networks have developed MoU with their partners)
- Collegial visits to partners by partners group
- Allocation of separate staff for CFC work at partner level
- Policy and planned approach to networking

Some of the CFCs have taken development cooperation really as a value and applied it to other non-EED funded initiatives. Though some of them have DC as value and strategy, still they have not relinquished their responsibility in direct implementation of programmes. In fact, these directly implemented programmes are immensely larger than the network programmes. Networking has also helped some of the CFCs to build more institutions which deal with specific issues with expertise. The process of networking has acquired the respect of some of the boards. This has resulted in the parent organization entrusting the work of networking to an independent and empowered organization. Fairly, networking has enhanced the process of public advocacy impact on programmes and representing communities.

**Human Resource Development**

*Recruitment and Induction*

One or two organizations have developed a robust induction process; through which newly recruited staff are given series of training and other capacity-building processes. These systematic and systemic induction methods cover perspective building to handling day-to-day development intervention activities. In some places, people who are responsible for governance play a strong role in
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The process of networking has acquired the respect of some of the boards, resulting in the parent organisation entrusting the work of networking to independent and empowered organisations.

recruiting staff, in some place the senior management does recruitment. There are well-written staff policies, in some places there is no staff policy at all. At least in one CFC, the key positions governance and executive always remain exclusive i.e. kept within a close-knit group.

Capacity Building Process
Building the capacity of the staff rests upon need-based training, properly designed training programmes. In some places, capacity building is treated as a core issue. In few places, capacity building is processed with an approach, functional elements and executed as an activity. Only in one case appreciation is used as a tool where training is given, based on an individual’s plan which is driven by his or her dreams.

Empowerment
Whether the induction of the staff, appropriate capacity-building programmes yield results or not depends on the space available for the staff to innovate, experiment and be accountable for that process. In few cases, the overwhelming presence has either been holding back others or puts a huge gap. This has been noticed seeing the natural gap which exists between the leader and second rank leaders. In some cases, the values and ideology of the organization empowers the staff. In some places, the systems empower the staff. In few cases, conscious attempt to include subalterns has empowered them to grow and assert.

Redressal Mechanism
Institutionally-arranged redressal mechanism (RM) in some form exists only in few of the CFCs. Some are based on written policy on RM where the policy states procedures for entry and exit of partners in the network. Exit of partners in a few cases had taken place on ideological differences. Some are based on context-specific issues and in few cases mechanisms are developed as and when the need arises, where there may not be any policy on partnership procedures. Some are based on mechanisms, which are based on values which demand total transparency on planning programmes and allocating resources.
END NOTES

1. In the mid of nineties EED’s consultant Badal Sen Gupta facilitated the PSP process in Peaceful Society. This two-year long process brought together various strategic thinking and planning to develop institution-based methods and mechanisms to build people’s organization

2. The formation of NEERA as a network took almost two years as the partners went through various processes to discuss ideology, areas of work, geographical boundaries, so on and so forth.

3. SCINDeA as network had to be formed within two months

4. The classic example is SBSS. Apart from developing plan of action and appropriate perspective for every phase, SBSS left everything to the discretion of its partners-Diocesan Board of Social Services. With sixteen month preparatory and organizational change process in 2004-2006, it took a decisive change to be an accompanier and resource sharing partner whose involvement goes beyond distributing just financial resources in the initiatives of the partners

5. CASA, for instance, is a faith-based organization but its understanding of development is ‘secular’ and strategically works more with secular organizations with secular ideology

6. SCINDeA’s formation and perspective development largely reflect the formation of ODAF in several ways but the dynamic secretariat of ODAF stands in a different level compared to that of SCINDeA

7. Out of all the case studies, only CWS is registered as a trust but it has expanded the number of people who are part of the governing board

8. NEERA is not a registered network, even its coordination centre – DATA - is not a registered body. But NEERA’s legal framework comes from PWDS, which is a registered body

9. CWS has a long history of working with like-minded organizations. As stated, its vision statement talks about working with different civil society organizations and being accountable to them

10. CWS, whenever it finds a specific initiative, attains maturity and position to look after its affairs; it proactively makes that as an independent institutional initiative with independent governance, structure and systems.

11. Though every CFC vouches for development cooperation, still some believe in direct implementation. For instance, CASA’s direct programmes are in conservative calculation several-times bigger than the network programmes.

12. Even before the formation of NEERA, PWDS had gone through different phases where the ideology always played a strong role in determining its perspective over planning process. The bitter experience of losing the registration for two years because of its open confrontationist approach through which people were mobilized had to be abandoned for a more softer ideology of mobilizing people through their product power

13. The case is NEERA. The stress on task-oriented approach and product power in fact go hand in hand. It is also noticed that such approach goes well with a project-based and time-bound development interventions
14. ODAF partners have embraced many ideologies but their commitment to working for the rights of the people has brought them together.

15. The structure of Peaceful Society and its commitment to building PO at every village has been successful in terms of developing grassroots level leadership, which has a space to represent at the higher hierarchy of the organizational structure.

16. In the case of CASA and SBSS, the governance comes from their parental Church body. The senior leadership of SBSS as well as CASA does not have much say (legally and structurally) in deciding the members of the board. In the recruitment of staff, the board plays a very active role and without the knowledge of the board, recruitment cannot be done.

17. CWS partners increasingly with women-headed organizations and supports largely Women Fellows.

18. CASA’s package programmes have brought and formed many groups, each working on specific issues.

19. Peaceful Society has formed Swaraj in every state where it is working. Swaraj is a network of Gandhian PO, and organizations. PS is part of Swaraj Goa.

20. NEERA did not get registered because of legal reasons. For instance, the Home Ministry was not in favour of giving FCRA to NEERA as PWDS had one already. Secondly, under Society Act, there is no provision for a group of organizations to form another organization for networking purposes and register a society; but from those organizations if individuals come forward to register, it may be allowed. But the leadership from the partners of NEERA did not prefer to register the network as group of individuals.

21. Part of the mission statement of CWS reads like this, “Partnering with a large number of NGOs and networks” This should also be seen in line with another facet of CWS, i.e. its hugeness. CWS’ growing size and scope of work has already triggered the process of hiving off some of its units, which has already resulted in independent organizations emerging up; like WASSAN Centre for People’s Forestry and BODHI which are already in place as independent organizations.

22. www.aidworkers.net?9=node/669

23. CWS’ National Annual Consultative Meeting (NACM) and Regional Consultative Meeting (RCM) bring every partner together to plan, execute and submit relevant reports.

24. The partners of SCINDeA have agreed to common minimum programme based on Millennium Development Goals, which means the issues under focus have been designed by structures outside the network purview.

25. The Database of SBSS is exhaustive and it has few parts which can be and need to be updated to show the impact of the programmes as well as serve as indicators to change the focus and strategy.

26. CWS evaluates its financial utilization independently. This is done periodically. Such practices are very important for the sheer reason that the organization is really huge and its interventions, partnership and relationship are in need of robust systems.

27. Participation is a process where the marginalised groups become the protagonists and decision-makers and foster their critical consciousness and ability to influence and transform power dynamics as well as the norms, systems and institutions that affect their lives. In practice, development institutions interpret
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27. Participation is a process where the marginalised groups become the protagonists and decision-makers and foster their critical consciousness and ability to influence and transform power dynamics as well as the norms, systems and institutions that affect their lives. In practice, development institutions interpret...
participation differently and accordingly the participation process also differs. At first, most development organisations understood it as a means to improve programme design and implementation by tapping local people’s experience and ideas. Over time, it was seen as a methodology to build capacity and, more recently, as a way to engage in policy change.

28. NEERA as a CFC understands and administer participation as a strategy. An organisation may value or may not value participation but if it can strategically rope in all the stakeholders in executing a particular development programme, then it is assumed that such a strategic process would help in efficient and effective programme intervention.
Prescription of a model or dolling out a ready-made framework on transparency practices and accountability mechanisms is not the intention of this research and its process, but to emphasise the necessity to be transparent and accountable as civil society organisations and to take the discussion on TA from the normal line of thinking which is usually prescriptive and dogmatic. Normally, literature related to trust, society and company when it discusses the matters related to governance, gives specific features on the formal governance structure. The descriptions covers 1) the name of the governing body or bodies with their relationship to other organisational entities 2) Basic responsibilities and powers 3) Duties of individual board members, such as loyalty and confidentiality 4) Minimum number of board members 5) Membership rules (including eligibility suspension and expulsion) 6) Terms of office (length of terms, limits on reelection) 7) Minimum number of board meetings per year 8) Method of convening meetings (who initiates, how to set dates who decides agenda, etc) 9) Decision-making procedures (number needed for quorum, how to vote and record decisions) 10) Conflict-of-interest provisions (Wyatt, 2004).

These are, of course, some basic requirements from a board to initiate good governance practices. Like this, an organisation may have described or even put everything in paper. The organisation may follow and may even have robust systems to ensure these basic processes. But the question is - would all these characteristics of governance and even more like these ensure transparency and accountability? The answer is anything but indistinct. Then what is that actually ensures transparency and accountability. Though TA emerge from the above-mentioned norms; they actually go beyond the above-mentioned descriptions and actually lie somewhere in the intricacies of these norms. To mention a few, the intricacies could be the willingness and commitment to operate with an attitude of openness, willingness to accept the public scrutiny, willingness to put the common good above self-interest, etc.

In fact, the attempt of the previous chapter is to analyze the intricacies. At least, at a preliminary level, the chapter has made several observations and attempted to capture the existing practices on TA. These observations across the CFCs point out the areas in which their actions have made them transparent and accountable or otherwise. Considering the nature of this report and the strength of brevity, the researchers have restricted their
discussion to six salient elements of the development cooperation and intervention process. These six key elements the researchers feel would, in many ways, either act as pressure to demand certain TA practices or serve as indicators to show how far the CFCs are transparent and accountable or not. The six key features are:

- **Mission and ideology**: The broadness\(^1\) and boldness\(^2\) or the range of specificity of mission statements
- **Paradigm**: Development\(^3\) versus Rights-based
- **Governance**: Exclusive versus Inclusive governance practices at every level
- **Programmatic Approach**: Product power versus People’s Power
- **Institutional Framework**: Legal/Formal institutional framework (NGO) versus Social Movement Process
- **Programme Implementation**: Direct implementation\(^4\) versus intervention through development cooperation process

These six overarching features are presented pictorially here (see graph). For a better understanding the researchers have placed the extremes of particular element in one single line with its two ends pointing to two opposites of a particular area under discussion. For instance, if we take governance, though it can have different facets, for the purpose of analysis, only the exclusive and inclusive nature of the governance is taken for discussion where one end points to exclusiveness and the other inclusiveness. The end on left side points to the limiting factors and end on right side refers to those life-enhancing traits of organisations. Each factor on either side is graded with four point scale. Respective CFCs can do a self analysis and mark them to see on which side they fall in the continuum in all
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six key areas. After marking all six elements, it is necessary that we reflect and see how close each indicator is to the other. A CFC may claim that its governance is inclusive and participatory but actually it may be implementing or may prefer to implement more programmes directly than through a development cooperation structure i.e. within CFC framework. In such scenario, there is obviously a gap between what one is at governance level and at programme implementation level. With such disparity, the pressure or onus to be transparent and accountable on a particular organisation is less. This leads to a situation in which basic norms to practice transparency and accountability becomes descriptive rather than normative.

- **Mission Ideology:** Our aspirations coupled with overt enthusiasm and sometimes even lack of clarity on what we are supposed to do usually lead us to frame/claim/set/promise a very broad mission statement and too many objectives. In such situation either simply we would not be able to fulfill what we actually claimed to do in our papers or in addition to such over ambitious and unachievable mission with low or moderate performance we tend to justify what we did or fail to achieve. In this process we may become less transparent and accountable. On the other hand, bold and specific mission statement itself makes our work easier and enables us to design our programmes with very less ambiguity and meet with visible and ‘measurable’ progress in our work.

- **Paradigm:** The nature of our programmatic involvement/paradigm would also determine the level of transparency and accountability practices. Over the years, the nature of development work by NGOs have transformed quite drastically; like from charitable to welfare to development and now it is engaged more on rights-based and justice-oriented and equity-based development programmes. Among these paradigms, rights-based approach demands supreme transparency practices and accountability mechanisms as it confronts status quo of the elite/ruling groups, oppressive forces and institutions and their muscle to wield power over the weak. In benign development work, there is less pressure to show more open transparency practices and accountability mechanisms as our approach is soft and may move along comfortably with the existing societal structure or may remain aloof to such reality.

- **Governance:** On the other hand, governance with its many facets, especially its constituent of leadership determines the level of transparency and accountability. Inclusiveness and exclusiveness of the leadership actually decides whether one needs to be transparent or not. Inclusive and exclusive nature of leadership is just a reflection of the attitude of the leader(s), their intention, willingness to take risks and readiness to allow different perspectives and innovative ideas to come into their governance and decision-making on programme management. These elements of leadership would
decide the level of participation of different people involved and space for collective and democratic decision-making process.

- **Programmatic Approach:** The other important key area is the complementariness between product power and people power. At the outset it should be stated here that the power of people’s product definitely makes them powerful and to an extent influential too. In fact, people become powerful because of what they produce/sell/market and extent their services for their sustainability. At the same time, we can understand the relationship between the variables better i.e. people’s product and power emerging out of it by placing them in a more specific socio-political and economic context in which we live. As neo-liberal and market driven policies are promoted and considered to be the magical bullet for the growth of Indian economy and prosperity of its citizen, the fate of the huge Indian population has become uncertain. Only ten to fifteen percent of Indian population is prospering while the rest of the population is either in extreme poverty or marginalised or have become severely vulnerable. They are vulnerable because any change in their socio-political and economic environment can leave tremendous impact, pushing them into poverty. Most of the Indian population lives in such condition. Now the point is whatever people produce to ensure their survival, the policies of the state is being increasingly designed in such a manner that it can nullify or reverse at one stroke what this section of the population could achieve over the years. It is also true that sometimes people’s product power contributes and complements people’s power (people’s power is that by the virtue of being a person or community, people are entitled to certain fundamental rights), but this is not an end itself. It is not such a simple process whereby people become absolutely powerful with their product alone unless they have an access and control over the market; instead of a few self-serving business houses determining everything. Finally, the point is when we focus completely on product power more from a development perspective, there may not be any overwhelming compulsion on us to be transparent and accountable; in other words, the level to which maintaining transparency practices and accountability mechanisms may differ. On the other hand, when non-governmental organizations work for people’s power the pressure to be transparent and accountable is high.

- **Institutional Framework:** The way we understand and operationalise our institutional existence would also decide how far and to which level we should be transparent and accountable. In the present context, NGO world is shrouded or constrained by the boundaries of legal/formal nature of our structure which is tuned to facilitate and implement more of development work within the parameters and life cycle of projects. In this process of development work where the communities receive more from our work rather than contributing equally to change, the need to be transparent and
develop accountability mechanism is necessary only to a certain extent, because people are taken more as mute subjects at the receiving end. On the other hand, when we pledge ourselves to mobilise people to fight for their rights, assert their citizenship rights and be an alternative political force, we need to be supremely transparent and accountable not only to resource sharing agencies, implementing partners but to the communities and to the state which is keenly watching and scrutinising every move of civil society organisations, specifically those NGOs who work with rights-based approach.

- **Programme Implementation:** Finally there is a greater need for transparency and accountability when our passion lies with development cooperation as a framework in development intervention. The core value of collective form of cooperation is engaging with societies as a team of organisations coming together, visioning together, working collaboratively and sharing pain and facing struggles collectively and ultimately dispelling the notion of ideological differences, antagonism to prove who is better or who should be in limelight or how to appropriate resources as these miserable traits were afflicting organisations not long ago (still continue to bother some of us). So when we become part of a larger development cooperation process, in a certain sense we automatically become transparent and accountable as the structure itself necessitates such organisational traits.

**Way Forward**

First of all, this study, as mentioned elsewhere, is unique as it is first of its kind within CFCs and largely in FCFC. Secondly, the process of the study was elaborate and lot of efforts were taken to ensure that CFC’s participate in an open environment where no one’s conduct and practice would be judged or condemned considering the sensitivity of the subject enquired. Above all, the study was carried out not to develop and prescribe a ready made framework for transparency and accountability practices.

This initiative may actually become worthy, only when it succeeds in inspiring the CFCs (if not all) and larger civil society organisations to reflect and mirror themselves to understand and analyze how their structure and systems are conducive and to enable the particular CFC, as an organisation in development cooperation process, to be transparent and accountable and how good our structure and systems to interface with the fast-changing socio, political and economic environment. In some ways it should lead all of us to go through self-appraisals.

We use and try to practice words like participation, leadership, motivation, community building etc more in relation to our grass-roots involvement which is undeniably legitimate and justifiable. At the same time we knowingly or otherwise separate it from our organisational life as though we can be different at community level and operate in other
mode within organisation. Unless, we break this dichotomy and believe and truly become participatory, take decision, more democratically and collectively, motivate and support our fellow colleagues, build a team within our organisational setting, it would be impossible to practice these ideals at the community level. So, to become a true representative of our communities, it is necessary at the first instance that we become more participatory, trustworthy and democratic in our day-to-day organisational conduct. Secondly, there is a responsibility to transfer these values to our partners in development cooperation and to the entire spectrum of civil society organisations. Transferring values is not only dynamic but intrinsic to the existence of NGOs. Through this, the development cooperation with the partners and larger civil society actually gets strengthened and the results we seek at the grass-roots become effective and turn impact-oriented.

With globalisation spreading its tentacles of oppression, with neo-liberal states increasingly becoming brutal against all kinds dissenting voices and people’s mobilisation, we, the NGOs, in these circumstances as part of larger civil society tend to become possessive or overprotective about our institutional structure and try to operate and advocate for people. Instead, we should actually accompany with the marginalised and oppressed communities to raise their voice, fight for their rights and advocate for equity and justice.

END NOTES:

1. Broadness of mission simply refers to our intention to do everything under the earth. NGOs have the tendency to draft mission that are too broad. As a result, they list many outcomes that they are not actively pursuing and that they can’t pursue because they don’t have the resources. This could be dangerous for several reasons. First, NGOs could try to spread themselves thin and move into areas they don’t have the capacity, resources, or abilities to tackle. Second, stakeholders looking at such a map might question why the NGO is not tackling these other issues. For that reason it is crucial that we focus on what is practical, can be monitored easily and implemented with less hiccups and contingencies.

2. Boldness refers to specific and pointed mission statement which is clear and unambiguous. A well-defined mission statement can guide the organization and leadership in making crucial decisions about programme and resource allocation. An overly broad mission statement may not provide sufficient guidance in deciding which projects to focus on, and at the same time, an overly narrow statement may prevent the organization from thinking creatively about alternative ways to achieve its purposes.

3. The word ‘development’ is one most contested word. It means different things to different people. Here in our context it refers a process in which the change is gradual and falls within the realms of economic growth or progress devoid of social, political and cultural empowerment.

4. Direct implementation refers to how much the CFC is into direct programme implementation, in which the concerned CFC appoints its own staff/satellite offices to do the task. With in that structure, the CFC may have some partners to work with not as an overarching value but as a strategy. The ratio of direct implementation may be huger than their programme implementation through partnership and development cooperation process.
1. South Central India Network for Development Alternatives (SCINDeA)

1. Genesis and Formation

In the early 1990’s with the changing scenario into voluntarism, few concerned NGOs and individuals felt that NGOs should not continue to develop policies and programmes in isolation. Partnership with likeminded NGOs would help in the improvement of the quality of programmes as well as the giver/receiver model would be replaced by one of sharing.

The ODAF model of networking was replicated and in February 1994 when sixteen like-minded NGOs who were already working in the region decided to come together.

A CFC was formed in April 1994 to plan long term strategies in facilitating people’s development through their own participation by employing innovative methodologies to work towards mutual sharing with overall vision for people’s based participatory development.

On 4th August 1994, South Central India Network for Development Alternative (SCINDeA) was formally registered as a network. It started with a pilot programme for eighteen months supported by United Evangelical Lutheran Church (UELc) in Madras. UELC was the former project holder. Later on, when the 3 years project period started, SUCHI was the legal project holder. But now after the FCRA registration, SCINDeA is the legal project holder.

2. Profile of SCINDeA partners

- Among the partner organizations of SCINDeA, 6 are headed by women. The Secretariat of SCINDeA is also headed by a woman. This emphasizes a strong gender balance.
- Presently, two partners have withdrawn from the Network and have been replaced by two new partners. Thirteen NGOs receive funds while 2 do not.
- All partners are guided by Common Minimum Development Programmes, though movement building is strong in some partners.
- Present profile: 15 partners, 491 villages 15 districts and 3 states.
3. Ideological perspectives

- SCINDeA vision and mission as a Network was formulated in 1996, when the first 3 years’ proposal was submitted.
- In 2006, when the organization went through an Organizational Development (OD) process, SCINDeA evolved a new vision and mission.
- The vision and mission, objectives and the strategies of the Network was formulated through a series of workshops where all the heads of partner organizations of the Network participated.
- The vision and mission is shared and owned by all the partner organizations.
- Guiding principle: empowerment of communities through people’s participation.
- Values practised by the Network are: 1) Collective, democratic & participatory decision making 2) Respect for partner organizations in the Network 3) Solidarity 4) Transparency 5) Gender sensitivity 6) Social and financial accountability and 7) Mutual sharing of resources & experiences.
- Almost all the Chief Functionaries of the partner organizations are from the subaltern groups.

4. Governance

- SCINDeA is a registered Network under the Tamil Nadu Society Registration Act. It is also registered under the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act and the Income Tax Department (12 A and 80 G).
- The Executive Committee comprises of 7 elected members. Elections to the Executive Board of SCINDeA are held once in 3 years. The last election of office bearers to the SCINDeA Association was held on July 2, 2005. A gender balance is maintained.
- All the partners’ organizations of the Network form the general body of the SCINDeA association.
- Executive Committee takes policy decisions related to smooth functioning of Network, such as budgetary provision, justification for deviation from planned programmes, etc.
- Board members are the primary members who are the founding members of the SCINDeA Association. They are also the Directors/Secretaries of the partner organizations.
- Staff interface takes place at the Annual General Body Meetings.
- The decisions taken by the Executive Committee are later ratified by the General Body. The Executive Committee is constituted from among members of the General Body.
- At the Annual General Body Meeting, narrative reports of all the programmes of partners NGOs are presented and discussed. At the business session of the AGM, the audited reports and balance sheets of all partners are shared and discussed.
- A minimum of one beneficiary and two-programme coordinators participate in the meeting.

5. Structure

- 15 partner organizations form the SCINDeA Network for resource sharing.
SCINDeA is the legal project holder with a Secretariat at Yelagiri Hills.

All the 15 members are the primary members of the Network and they constitute the General Body.

From the General Body, 7 members form the Management Committee.

The Executive Secretary of SCINDeA Association is from a partner organization of the Network and is responsible for association-related matters.

SCINDeA Secretariat plays the role of coordinator, facilitator and administrator.

The Secretariat has the administrative and programme department with four staff apart from the Executive Director. It also has the provision to appoint consultants.

6. Systems and Process

6.1 Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

6.1.1 Planning

- Programme and financial planning is done collectively by all the partner organizations.
- The projects are planned and implemented at the CBO and partners level.
- All the planning is based on the Common Minimum Programme.

6.1.2 Monitoring

- Tools such as decentralized cluster field visits, half yearly meetings, 6 months’ programme and financial reviews, annual reports and formal and informal sharing of issues are the part of the monitoring process.
- The Project Coordinators and the Chief Functionaries visit the field periodically.
- Weekly meetings are held to review the programme.
- Monthly staff meetings are held at partner organizational level to consolidate reports and plan the next month programme.
- The concerned programme staff, along with the animator, also reviews the programme.
- Partner organizations consolidate the report and send to the secretariat every 6 months.
- At the Annual General Body Meeting, the programme coordinators are invited to present the annual reports.

The visit of the Secretariat Programme Coordinator is of 2 days, with a fixed agenda in which all the programme components and activities are monitored. Going back to community and interacting with the stakeholders of the various programmes activities also help to know the actual status of the programme. Relevant records and reports are verified during this period. The capacity building and the training needs of the field staff are also identified. Once the programme coordinator reports back to the Secretariat, a formal written feedback from the Secretariat is send to the NGO.
6.1.3 Financial monitoring
- The NGO partners submit request for transfer of funds every six-months, based on their programme requirements and previous balances available.
- Funds are released every 3 months only, on submission of narrative reports and unaudited statement of accounts. Audited financial statements are submitted every 6 months.
- Periodic visits are made by the Network Accountant to the partner organizations.
- Audited statements of all partner organizations are shared and discussed in the business session of the Annual General Body Meeting.

6.1.4 Review
SCINDeA undertakes an external evaluation once in 3 years as per the EED requirement. Internal review of programmes are undertaken periodically once in six months and annually. Once in six months, intra-network decentralized coordination programmes are undertaken by programme staff. Annual reviews at cluster level take place at end of every year. Additionally, specific programmes components are reviewed every year. SCINDeA also practices the collegial visit which also serves the same purpose. This system of review provides sufficient opportunity for participatory learning as well as promotes transparent functioning.

6.2 Leadership
Leadership at the SCINDeA Secretariat provides autonomy and independence to the partners. There is a lot of flexibility provided for planning and implementation. The convenience of the NGOs is always taken into consideration. The leadership also promotes visit of the NGOs within the Network, as and when necessary. Partner organizations of the Network also periodically correspond or phone the Secretariat office, as and when they need help and advice on programmes and staff.

6.3 Development Cooperation/Networking
- As SCINDeA is a Networking organization, networking is encouraged by
- Training and orientation on common issues and common concerns (e.g. water, violence against women, etc)
- Joint Campaigns – staff and communities of all partners participate.
- Space is provided for staff of partner organizations to participate in programmes of other Networks and forums.

6.4 Decision making
Decisions are taken democratically and collectively in the General Body where all the partners and CBO representatives participate, thereby ensuring active participation of various stakeholders in the decision making process. The structure of SCINDeA promotes democratic decision making.
6.5 Transparency

- Planning is done collectively with the community and the NGOs on the basis of the common minimum programmes of SCINDeA Network.
- At the AGM, there is a business session where there is a presentation of the audited statement of accounts followed by a detailed discussion of each report.
- At the Secretariat level, the Network auditor scrutinizes the audited statement of accounts of partner organizations and notes of over and under utilization of funds. Network partners are alerted and all these notes are presented.
- As shared by SCINDeA, norm of transparency is practiced but this norm has not been percolated to a large extent from the partners to the community.

6.6 Human Resource Development

6.6.1 Recruitment
At the Secretariat level, SCINDeA has no written recruitment policy but the basic requirement in recruitment consists of basic knowledge in Tamil and English and computer literacy. Special emphasis is given on gender balance. Though the Board Members are not physically present in most interviews at the Secretariat level, they are kept informed of the process and finalization of candidates. Programme staff selection at the NGO level is done by the NGOs themselves.

6.6.2 Appraisal
There is no standardized format for the process of appraisal nor is the job of the staff contractual. But at the end of each project phase, the Executive Director of SCINDeA asks the staff their future plans for continuity.

6.6.3 Motivation
More than the tangible benefits, the staff of SCINDeA are motivated by the intangible benefits like freedom of work, independent decision making, encouragement from the Executive Director and opportunities and avenues being provided to them for their career growth.

6.6.4 Staff redressal
Grievances of staff are addressed at the staff meetings of partner organizations and accordingly dealt with. When grievances of staff of partner organizations are brought to the notice of the SCINDeA Secretariat, the Executive Director deals with the NGO concerned in a facilitating way. If it is a serious grievance of any partner in the Network, then a committee of 2-3 senior staff of partner organizations (usually Directors) is constituted to look into the grievance.
1. Genesis and Formation

During 1988, to tackle the drought situation in Orissa, a group of NGOs came together to evolve a long-term drought and development programme in 800 villages. CReNIEO was given the responsibility by EZE and the members to be the Convener of ODAF. Orissa Drought Action Forum (ODAF) was established in February 1988 with bilateral partners of EZE. This year can be marked as the year of CFC formation for ODAF. In the next couple of years, there was an extension of membership from 5 to 12 who were recommended by the founding partners.

- In 1996, there was a shift in paradigm and the name was changed to Orissa Development Action Forum without changing the acronym to have a broader focus and to address the issue of sustainable development and livelihood through a long term strategy.
- In the year 1997, ODAF was registered as a Society and Gram Vikas was the project holder. In the same year, ODAF signed a 10 years MoU with EZE.
- In 2002, ODAF as a Forum received FCRA and presently it is the project holder.

2. Profile

- No. of Partners 12 (last new member was in the year 2004)
- No. of Villages 758
- No. of District 13
- No. of Blocks 34
- No. of Panchayats 109
- 75 percent of the target population are Adivasis, 10 percent are Dalits and the remaining belong to other backward classes
- ODAF is working through its member NGOs only in Orissa and with its Secretariat which is housed at Bhubaneswar.

3. Ideological Perspective

- ODAF’s vision and mission was formulated in the year 1988.
- After the 1997 evaluation, ODAF wanted to have a paradigm shift to an impact oriented ‘mission mode’. The process was initiated by a Perspective Building Workshop in Vishakhapatnam in May 2001, followed by a meeting of team leaders on project planning in July 2001.
- This workshop helped ODAF in developing a common vision and mission. This mission mode was the base of the new project proposal.
- A shift from ‘project or activity’ to ‘impact oriented or mission mode’ is fundamentally a shift
in paradigms and not merely a methodology shift.

- The 12 members of ODAF are from different ideological backgrounds like Gandhian, development and Church-related organizations, Tagore but right-based approach crosses across the entire network partners.
- The forum members are relatively independent and have their own vision and mission. Some members are multi-funded and therefore they are engaged in various other projects and programmes. ODAF is more like a common area of vision and mission evolved over the years.
- The forum has a 23-point criterion as guiding principles for engagement in sustainable development.
- Core Values: 1) Transparency 2) Dignity rights and justice 3) Gender focus 4) Participatory and holistic approach 5) Indigenous knowledge 6) People-centred 6) Social transformation and 7) Accountability

4. Governance

- All the 12 members of the Forum form the General Body.
- Out of the 12 members, 5 members’ management committee is selected every 3 years.
- The Management Committee and the General Body meets every six months.
- The Executive Secretary of ODAF is a member of the Management Committee as well as the General Body.
- The Executive Secretary has full fledged Secretariat with a Coordinator and with multiple roles and various desks.

5. Structure

- Each of the partner organizations has their own organizational structures that suit the specific requirements to meet their vision, mission and objectives.
- The vision/mission of the member organizations is in sync with the overall objectives of ODAF. Therefore, the individuality of the partner organizations is maintained. The structures of the partners are now more geared to meet the requirements of the forum.
- However, separate desks such as PME, Advocacy and Livelihood desks apart from Finance desk (with specialization for the ODAF programme) have been established in all the partner organizations to bring in synergy and formation of a task group/team at the forum level.
The structure has promoted collective existence and has also made things more effective and affordable in terms of capacity building and cross learning. The structure of ODAF can be divided into two broad administrative and functional hierarchies, between ODAF & its members and between members and the remaining stakeholders where the stakeholders PO/CBOs are federated to form State level POs called the OAAA.

6. Systems

For effective functioning of the Forum, ODAF has a full-fledged Secretariat. There are practices like Bi-annual, Team leaders, Management Committee, Secretariat Staff and Consultants meetings for planning and reviewing which is organized and coordinated by the Secretariat. This practise also encourages participation and transparency.

The thrust areas of the forum secretariat include strengthening the planning and implementation process; this is done through the PME desk. It also facilitate different levels of training, reporting, promote documentation and evaluate the process that enables member organizations to maintain and create field programme in line with the ODAF perspective. ODAF attempted to introduce impact monitoring indicators in 2003, but the concept needs some more time to be internalized by member NGOs.

The forum through the Finance desk at the Secretariat is facilitating a standard Financial Monitoring System that enables member organizations and ODAF to develop and maintain financial management systems in line with ODAF’s objectives and perspective. The desk looks after financial management and consolidates budgets and even organizes training. ODAF has developed common accounting systems that are followed by the members. The secretariat has also developed accounting manuals for financial management.

From 2002, the Secretariat has emphasized on having an Advocacy desk (which was earlier housed at a member NGO) to carry out the advocacy work through workshops, campaigns, lobbying and publishing of articles, booklets and newsletters. The state level advocacy desk takes up the issues through civil society organizations, media, and lawyers.

Through the Advocacy desk, the secretariat also takes care of the statutory and legal obligations and bears the responsibility of consolidating, communicating and reporting to EED.

6.1 PME

ODAF emphasizes on participatory approach of planning. Special meetings/sessions are organized on the concept, planning and implementation of various activities undertaken by ODAF in order to achieve its objectives. Planning begins at the community level. Here initially the concerned members’ team leaders discussed the situation of the villagers with them and made them aware of the fact that they can improve their standard of living. Now, the community members discuss their needs and identify issues, along with the staff of member NGOs.

Then, the proposals or possibilities are discussed and debated on amongst the community,
senior staff and the team leader. The finalized plans are sent to ODAF, which looks into the nuances of the plans and its viability and consolidates the proposals into one. Then, the consolidated proposal is presented in the bi-annual meeting, team leaders’ meeting and then to the managing committee, for ratification.

In the bi-annual meeting, the programme and the financial outlays are discussed. The finance and audited reports submitted by each member also act as a monitoring process.

ODAF encourages both organizational review and individual review. The organizational review is done through external evaluations, several studies conducted by the funding partners as well as the collegial visits. The individual review is done in the bi-annual meetings and staff meetings by mutual sharing. ODAF has its own policies for staff review, finance, development, gender, etc.

6.2 Leadership

ODAF has emphasized on Leadership at 3 levels – network, organizational and community:

- For ODAF, individual leadership is created through capacity building and awareness. This in turn forms the collective leadership; this further leads to transformation in society.
- For second line leadership, ODAF trains staff at the organizational level. It invests in encouraging members to study and undertake training. There is also a realistic understating that people they train might not continue with ODAF forever and leave for better pastures, yet training for everyone is encouraged.
- ODAF promotes leadership through a capacity building process, through a set of module programmes which is organized and replicated at all the 3 levels mentioned above.

Leadership is also promoted by people organizing rallies, dharnas and morchas and collegial visits.

6.3 Networking systems

- Even though ODAF is an open forum for issues, there are 23 point criterions to become a member of ODAF.
- This 23 point criterion was developed by ODAF members in a workshop held in 1991.
- To join ODAF, a new member must undergo a minimum of two years rigorous training before they can become a partner.
- Funding is not the only reason for not taking on new partners, but the adherence to the code of conduct and the 23-point criterion was given priority.
- To enhance the process of partnership, regular staff meetings, bi-annual meetings, team leaders’ meetings, meetings with members of Orissa Adivasi Adhikar Abhijan (OAAA) are done from time to time.
- Field visits are done regularly by consultants and experts as well as the Secretariat team members to analyze the processes. Apart from that, exchange programmes for staff and people are also organized, in which they can visit the fields, interact with staff and community members of other
6.4 Decision making

- The decision making process at ODAF is carried out in a democratic manner through consensus mainly at the bi-annual, team leaders’ meeting and finally at the management committee meetings. Although the management committee is the highest decision making body as far as the legality is concerned, no evidence could be observed of the management committee overruling any of the decisions of the forum or giving directives without it having come from the decision making structures of the team leaders.
- The partner organizations have their own structures and mechanisms for decision making and implementation of programmes.

6.5 Transparency and Accountability

For ODAF, participatory accountability and transparency are values which need to be practised at the organizational as well as individual level. For ODAF, transparency is a precondition for accountability. ODAF is accountable to the community, to the members (NGOs) and the accountability is ingrained within the systems of planning, implementation monitoring and evaluation.

Member NGOs and the Forum not only involve the communities in proposal formulation, but also the proposal and approved budget are shared among the villagers, after it is agreed between the donor and implementing partners. Operational plans, community partners for particular programmes, budgeting, time plan, amount and nature of people’s contribution are developed with active participation of people’s organizations, women organizations. Any changes in plans are also made with their knowledge and participation.

During implementation, almost all the activities are being carried out through people’s organizations, women organizations and women self-help groups. Periodically, the progress is discussed, analyzed by the concerned community-based organizations. Staffs/programme coordinators present progress report and financial reports to the community.

Accountability empowers the communities as well as strengthens the relationship with member NGOs and thereby, with ODAF. Community shares responsibility with the staff, own activities and achievements/failures, sustains the process. Other activities include motivation among parents to send their children to schools, strengthening PRIs, livelihood options, adoption of agro-forestry models, forest protection and regeneration, and people’s contribution in construction.

6.6 Capacity building

ODAF’s capacity building programme reached not only the staff of the secretariat and the member
NGOs, but was replicated at community level, reaching leaders of POs, capacity building take places in terms of centralized training, training for the networks and for the people’s organization. There are internally designed training by the secretariat (PME desk and advocacy desk take care of it). Exchange programmes in terms of collegial visits where staff of other member NGOs’ visits each other also forms a part of cross learning and reviewing process. ODAF also encourages **People-to-People exchange** which is also a mechanism used for ODAF to enhanced capacity for cross learning.

6.7 Dispute settling mechanism

Bi-annual meeting provides space to each and every participant (representative of staff and community members) to share their feelings, put forth their grievances in front of the team leaders and management committee and those points are given due importance. In special cases, urgent meetings, staff meetings, meetings of team leaders’ are called to solve the problems faced by the staff. Special committees are also formed sometimes to look into the matters.
Peaceful Society (PS), a Gandhian organization, was established in 1983. The Goa Lok Samiti (GLS), a people’s organization, has been active in Goa since April 1981. GLS was the state unit of National People’s Committee, founded by Loknayak Jaiprakash Narayan in 1977. Dr. JB Sardesai and Kumar Kalanand Mani were the key role players of GLS. GLS felt the need to have a registered organization to undertake integrated rural developmental activities, as well as protection and conservation of environment and ecology. This need gave birth to a process in 1982, which brought together like-minded people. A few meetings were organized at Panaji, Priol, Bandora and Ponda to finalize the formation of a registered voluntary organization.

2. Genesis and Formation

As one of the PS’ documentation says, “the process was stuck on the linguistic issue as to whether the name should reflect Marathi or Konkani language and on thrust area - should it be Goa or the entire world?” Such a conflict at the initial stage resulted in a split among the founders of the process and finally one group got it registered separately without taking everyone into confidence. The first setback led to a beginning of a second process, which started in 1983 led by late Mr. Madhav Bir and Kumar Kalanand Mani. This second attempt gave a final shape to the formation of “Peaceful Society” which was registered in March 1984 under Societies Registration (Central) Act of 1860. Its office was set up at Bandora in Ponda Taluka of Goa” (now in Madkai village). Its focus areas also include environmental issues and it led a very successful ‘Save the Western Ghats’ movement in the late 80s.

K.K. Mani, founder of Peaceful Society, has been a Gandhian activist since 1971. PS was formed in Goa, when he moved to this state in the Oct. eighties. It initially survived on funds from friends and Mani’s writings. PS’s vision at that time was to build a society that was self-sufficient. It undertook a house-to-house research in Goan villages to understand the issues confronting the local people. As a result of that survey, PS short-listed livelihood- and environment-related issues as its focus areas. It decided to start work in five of the most remote Panchayats of Goa.

It designed a project for ensuring additional income for village women as an experimental model. It tied up with a marketing agency to sell the products made by women and this project did well. Later, for various reasons, PS’s focus shifted to the wider environmental issues and ‘Save the Western Ghats’ movement. It positioned PS as a key environmental organization and raised its profile at the national level. Slowly, PS evolved as an organization with a three-pronged strategy to bring about a change in the lives of rural people. It focused on environmental issues, village
industry- and community-based education with an objective of empowerment. PS, in its thinking, always kept its focus on two aspects of self-reliance, which served it well in later days - independence in decision-making and financial self-reliance.

3. Present Profile

- The constituency of Swaraj includes eight states (Goa in a small way) and eight campaigns including the Western India Forum for Panchayat Raj (WIFPR) and the various consortiums under the Indian River Network (IRN). The work is spread over 17 districts and covers a population of about 10 million.
- All the members who work in Swaraj are referred to as Fellows or Karyakartas. A total of 72 fellows are associated with Swaraj programmes at the national, states and various campaigns.
- The gender profile of the fellows reveals the presence of a large number of women. At present, there are 32 women fellows (44%). At the community level, Swaraj has already ensured 50% representation of women in various committees and at the level of volunteers in most places. However, recruitment and retention of women is a challenge.

4. Ideological Perspective

- My life is my message
- Vision: is a society that is based on Gandhian ideology, with economic self-reliance for people, political self-rule with decentralization of power and resources and democratic processes with real participation by both men and women.

Objectives are:
- To ensure the community’s right to self-rule in order to re-establish its rights and access to natural resources and other means of production for a sound and sustainable development.
- To realize positive transformation in all spheres of life, namely social, political, economic, cultural and environmental.
- To reject the influence of internal and external exploitative forces in society such as the one’s perpetuated by the World Bank, World Trade Organization, Multi-National Companies (MNCs), etc.

5. Governance

Board and its tenure.
- Tenure of each member is 5 years. A member can be re-elected. There is no age limit.
- The Gandhian principles of personal commitment and involvement in social development work.
6. Organizational Structure

The structure of PS can be understood if it is narrated from the bottom rung. The structure is more or less a network called Swaraj. In fact, Swaraj network gives the structure to PS. As it was mentioned in the beginning, PS played an important role in creating many forums, networks, it also developed Swaraj network.

- **Swaraj Forum** was initiated in November 1996 by PS and like-minded groups and individuals to work towards a society based on Gandhian principles.
- After two and half years of dialogue, discussions and orientation, 223 voluntary organizations, people’s movements and social action groups became associates of Swaraj in seven states, which included in them NGOs, social action groups, voluntary organizations and peoples’ movements. PS conceived this process as its national programme

**Structure:** It all started with five villages; in each village there was a people’s organization (membership based; in each PO at least 70% of adult men and women are its members, PO is not a registered forum) ⇒ all these five POs come together and form a People’s Development Organization (PDO), these are registered, the board of PDO comes from PO, every PDO is a Swaraj, and the name of every PDO is prefixed with the word Swaraj, it works within a district boundary ⇒ all PDOs come together and form state level Swaraj. They are called Swaraj Jharkhand, Swaraj Kerala, etc, these state Swaraj are facilitated by state level facilitator who selected out of fellows ⇒ Consortium Advisory Committee, Campaign Advisory Committee, State Advisory Committee ⇒ National Forum ⇒ National Team ⇒ National Executive Unit (NEU) ⇒ National Convener. The post of National Convener came to an end in April 2006 with the aim to respect and place Collective Leadership of NEU.

7. Organizational Systems

7.1 Planning participation and collective decision making process

- In 1996, when PS decided to shift from development mode to networking through Swaraj model, it included every like-minded organization for discussion. In the vision building process, the training on PSP process and the actual implementation of PSP at the village/community level took more than two years. The structure Swaraj and the vision, mission, role, strategy and programme (VMRSP) were evolved based on the outcome of the PSP. The states and the consortiums developed their VMRSP after compiling and consolidating the PSP outcomes from their regions.
- The structure is very participatory with two representatives from each PDO forming a state or consortium committee, two representatives from each state, out of which one is PDO representative, form the national committee which is known as National Action Committee. All coordinators are part of National Executive Unit. The end on Eschewing from one person leadership has strengthened through the values and praxis of collective leadership.
7.2 Leadership

- There is no one-person leadership. A team of 17 persons leads the whole process in equal, collective and transparent manner.
- The adult members (paid) of PO elect 4 office bearers. Such office bearers automatically become members of GB of PDO. The office bearers of PDO are capacitated from time to time.

7.3 HRD

- Written staff policy is there.
- Internally designed courses: workshops, seminars/conferences: Job trainings: Exchange programmes.
- Individual performance is appraised.

7.4 Unique features

- The initial involvement of PS mobilized people and resulted in environment movement to save western ghats, later when the question of sustainability came, it has found ways through institutionalized development model of grassroots involvement
- In terms of project implementation and organizationally building and promoting people’s organization is a core strategy (there are 420 POs and 84 PDOs)
- Any intervention and every level initiated after proper understanding of the reference communities through research studies
- The inherent strength of the organization is to look at alternative sources of income generation as a means to survival
- PS is instrumental in creating several forums and organizations; these organizations address several issues ranging from environment to PRI
- One of the strengths of PS is its entrepreneurial outlook which flows from Gandhian values of self-reliance
- Resource sharing agency has played a very important role formulating the networking process through PSP process
- Thematic areas are people’s organization, panchayat raj, environment, gender, societal peace
- PS does not believe in the word ‘staff’. Those who work in PS are considered as colleagues and integral part of extended families. The family relationship is a great platform of building vibrant motivation and commitment.
- The contribution from community to programmes is around 60%. In many village level programmes, it is even 100%.
1. Genesis and Formation

Society for Participatory Action and Reflection (SPAR) is a voluntary organization working in the field of rural development for the last two decades. The SPAR headquarter is based in Kolkata with an operational area spread out in Orissa, West Bengal and Jharkhand. In 1991, it started with a handful of dedicated people in Kolkata in a very humble way to propagate and practice People’s Participatory Process (PPP) in rural development. Experienced veteran social workers, combined with energetic and visionary youths formed the collective leadership of the organization.

During the initial years, SPAR started a pilot project supported by Bread for the World (BFW), Germany. With the help of ICCO of Netherlands, SPAR was also entrusted with some consultancy services. Apart from that, Evangelische Zentralstelle Fur Entwicklungshife e. V (EZE) has extended their major support till today for PPP, advocacy and rights-based work.

2. Ideological Perspective

People’s participation and people as subjects of development are the main principles of SPAR. This as value and practice is clearly expounded in all the activities of the organization. SPAR collectively aspires for the society where people will be free from all sorts of exploitation and injustice.

SPAR facilitates a network of 17 partners (14 under EED project & 3 under PACS project) - both conceptually and financially. It is mandatory for all partners to practice the same principles in their developmental endeavour.

3. Governance

3.1. Governing Body: The governing body consists of nine members – one or more founding member(s), five ordinary members, and three staff members. One-third of them are women. The secretary of the governing body acts as the Director of SPAR. Principal governing body members visit the field and closely monitor the programme.

3.2 General body: The general body comprises of 25 to 30 members from all walks of life - academicians, teachers, students, lawyers, NGO leaders, artists, farmers and workers of SPAR. Enunciating the principle of people’s participation, ordinary grassroots worker is in the policy making body of SPAR.
4. Structure

SPAR is headed by the director who is the executive head. He is assisted by the deputy director. Deputy director/Director is supported by project in-charges, administration, and finance and communication desk in-charges. The most critical aspect of the structure is workers’ forum, unequivocally an explicit practice of people’s participation.

Workers’ forum consists of convener of the projects and convener of the coordination teams. This forum scrutinizes planning, monitors, guides and influences the policy decisions of the governing board. The workers’ forum elects coordination team consisting of five workers, director/deputy director.

5. Systems

SPAR has a strong base on the participation of human resource in every sphere of activities. It is committed to protect essential human values. SPAR is always trying to disseminate the participatory ideology with community, partners and development actors working in other development organizations. If we try to look at the norm of participation from the organizational point, it is validated by the following practices:

5.1 Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1.1 Participatory Planning

SPAR has two types of intervention - direct intervention and intervention through partners. Community and the partners practice and participate in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of the PPP. The process is voluntary. At the initial stage, SPAR facilitates the process. Later on, People’s Organization (PO) conducts the process independently after continuous capacity building of SPAR. The steps of the planning process are as follows:

- **Step I - Workers’ Forum:** The general format prepared for the planning is discussed at the workers’ forum, which consists of the unit–in-charge, project in-charge and the core committee members like the director/deputy director. After thorough discussion, the format is taken down to the 2nd step.

- **Step II - Regional Workers’ Forum:** The format is further discussed and simplified by the regional team, made up of the project staffs. Then, the project staffs of SPAR discuss it with the village committee at different project areas.

- **Step III - Village Committee (VC):** The village committee comprises of two/three representatives from each PO group. Each group consists of 20 to 30 families. The village committee, along with the respective project staff, reviews the experience and achievements, if any developments. Emerging and present issues and trends are also discussed. Capacity of the staff and the community is ascertained. A complete report on the discussion of the VC is submitted to the central committee.
5.1.2 Participatory Implementation

To implement a planned programme/activity, in a participatory way, at the grass-root level, implementing committees are formed at the village level. The committee selects the beneficiaries and sends a resolution to the central committee to pass it. Then, it is placed in the regional workers’ forum by the project in-charge, from where it goes to the HQ. Every month there is also a meeting for implementing the programme. All these requirements are designed in such a way that they also adhere to the financial manual. The system is developed in such a way that people at all levels are involved in the process.

5.1.3. Participatory Monitoring:

- **At Village level:** For better monitoring, the beneficiaries for any programme are selected by the village committee. There is also a practice of having a purchasing committee as sanctioned by HQ. For the usage of any commodity at the community level (e.g. diesel pump, generator, thrasher machine, etc.), there is a usage committee.

- **At Project level:** Monitoring meeting is held around 25th of every month at the project office. Discussions take place on the number of programmes implemented during the previous month, progress of the project and planning of the future programme based on the collected data. It is then sent to the head office for cross checking and for finalizing it.

- **At Central level:** Monitoring visits also take place from HQ by the core members once in 3 months to see the entire programme from both the technical and conceptual aspects, along with the outcomes and achievements. The team from HQ also sits with the cluster committee, not only for monitoring but also for developing relationship. The director and deputy director of SPAR go to the field for monitoring and give feedback to the governing body. As a part of monitoring, internal audits and external audit mechanism are practiced. The regional accountants also visit the partners for monitoring.

5.1.4 Participatory Evaluation Process

In spite of the presence of external evaluation by the donor agencies, there is also an in-built evaluation system within the organization, which is a continuous process. Evaluation is both formal
and informal. At the review meetings, a project is discussed at length - its success, problems, future course, etc. Each project office submits activity reports on a monthly basis and progress reports, at quarterly and yearly basis. The information in these reports is verified when the team visits the fields.

5.2 Leadership

SPAR emphasizes on leadership in terms of giving directions, making comfortable atmospheres, decentralizing the power to develop decision making authority within the projects areas. Leadership at unit and project levels by the unit/project in-charge offers a comfortable atmosphere to the workers to perform as per fixed target and time frame. Quarterly monitoring and evaluation process has been in-built in the organization to ensure consistent guidance in the right direction. Moreover, the director and core group members pay regular visits in the office and field to ensure the quality performance of programmes. Besides this, in-house sessions and discussions are organized, so that the workers’ conceptual clarity and working abilities are increased in the desired direction.

Collective decision making and collective leadership are practiced in the organization almost in every sphere of its activities. As mentioned earlier, regional and central level workers’ forum are competent enough to take decisions during any crises. Though a core group of senior workers are assigned with planning, implementing and monitoring the overall activities of the organization, the recommendations of the workers’ forum play a crucial role in the important policy matters and financial commitments.

The director oversees the whole process and offers his expertise and guidance. The governing body also has the scope to extend guidance and support. Efforts are being made by SPAR to encourage second-line leadership by building their capacities and skills. Competent and committed leaders are already being promoted. It is noteworthy to mention that deputy director, one of the senior staff of SPAR, has the power to take a structural decision in all administrative and programmatic aspects. The senior leaders always help the young staff to come up with new creative ideas.

5.3 Motivation

Motivation among the SPAR team members is very high. The team consists of both young as well as old leaders. They enjoy personal freedom and have a high level of commitment. They expressed that this is mostly due to the leadership style of the director. Most of the veteran staffs, who have been there since the inception of SPAR, claim moral ownership of the organization. They strongly believe in the same ideology i.e. working for the marginalized sections of the society. They also claim that they are allowed to take up challenges and freedom to innovate. They also have scope to grow personally.

They started SPAR literally from nothing…no funds…no idea…no salary…all was out of their personal pockets…had an accountant but no accounts…had a driver but no car…highly imbalanced group…They had a desire and a personal motivation.
5.4 Development Cooperation

5.4.1 Selection Process of Partner Organizations
The partner organizations are like-minded, work in remote villages on similar issues as per SPAR’s perspective. The partners’ proposals follow a similar tangent in planning just as that of SPAR. The proposals of the partner organizations are scrutinized by a committee of SPAR - HQ, which forwards it to the governing body for compiling the proposal and budget, and for sending it to the donor. Even if the proposal is outside the interest of EED, they may get funds from other donors for some selected specific issues relevant to the present scenario of the referral area (e.g. issues related to water). It needs to be stated that to be a network partner of SPAR, one needs to inculcate the perspectives and values of SPAR. Before providing any financial support to any organization, SPAR keeps a close watch on it for at least 3 years. Distribution of funds to the partners depends on three criteria – number of villages covered, issues addressed and remoteness of the area.

5.4.2 Selection Process of Referral Areas
There are certain definite criteria for selecting the referral area. The area with high concentration of the tribal population, high illiteracy, low communication facilities, dependence on forests products for livelihood, low health-related facilities are taken up. Poor, marginalized and deprived people (with special emphasize on SC, ST, OBC and women) are the focus groups of SPAR. SPAR has 5 project bases in three states- Patharpratima and Coochbehar in West Bengal, Ghatshila and Ranchi in Jharkhand, and Jashipur in Orissa.

5.5. Training Process
In any training or capacity building programme at the organizational level, the participants can share their collective knowledge and experiences. The practice of the participatory method during the training programme is also encouraged. At the end of the training programme, SPAR practices the follow up sessions.

5.6 Performance Evaluation
SPAR reviews the performance of each staff. They practice a mechanism of keeping a close watch. Good performances are praised publicly in meetings and spoken of as an example. This has two other purposes - the person feels happy, noticed, appreciated and hence encouraged; and others also learn from that person’s experience. If a worker is doing very well, he/she is promoted as well. For example, a woman had joined from an area in the field and later on because of her good performance she was promoted to project in-charge. Her block was given an ‘A’ grade during her tenure. Increments are given to the deserving staff as per their performance and rewards are given to those who take risks. The staff are sent for various programmes for capacity building (for paid programmes also). Every staff has a job assignment and fixed time schedules for the performance of those jobs.
5.7 Accountability and Transparency

For SPAR, the first accountability is towards the people. The team closely keeps in touch with the community through cluster meetings and village meetings. Participation as a value is very strongly practiced in SPAR, and therefore, accountability and transparency is automatically addressed. The programmes, finance and policies are always shared at the workers’ forum. Even in the head office, each person is accountable to the other. Anybody can check and point out any slackness. The collective decision making system and conducive functional structure ensure high level of transparency within the organization. It also strengthens the ownership within the community, among the staff as well as associated members. It creates space for community to participate in organizational decision making with regards to issue identification, planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation. During the discussion with SPAR team members, they stated that they are also accountable to making the community self reliant, as it is the goal of the organization.

5.8 Conflict Resolution

For SPAR special importance is given in identifying the problem, looking for an alternate solution and peaceful termination, if it does not work out. The first thing is to identify the nature of the problem or conflict. Attention is focused on trying to minimize the conflict by sitting down together and discussing it in the collective council, or even in an informal meeting. Conflict is not beyond our control but it is something that can be resolved through discussion and consensus basis. Not that the director is kept in dark but one need not take everything to him. We have built our capacities to resolve any conflict. There have been instances that the concerned personnel have been discharged on consensual basis. Transparency seems to be followed and adhered at all the levels and hence it is also followed in the case of conflict resolution.
1. Genesis and Formation

Since 1957, the Action for World Solidarity (ASW) organization has supported small, self-initiated groups in India, which try to strengthen and improve the situation of women, strive for environmental protection, or attempt to achieve social and cultural human rights. Currently, the countries supported by ASW are India, Brazil, the West African countries of Senegal, Burkina Faso, West Sahara, Zimbabwe and the Republic of South Africa. In India, up to 1980, the main emphasis was on child sponsorship, which was then shifted to social action.

CWS’ inception came in 1984 as a Consultant Office of ASW when there was a move to indiannize the international set up. It got registered in 1992 as a trust and started working as an intermediary organization. Within FCFC–fold, CWS is one of the bigger organizations in terms of number of partnership, networks and area of coverage. CWS works both on social and land based activities (gender, Dalit, tribal, human rights, PRI are some of the social initiatives and watershed, forestry initiatives and sustainable agriculture are some of the land based activities.) CFC/Partners – CWS works with approximately 133 organizations, 23 networks and 16 fellows in 5 states (TN, AP, Orissa, Jharkhand, Bihar and Puducherry).

CWS, which is located in Secunderabad, has taken over the ASW’s projects in India support programmes related to protection of environment, women’s empowerment and the promotion and social and economic rights of marginalized communities.

- CWS is one of the very few organizations within FCFC to have a document on systems. CWS has a long and detailed document explaining the structure and systems within and outside the organization. A manual for financial management, staff policy and work policy on HIV and AIDS are some of the important policies found in CWS.
- Networking has been part of CWS’ stable strategy, especially in work with women’s networks since the late 1980s.
- CSW has stated policy of giving preference to women in recruitment and of encouraging women and dalits to move up the organizational ladder. From the date of inception till date the managing trustee is a woman.
- CWS works in five states and in one union territory of Pudhucherry. It has 94 one-to-one partners, 23 networks (317 organizations in the network) and 16 fellows i.e. CWS reaches communities through more than 300 organizations.
- More than 15% of the partner groups work with more than one CWS programme area, and 7 per cent work with three or more programmes. Many of the partners and fellows are also members of the networks promoted by CWS.
- Good governance methods are the real strengths of CWS. The governance process often states the need to be accountable to the larger civil society groups.
The resource for CWS comes through a multi-donor relationship (ASW, EED, GAA, NOVIB, HIVOS, AEI, FRD, state governments, NOVIB, EED and ASW fund the core programmes)

Some of the internal documents (with the intention of honest self-analysis) written clearly and openly state the strengths as well as the weakness of the organization like communication gap between head office and resource centres, head office staff and field staff, issues in expanding the geographical coverage.

Inherent commitment to rights-based approach.

So far, CWS has given birth to five independent organizations, namely Watershed Support Services and Activities Network (WASSAN), Centre for People’s Forestry (CPF), Centre for Sustainable Agriculture (CSA), National Dalit Forum (NDF), and BODHI. As CWS is well aware of conflict of interest, it never forms a part of any sister institution or partners’ organizations.

2. Ideological perspective

**Vision:** Emergence of a society of interdependent small communities, vibrant with the consciousness of their rights and duties, sensitive to the rights of dalits, tribals and minorities, to women rights generally and to gender equality, to the rights of children, physically challenged, the elderly, and to eco-friendly development processes that cohere with the rights of these sections.

**Mission:** Partnering with a large number of NGOs and networks focusing on NRM, gender, dalits, tribals, minorities, children, panchayat raj institutions and human rights in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Orissa, Jharkhand and Bihar. Further, CWS associates itself with regional, national and international initiatives that share its vision.

**Objectives:**

- Initiating sustainable and equitable development processes and contributing inputs towards building decentralized and self-reliant rural communities
- Setting up mechanisms within a democratic framework to secure economic, social, civil, and cultural rights, including rights to food security, fair entitlements generally and to provide space for assertion of identities for women, tribals, dalits, minorities, physically challenged, elderly and other marginalized sections
- Work on the issues of child rights as enshrined in the Child Rights Convention by supporting campaigns by partners with special focus on the girl child
- Towards the above objectives, working closely with other actors – individuals as well as groups – within India and across the political frontiers
- Interacting with the government and others to find commonalities, and also to influence policies to empower marginalized sections and to give a tilt in favour of environment
- Drawing from the above, delineating processes contributing towards national and world
solidarity with a firm base at the grassroots

- Instituting processes of transparency and accountability within CWS & its partners, networks and kindred institutions

3. Governance

CWS is a Trust. But to ensure better governance for adequate transparency and accountability, it has stretched the boundaries of the trust deed.

- **Board of Trust (BoT):** stresses gender inclusiveness, community members are represented, board consists of 11 members and as per the constitution, majority of the trustees should be women. Each trustee normally gives way for a substitute after a maximum of two terms; each term has three years. Trustees elect a managing trustee from among themselves. The BoT also appoints a staff member as Executive Secretary for a renewable term of three years. The Trustees are drawn from diverse backgrounds and different regions of India. The objectives of trust deed were finalized by consulting the partners. It is mandatory by the trust deed to have a partners’ meeting annually. Partners are also consulted in appointing trustees to the CWS Board; all trustees should be Indian and majority should be women. While a Trust by law is not obliged to have consultations with the partner NGOs or to implement the recommendations emerging out of the consultation, CWS has built the former into its deed and the latter into practice.

- **Board Meeting:** Board meets once in six months. Finance committee meets once in six months. Board members are involved in the key organizational activities and committees, and contribute
their time and skills actively. It has good governance systems where even the Board gets to meet the project partners during its annual meetings. One of the meetings in a year coincides with NACM. BoT members participate in select RACM.

- **Board and Staff Interface:** All staff members are invited to the Board meetings. Board members visit the field. All staff members are free to interact with the board members directly; board members also participate in the workshops and seminars as also the consultative meetings.

### 4. Structure

**CFC level:** CWS has the following broad main category of partners:

1. One-to-one partners, i.e. agencies that CWS works with on one or more programme or thematic area
2. Partner networks or CWS’ support to groups of agencies woven around an issue or thematic area, e.g. women’s networks, dalit networks, NRM networks, etc
3. Fellows or individuals who are supported to work on a particular topic potentially leading to formulation of an agenda for further organized work.

CWS also provides small assistance and one-time grant to groups and activists as crucial inputs to support their work. There are about 94 one-to-one partners, 23 partner networks, with more than 317 members and 16 fellows.

**Within the Organization:** To ensure strategic focus on each of its programmes, it has formed autonomous teams for each issue, with decentralized decision-making. Moreover, to ensure a holistic overview of each programme, there is a programmes committee that monitors and sanctions its programme activities. Each programme has an advisory group, including members from the board and external people to provide guidance and a broader outlook. CWS’ growing size and scope of work has triggered the process of hiving off some of its units, which has already resulted in independent organizations emerging. WASSAN, CPF and CSA are already in place as independent institutes. This is to ensure a closer link with communities and their issues and facilitates independent decision-making, with less bureaucracy and time-delays. CWS has the following regional resources centres:

i. Orissa Resource Centre (ORC)
ii. Jharkhand Resource Centre (JRC)
iii. Bihar Resource Centre (BRC)
iv. Tsunami Resource Centre (TRC)

All the resource centres of CWS are taking care of most of the programmes implemented in the respective states by CWS. Necessary programmatic support is extended to the resource centres by
the programme teams based in Secunderabad. Overall management support is provided by a finance and administration team that serves as a common services unit for all the programmes and the four resource centres.

5. Organizational Systems

5.1 Planning and Networking process

As mentioned earlier, there are three kinds of partnership - one to one, network and fellowship programmes. Let us see briefly how these partnerships are processed.

The annual meeting of the CWS partners is called National Annual Consultative Meetings (NACM). NACM receives activity reports, financial statements and also proposals for the following periods, including budgets. NACM plays an allocative role vis-à-vis free fund of a modest order in the following specific aspects: gender; dalits, tribals and minorities; environment and organizational development. NACM recommends on continuation and appointment of trustees. While the NACM is a recommendatory body in a formal sense, its recommendations have been rendered mandatory in practice. Each NACM is at present being preceded by Regional ACMs (RACM) of states, consisting of partner NGOs, networks of NGOs (including non-partner NGOs) and individual fellows of the particular state; also, the participation of CWS partners in the NACM is limited to a small number of representatives nominated by RACM. At least one member from the new independent institutions that have evolved from CWS initiatives, such as WASSAN, is also invited to participate in NACM, in addition to some selected other non-partners and special invitees. NACM informs partners on the progress of CWS; reports and financial statements for the preceding year approved; approves programmes and budgets for the coming year and creates appropriate structures involving partners for overseeing, planning and facilitating the CWS programmes.

On the other hand, RACM brings together partners, members of network and fellows at regional level to create sense of belonging, apart from discussing programmatic issues; provides interface between NGOs and functionaries of the state government and nomimates representatives to the NACM to be involved in formulation of policy by CWS. In short, mechanisms like NACM and RACM uphold the values of consultation, participation and transparency.

5.2 Review

- At programme level from time to time each of the programme staff reviews the activities and reports to the programme committee
- Senior management also sits with the programme staff and reviews the activities and progress
- Once in six months, every programme is reviewed.
5.3 Partnering with Fellows

There are guidelines to select fellows. The spirit behind fellowship programmes is to help those struggling individual grassroots level activists to continue their work. There is a fellowship committee (FC) to provide support to the fellows. The fellowship committee meets once in every three months to review, monitor and organize support. Each programme staff is allocated the responsibility of interacting with a given number of fellows.

5.4 Team work and division of work

Team work and the responsibility of each programme is processed through several methods. First, let us see at the individual and small group level.

- Every member of the programme staff is expected to examine proposals received, or make proposals in specific areas of work in specified geographical areas and present the same to the programmes committee for discussion and concurrence.
- Some staff members are also assigned with the responsibility of keeping track of the progress of implementation of activities in each state including networks, fellows and partner NGOs.

The following programmes are found in CWS: 1) Gender programme, 2) Dalit programme, 3) PR initiatives, 4) Human rights, 4) Minorities initiatives, 5) Child rights, 6) Mainstreaming HIV and AIDS, 7) Adivasi initiatives, 8) NRM programme, 9) Flood control management, 10) Social watch, 11) KICS (Knowledge in Civil Society) and 12) Relied and rehabilitation programme.

- Some of the above programmes have an independent advisory committee, which consists of CWS staff directly involved in that work and few other CWS staff and outside experts; the concerned programme team selects the members for their advisory committee (AC).
- At least one trust member is made part of each AC; term for AC is normally two years and it meets not less than three times in a calendar year.
- AC’s views and recommendations are important and critical inputs by the projects committee are incorporated in its decision-making.

5.5 Decision Making

The BoT has delegated day-to-day responsibilities to the staff through two structures of staff. They are: staff association consisting of all staff; and programmes committee (PC) consisting of programmes/projects related, field oriented staff and finance. BoT members also participate in the PC meetings.

- All the programme staff members are members of the PC, where staff familiarize themselves with all activities and develop a holistic understanding of activities within CWS and give their inputs to promote integration.
- Prior to the PC meeting, the staff of each programme have their internal discussion, prepare their agenda for the PC and an abstract of each item on the agenda. This document is given to
the convener of PC a week before the date of the PC meeting for circulation to the staff.

- An executive committee (EC) addresses emergency issues
- PC constitutes task-specific committees as and when required. A task-specific committee will normally be formed during the PC meeting and its life will be restricted until the next PC meeting or until the completion of its task, whichever is earlier.
- PC meets once in two months. It is the decision-making body on sanctions and continuation of projects, programmes under networks, fellowships, and it reviews and assesses the performance of the various projects and programmes on an ongoing basis.
- PC is also involved in the planning of the CWS programme for the subsequent phase, including decisions on inclusion of the additional areas of work and new directions for existing programmes, allocation of resources to each programme and the drawing up of the CWS budget.
- PC, along with the Personnel Committee and a representative of the concerned programme team, is responsible for the recruitment of staff, for the finalization of their job descriptions and for the upgradation of their skills, by participation in workshops and trainings.
- It assigns organizational responsibilities to the staff and oversees monitoring of projects/programmes, networks and fellows’ work.
- PC’s work is subject to the board’s ratification

5.6 Gender

- Gender is a core value and non-negotiable in CWS. There is no specific written policy but it appears in different policy documents of CWS. In the human resource policy of the organization, there is flexibility for women staff in timing, travel concession, for security, working for a women-friendly policy. During travel women staff could stay in decent/secured hotel, though it might be little expensive or could stay with relatives. Paid maternity is extended for 4 months and paternity for 15 days. There is also flexibility of office time after the delivery leave. While travelling, if the children are below 5 years, they can be taken with the women staff members.
- As per the informal gender policies of CWS, 50% of women should be in the recruitment and decision making level. Currently, CWS has 43% women. ASW/ CWS established women’s wing in the year 1990 itself. CWS has a total 59 full timers, including the 4 staff members in the Tsunami Resource Centre.
- Encourage women-headed NGO partners, even when the women-headed NGOs have inadequate capacities to run the organization. There is a network of women-headed NGOs. Similarly, while selecting fellowship there is a preference for women fellows. The fellowship was first initiated to support women and in due course, other young activists got included without deviating from the original idea. Also, to create personal contribution fund to support girls.
- While talking about ‘gender balance,’ there is also consideration and preference for women staff from the marginalized communities like dalits and adivasis.
There are several committees in governance and ensure women have active participation. It is ensured in the board and till now the managing trustee has been a woman. The convenor of the complaints committee to address sexual harassment at work place also has been a woman and this committee consists of more than 50% women.

Women employees of NGO partners are given opportunity to come together to share their concerns of working in NGOs, and the advantages and disadvantages. CWS has been pioneer in women networks in the different states. CWS has also ensured women’s wing in networks where the issue of focus was different.

If partners were not gender sensitive, which is non-negotiable, then CWS reconsiders the continuity of the partnership with those NGO partners. Considerable period of time was given before deciding on the continuity of the partnership.

There is regular orientation on ‘gender’ and check list to test against it. Also, gender discussion invariably takes place in different forums and meetings. There is common orientation for partners and staff members on ‘gender sensitization’.

Complaint committee is working and because of sexual harassment complaints, about 6 NGO partners were dropped from partnership so far. There have been efforts to make the partners aware of such committee. There is preventive effort and culture of open discussion. CWS has taken the concern beyond its staff and NGO partners, organized state-level workshop to suggest the need to have such system in every office.

5.7 HRD

CWS works on the principles of participatory management. It has fairly detailed human resources related systems and policies, which are quite staff- and gender-friendly. A separate workplace policy on HIV and AIDS is in place in CWS. A Sexual Harassment Complaints Committee (SHCC) is also found functional in CWS.

A uniform 10% increment to the entire staff has up till now been the norm, but there is a current shift towards performance management systems and organizational development processes.

There is a staff association which discusses all matter relevant to staff welfare; facilitates the administrative functions by allocating the responsibilities among the staff; identifies training programmes and arranges the same; facilitates the work through various sub committees and allow interactions across the various programmes and specific responsibilities. A synergy meeting is also being conducted periodically and exclusively for all the women colleagues in CWS.

It has also developed a system of regular performance appraisal leading to decisive decisions on promotion and emoluments (This is actually under development). linked to promotions, which is under development.
Network for Education Empowerment of Rural Artisans (NEERA)

1. Genesis and Formation

Palmyrah Workers Development Society (PWDS) is a development organization founded in 1977, with its registered office at Marthandam, Kanyakumari district, Tamil Nadu, India. Dr. Samuel Amirtham and a group of friends initiated PWDS in 1975, as an expression of their social commitment and collective efforts to improve the living conditions of palmyrah workers and other weaker communities. Based on a socio-economic study of the Palmyra worker families in Kanyakumari district, a programme was developed and PWDS came into formal existence in 1977 as an organization registered under the Societies Registration Act. Spanning an eventful period of more than two decades, the historical evolution of PWDS can be traced through four stages of transformation and change. They are: 1) Mobilizing and organizing the people 2) Introducing sustainable programme interventions 3) Offering consultancy and support services and 4) Promoting networking and collective functioning. This fourth stage gave birth to the alternative process of development cooperation and networks like NEERA came into existence. NEERA formally emerged in 1996 after two years of planning.

There are 12 partners in the network, which are located and are working in nine districts of Tamil Nadu. The goal of NEERA is to work for the self management of community organizations and sustainable livelihood opportunities.

- The formation of network preceded by several studies on socio-economic conditions of palmyrah workers, their potentials, marketing and feasibility of their product and sustainability of an initiative like this.
- Largely, PWDS does not have any role in NEERA management
- The target group of NEERA are rural artisans, palmyrah workers, rural, poor women and children
- PWDS is the legal project holder of NEERA programmes
- The network activities are coordinated by an organization called DATA, which is one of the partners of NEERA network
- NEERA is not a registered network. When the partners feel that there is no need for such cooperation and/or find less relevance for NEERA, it may be dissolved. Moreover, NEERA is a programme entity to fulfill some objectives of the development cooperation.
- The staff of NEERA gets their salary, honorarium, emoluments and other financial benefits from different projects. Strictly speaking, they may or may not be the staff of either NEERA, PWDS or DATA. DATA is only a coordination centre, which is not a registered society
PWDS, in fact, has given adequate space for development cooperation and networking and it has become a value in itself.

NEERA did not get registered because of legal reasons. For instance, the Home Ministry was not in favour of giving FCRA to NEERA, as PWDS had one already. Secondly, under Society Act, there no provision for a group organization to form an organization and register a society.

PWDS also has direct programmes in Kanyakumari district – the project is called ARTS with an independent PME system. Resources for these direct initiatives are completely taken care of by PWDS under the guidance of the deputy director.

The director of NEERA is responsible for all the networking process of PWDS, including that of NEERA.

2. Ideological and perspective premises

"Visions are not created or worked out, but received…"

Vision: A society where people enjoy social justice, live with dignity and mutual respect for each other, participate in all important decisions affecting their lives, and exist in harmony with nature. NEERA believes in conscientized solidarity, self-reliant communities and resulting liberation, freedom and augmented quality life.

Mission: Support services to sustain community initiatives

Principles: NEERA believes that there is strong sense for values within the network, which rely on the principles of equity, equality, participation, ownership, decentralization, people-centeredness, transparency, accountability, justice and collectiveness, with the distinct aim of transfer of power and authority and decision making to the grassroots.

Values: the values of NEERA lie in Four Ts: 1) Team approach 2) Task orientation 3) Transparent functioning 4) Trust building

Strategies: 1) Community organization, 2) Awareness generation, 3) Capability building, 4) Linkage establishment and 5) Policy influence

The programmatic activities are tuned in such a way to enhance the product power and people power.

The programmatic journey of NEERA is dotted with a combination of at least five steps. It is called MEALS (motivating, equipping, accompanying, linking and sustaining)

3. Governance

Since NEERA is one of the projects, as well as the CFC of PWDS, the board of PWDS has been vested with the governance of NEERA too.

PWDS has a unique practice of involving one of the office bearers of the board, on a rotation basis, to spend a certain period voluntarily with the organization on a full-time basis.
Between NEERA and partners, the governance process is operationalized through an MoU which is part of NEERA handbook.

At community level, the reference community participates in the planning to evaluation process. Community and federations have the space to manage their own resources.

It is observed that the directorial responsibility of PWDS, NEERA and DATA (coordination centre of the NEERA network) are shared by the same person; this may be one of the reasons for a problem-free facilitation of issues and transactions between these different organizational set ups.

Recently NEERA has decided and still in the process of sharing more responsibility which is otherwise as of now being fulfilled by DATA.

NEERA is also a unique CFC; NEERA as a CFC is promoted by PWDS, which is the parent organization but in the case of other organizations, parent organizations operate as CFC or promote different CFCs.

4. Structure

According to PWDS, NEERA is one of the collective networking initiatives; this is also considered as a project of PWDS. In fact, PWDS has five projects. They are: 1) Action for Rural Transformation and Self-Reliance (ARTS), 2) Reconstruction of Livelihood (RL) 3) NEERA and 4) Alliance.

Some of the projects are initiated under the principle and process of Collective Form of Cooperation (CFC), which is also supposed to network with several partners. They are: 1) Network for Education and Empowerment Rural Artisans (NEERA), 2) Collective for Community Enterprise Promotion (CCEP), 3) Alliance and 4) Adivasi Livelihood (ADI). Though there is hierarchy, the working modules have reduced its visibility, which in turn has given space for staff to work more as a team.

In the NEERA network, along with 12 partners, all registered federations numbering 14 have also joined the network. With this new change, the total number of the networks has grown to 26. This has also brought its implications like whether these federations would function like NGOs or not. Till this point in time, NEERA is of the opinion that all these federations should remain as people’s initiative only managing their own resources.

All partners have common programmes, which are jointly evolved and structurally fixed. Special initiatives are based on the strength of the organization on a particular issue and local needs and urgency with which the issue should be dealt with.
5. Systems

5.1 PME

5.1.1 Planning and Budgeting

If it is stated that planning is the strength of NEERA, it would not be an over statement. In fact, the emergence of NEERA itself took two years’ time, because the partners discussed on various aspects of starting a network. Proper planning facilitates a lot of other functions to take place smoothly.

- Planning includes all kinds of activities, including training and budgeting being planned well in advance.
- Activities are coded and budget for each activity is allocated in terms of unit cost with a maximum ceiling
- While implementing each activity, conscious attempt is made to keep at least 10% of the budget to meet unprecedented expenditure or for other activities
- Everybody knows the budget; final proposal is made by all organizations sitting together. Every organization know the budget of the other
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● At staff level, each staff will have a budget sheet – thus, the programme is planned, designed and executed according to the budget
● No urge on spending the entire amount of a phase within the stipulated time period
● Separate audit for NEERA programme is a compulsory requirement

5.1.2 Reporting

● Narrative report is prepared every six months
● 10th of every month an un-audited statement of accounts for the preceding month is prepared
● Half yearly audited statement is also prepared

5.1.3 PME and Performance:

● Besides regular staff meetings, staff appraisals are undertaken periodically, both internally and with the help of external ‘experts’
● At partner level, an annual performance review is done by a team of members from the PC and consultant from outside
● By the end of the third year of every phase, an impact assessment and performance appraisal of each partner group will be made by a three member group comprising of one suggested by the partner group concerned and another nominated by the CC and an external consultant selected from a list prepared by EED.

5.2 Leadership

● The style of leadership is facilitative; cuts across network and community
● In spite of clear guidelines on roles and responsibilities, works are not assigned on day-to-day basis. But through a prepared plan, works are shared well in advance and then it is a matter of fulfilling that particular task. The approach is task-oriented ensuring efficient execution of responsibilities
● As a network everybody is made to know their responsibilities and the overall collective objective of the network
● At community level, people select their leaders and federation leaders with people identify areas of work, staff and reference villages.

5.3 Team Building

● Most of the works in the network is carried out through small teams consisting of two to three to five persons. One person leads the team and the others support him
● There are twelve components in NEERA looked after by five to six programme officers. They almost know all the components. Since they know everything, even in the absence of somebody, others can carry on the work forward
Fortnightly staff meeting is the place to review the process and status. Failures do not undergo any post mortem; even if it is done, the enquiry will not be individual centric, but it would be collectively analyzed and solved.

5.4 Participation

- Participation is not seen only as value but more than that it is considered as a management tool and strategy
- Participation is also not considered as a stand alone feature; it goes hand in hand with capacity building. Participation of people at different organizational processes depends on the kind of training and capacity building measures
- If community has to interface with the board, then the capacity building measures should equip the community, so that they can actually contribute to the high level decision making process.

5.5 Decision Making

- Programmatic decisions are always taken through participatory methods. Since every activity is carried out through a small team, the responsibility from planning to evaluation is carried by the team
- Partners also do not decide upon programmes on their own; they sit with the community and take decisions.

5.6 Training

As a network, NEERA is responsible for several training programmes as building the capacity of the partners is one of the basic mission. Primarily, three types of programme are organized by the network. They are:
- Centralized training
- Regional training
- Training organized by partner groups

Finally, it may look a little abstract if one looks at the vision statement of NEERA network, which is “visions are not created or worked out but received”. The question remains ‘received from whom’. The planning process and systems developed in NEERA suggest that the vision is continuously received from the aspirations of the community.

5.7 Development Cooperation Process

- Coordination centre (CC): Networking within the network takes place according to a
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clearly mentioned MoU signed between NEERA partners and PWDS; roles and responsibility of CC is clearly mentioned; partner organizations are accountable to CC; CC recommends partners; CC consolidates the proposals, corresponds and negotiates with donors; processes fund flow; receives and disburses the fund flow; files half yearly reports; accompanies, monitors and evaluates programmes and promotes federations of rural artisans. Once in six months, takes policy decisions; develops participatory methodology to design, implement and monitor the programmes.

- Programme committee: guides and supports CC on programmatic issues and it is the ultimate decision-making body; consists of project holder of each member group; meets at least once in three months; develops core fund through contribution; crisis like deviation of funds is discussed; periodically, a moderator is selected to lead the PC from partner organizations. In the PC meetings, federation leaders also participate.

- Partners should work within manageable area, normally not beyond a taluk; should adopt task-oriented approach; have a separate staff structure to implement the activities of NEERA.

- The criteria for selection of partners: A list of organizations is prepared; they should be known for reliability, contribution to the chosen issue, infrastructure and staff strength. Then, a team visits the respective organization and discusses the purpose of networking and its responsibilities. Organizations should be secular, possess a constitution and FCRA, a board fulfilling its duty with reasonable women representation.

- Even though there are operational issues and the resource of NEERA to the partner is sometime small, still they have not walked out of the partnership. The reasons cited are: 1) a strong PME process which has been enabling the partners and federations to work with each other effectively 2) Fellowship in the network and 3) Training and capacity building process.

5.8 HRD

- The staff policy of PWDS applies to the staff of NEERA also. PWDS has well articulated human resources-related systems and policies. The good work of staff is rewarded by financial incentives and by providing opportunities to apply for higher positions or areas of interest to them, if these are available.

- Staff is appointed on contract basis for the project period

- Staff gets benefits like mediclaim, provident fund, half a month’s salary as exgratia payment.

5.9 Dispute Settling Mechanism

- All disputes arising among the partner groups with regard to activities related to NEERA shall be settled through discussions and decisions taken at the PC.
Any partner found deviating from the agreed plan of action and indulging in diversion of funds will be liable for legal action by the PWDS CC. The PWDS CC can initiate all legal actions necessary in this regard, if the effort of the PC fails to arrive at a settlement as per the agreement.
7. People Institute for Development and Training

1. Genesis and Formation

With the nationalization of Bank in 1969, the National Institute of Bank Management (NIBM) was established in the 1970 to spread the impetus of national development to the primary agricultural sector. The NIBH, as a part of the Rural Action Project (RAP), started its work in 9 states and 29 districts, capacitating and training rural social workers. The sphere head team of NIBM met extreme challenges in the rural communities. The team believed that their identification with the poor was crucial in gaining the people’s trust as their understanding of outsiders had always been circumscribed by repeated exploitation at the hands of the government and money lenders. Based on this experience, 45 rural activists from RAP came out and formed a collective in 1979. It took them about a year for the transition and People Institute for Development and Training (PIDT) was registered in 1980. PIDT was formed with a focus on generating awareness among the oppressed, empowering them to seek alternative social order, and equipping them to manage internal and external conflict by peaceful but resolute means. PIDT is an action research and teaching institute. Its acronym PIDT means ‘oppressed’ in most North Indian languages.

2. Profile

- Crafts group: 52
- Federation: one (77 CBOs)
- CBOs: 300 (un-federated)
- villages: 343
- States: 5
- Districts: 5

3. Ideological Perspectives

- **Vision**: Creation of a humane, oppression-free, equality-based, transformatory, resource-rich society through the analytical understanding of the socially and economically oppressed, through their decisions and resources with full participation at every step to resolve problems.
- **Mission**: 1) Feminization of the value system for reconstruction of the community and the nation, 2) Environment as a means of sustaining human race, 3) Value-based education for the continuity of action for transformation, 4) Research and advocacy for peace, sustainability and self-reliance
- **Guiding principles:** Participation, reflection, praxis, accountability, equality, justice, service, self-reliance, pro-weaker sections, area-based approach and sustained transformation.
- For PIDT, concentration is the key for making the community advocates for their rights.

### 4. Governance

- 7 members form the general body from multidisciplinary backgrounds.
- 1/3 members have to be women representatives.
- GB, which is the most important decision making body, meets every six months.
- Board members have to be people working with the community and who are pro-poor section.
- Luminaries are there on the board.
- Chairman governs the governing body.
- The governing body also appoints the director, besides receiving updates, taking stocks and making future plans.
- Key governance positions are exclusive and closely related.

### 5. Structure

- PIDT as a CFC has a structure of a forum where the partners have a direct link with the parent organizations.
- The partners are crafts groups, CBOs and federations based under the four resource centres.
- The four resource centres are located in Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, UP and West Bengal with Headquarters in Delhi.
- Chairman is based in the headquarters and performs the role of a guide, counsellor, innovator, visionary, trainer and also crisis manager.
- The director plays a role of a team leader, manager, guider, counsellor, enabler, cares for colleagues, designs programmes, crisis manager and liaisons with chairman and the central office.
- Research and planning coordinator is another key position in the structure for documentation, doing action research and developing smooth PME systems for the organization.
- Each field area has a coordinator with field level staffs and volunteers. Chairman, director and the research and planning coordinator are the key functionaries of PIDT, accountable for the governance of the organization in all the 4 regions.
- As research and advocacy is an active intervention of PIDT, the structure has a provision for it and a new position of senior researcher and trainer has been introduced. The main work of this department is to carry out research and feasibility studies with the research coordinator as well as plan and organize trainings on different...
6. Systems

6.1 PME

- Planning is done to achieve targets in collaboration with target groups considering backward and forward linkages.
- People’s fullest cooperation is taken during the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes.
- Targets are tallied with achievements.
- Learning’s are paired with staff and local people of other project areas. In all stages of a programme, complete transparency is maintained.
- PIDT goes beyond the role of weekly planning, the organization holds a larger picture of annual and long term programme and there is a practice of proper programme design.
- At the time of designing programmes, a detailed plan listing planned activities, results, qualitative and quantitative targets are evolved.
- There are also quarterly meetings of the CBOs, but most of these meetings are for capacity building and information sharing.
- PIDT follows a process-based approach that has flexibility to respond to the needs of the community.
- The component of self evaluation as a routine periodic activity is not a work culture of the organization but in the staff meeting there is an informal activity of review of weekly plans and follow ups.

6.2 Leadership as a value

- In PIDT the core function of leadership of chairman and director has been one of ‘enabling understanding of the vision and keeping it alive’ in the organization.
- Practicing the cherished values of the organization and modeling, simplicity, approachability, free access, openness to learn and practicing equality has been the core form of leadership in PIDT.
- This in turn is modeled by the coordinator and the field staff and volunteers.
- The leadership practices sensitivity and discipline of professional boundary and upholding of the organizational values.
- There is positive provision of women leadership in decision making.

6.3 Motivation

- Any staff member can meet the chairman/director directly.
High motivation is due to inspiring work situation and a feeling of fellowship. Depending upon personal values and professional competencies, the staff is motivated to work in an environment where there is no discrimination on the basis of caste, religion, gender, region, socio-economic and educational status. PIDT staffs are first and foremost human and development workers. They see their problems in the context of the poor people among whom they are working. They are devoted to the service of the poor.

Besides, PIDT has a written HR policy. The senior management team of PIDT is an important part of the staff appraisal. In terms of work, each team member treats the other as equal partners and approaches problems as a team.

### 6.4 Decision making

The coordinators at the field take all decisions in consultation with the director/chairman. The field staff, director and chairman collectively take macro decisions related to the course, design and synergy of the programme. Collective decision making helps to enhance the understanding of the problem, explore more than one solution, learning from failures and experiences becomes easier through sharing, promotes ownership of solution, empowers the individuals, promotes analysis and self confidence.

### 6.5 Accountability and transparency

PIDT places high value on transparency and accountability. The basis of adherence to this is mutual trust and motivations rather than reprimand and rewards. An open system of cross check is established through non-linear lines of authority and control. Transparency is maintained through participatory decision making process.

PIDT adopts a 4 way approach to accountability at the community level. It is through 1. Integration, 2. Awareness generation, 3. Collectivization, 4. People’s participation.

### 6.6 Participation

#### 6.6.1. Integration

PIDT encourages integration of activists within the community to facilitate genuine understanding and investment in the work and to build trust, mutual respect with the villagers.

#### 6.6.2. Awareness generation

PIDT seeks to generate awareness of alternatives through the cultivation of analytic capacity, motivation and change orientation. For PIDT, awareness is looking at and being in the world.
6.6.3. Collectivization
For PIDT, an important approach is people’s appreciation and capacity for working collectively, initially through forming samitis or small community societies, that work towards social change and local development through group discussions, prioritization, planning and action. These samitis scaled up in to larger federation, self conscious of their capacity to transform.

6.6.4. Action for Transformation
Integral to PIDTs process is grassroots research that emphasizes learning by doing and goes beyond conventional participatory action research to ignite in the people the inquisitiveness and enterprising spirit of open relationship of the world around them. There is an analysis and action blend in a mutually reflective and responsive synergy leading to an effective advocacy and sustainable change.

6.7 Development Cooperation Process

- The central office at Delhi functions as a coordinating and liaison service office on all matters and directly takes up advocacy and lobbying programmes at the national and international level.
- Publication, planning and monitoring of all the programmes, documentation, public relations, liasioning with central government department. Capacity building of the field staff, budgeting and funding relations and their management are other functions of the central office.
- All functional heads of the central office in Delhi have reporting relationship with the chairman and director. At the field level (UP, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and West Bengal), the staffs hold multiple responsibilities. There are no watertight compartments and collaboration across programmes as one service provider to the village community.

6.8 Capacity Building

There are internally designed course workshops and seminars conducted by PIDT for the capacity enhancement of the staff. There is a process of job training. Capacity building emphasis on skill development increases the confidence of the staff to tackle problems and issues more confidently.
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1. Genesis and Formation

Church of North India Synodical Board of Social Service (CNI SBSS) is the ‘justice and development’ wing of Church of North India (CNI), formed in 1970. The historical Kolkata consultation in 1978 on “Church’s role in social service and development” provided the required thrust and direction and articulated the ‘Vision and Values’. “Nazareth Manifesto” (Luke 4: 16-19) was the source of inspiration and mandate. CNI SBSS was registered in 1989 under the society of registration act. CNI SBSS is rooted in humane values, believes in process approach based on human rights in all its endeavours. From 1970 to 1987, charity-based institutional approach was followed, with leadership development from 1988 to 1991. From 1992 to 1999, people-based community development was the thrust. Since 2000, the strategy is to ‘build communities of Resistance and Hope” based on human rights approach. CNI SBSS has four Regional Centres for Social Action (RCSAs) located in Agra, Kolkata, Ranchi and Pune. They are based on issues and themes. CNI SBSS is working with 20 Diocesan Boards of Social Services (DBSSs) of CNI to achieve its objective. The Collective Form of Cooperation was formed in 1996. The twenty DBSS operational area is spread over 11 states, 52 districts, 568 gram panchayats and 1477 villages.

2. Ideological Perspectives

- **Vision:** The new vision statement was revisited and articulated in 2005 “Where there is justice in the land, field and forest, every living being will dance and sing”. The vision is for every human being, flora and fauna, the whole creation and working towards ensuring its integrity.

- **Mission:** The mission was evolved as “In the spirit and service of Christ, CNI SBSS would accompany the DBSS and its partners to engage with the reference communities so that they will develop the capacity (skills and assets) to negotiate with the policy makers and to realize their rights and emerge as an alternative political force. To move towards this direction, communities should sensitize socially, politically, economically and culturally to organize themselves to claim their rights over livelihood means while protecting their identity”.

- **Guiding Principles and Values:** Human values, human rights are rooted in the endeavour of CNI SBSS. Community participation, sharing, transparency &
accountability and trust are principles of CNI SBSS’ work. The ultimate objective is to develop a just and humane society for one and all.

Issues and Themes

Over the last few years, from general developmental programmes to specific focus evolved. In the year 2005, three issue-based interventions were conceptualized. They are livelihood and food security, land and tribal identity and atrocities on dalits. The issues have cross cutting themes of church mission engagement (CME), gender and advocacy with lobbying & networking (LAN).

Core Activities

The issues and themes have the core activities to develop people’s organizations leading to people’s movements, enhance human capacity to ensure livelihood support, gender mainstreaming, develop leadership and CME, conserve environment, disaster mitigation and manage conflicts. Transforming people’s movement to an alternative political force where marginalized would not only acquire political positions, but would also be able to exercise political authority is destination. ‘Abhiyan’ to ‘Andolan’ and finally ‘Adhikar se hissedari’ are milestones of the process.

3. Profile

CNI SBSS, at present, works with 21 DBSSs. DBSSs are the justice and development wings of dioceses belonging to CNI. The four resource centres are located strategically in four geographical locations. These resource centres accompany the dioceses in their locations in their programmatic intervention.

4. Governance

CNI SBSS is expected to fulfill the mandate of ‘justice and development’ of CNI. The highest policy making body of CNI is CNI Synod, which elects the CNI Synod Executive. CNI Synod Executive elects CNI SBSS board, which in turn elects CNI SBSS governing board. The CNI SBSS governing board is always headed by a Bishop, has 15 members, of which four to five members are women. The tenure is for three years. The CNI SBSS governing board selects and appoints the chief coordinator (CC) cum secretary of CNI SBSS. The CC is the executive head of CNI SBSS and is appointed for a period of three years. The board members are elected at the Synod of CNI.

DBSS governing board is elected at the Diocesan Council and the Bishop of the Diocese is the ex-officio Chairman. DBSS appoints the DBSS coordinator and the staff
of DBSS. CNI SBSS’ mandate is to enable, accompany and enhance the perspective of CNI DBSS, who in turn are responsible to work with the reference communities. CNI SBSS cannot work directly with the reference communities. Chairperson of the DBSS has a major say in the process of decision making. SBSS works with defined partners only.

5. Structure

Chief coordinator and secretary is the executive head of CNI SBSS. The CC reports to CNI SBSS governing board. The central office is in Delhi and the four resource centres are located in Agra, Kolkata, Ranchi and Pune. Development communications team is located in Delhi office. There are three programme teams - programme resource team, programme facilitation team and programme support team. The resource team is responsible for generation of new ideas, innovations and providing strategic directions in consultations with partners.

The facilitation team is responsible for all partnership cooperation with the dioceses and accompanying them for programme implementation. The support team provides all logistic support and also manages resources prudently. The teams are not exclusive in nature. A staff can be member of two teams and share the responsibility as per need and priority. In fact, most of the staff who are members of the resource team, have responsibility of facilitation too. Each team is headed by a coordinator, a functional responsibility given to one of the member of the group. Each resource centre is headed by a team leader, again a functional responsibility assigned to one of the team members and changed on rotation. In such cases, a junior staff may be the team leader and senior staff will be reporting to him/her. This structure is to ensure that team work and human values are more important than position, power and status. The structure is to ensure non hierarchical culture at CNI SBSS, which enunciates human values, justice in its endeavour. Among staff, internalization and understanding of organisational ethos, basis and key approaches are at varying degree. Some of them have internalized and able to demonstrate its application while others are willing and learning.

At DBSS, the coordinator is the executive head. He/she reports to the chairman of DBSS, the local Bishop. DBSS coordinator is supported by facilitator for gender, programme and CME. Each facilitator is supported by a community enabler. Some of the DBSS staff has comprehensive understanding of the values of CNI SBSS while few are in process of recognizing the perspective and ideology. The structure of CNI SBSS and CNI DBSS board enunciates the philosophy and values of serving the oppressed, alleviate the suffering of one and all. Nevertheless, it (structure) leaves enormous pressure on CC and staff to perform.
6. **Systems**

6.1 **Planning and Monitoring Systems**

Most of the DBSSs have prepared an extensive database of its reference communities. Activities are based on database. Now, DBSSs think that they are close to the field. The database is used as a tool to develop impact monitoring indicators. Few DBSSs have not completed database, nevertheless CNI SBSS is engaged in the constant process of enabling them. CNI SBSS’ ideology is to accompany DBSSs in their work till the end and not to penalize. Nevertheless, CNI SBSS discontinued its partnership with four DBSSs after desired practices were not observed in the core values and principles. SBSS, as an organization, overviews the systems and processes as a means to practice and ensure transparency and accountability.

**Programme Activity Review and Accompaniment (PARAM)** – The web-based programme contains the activity, expected output, actual output and outcome, along with expenditure as and when it is conducted by DBSS. The programme is accessible to all staff of CNI DBSS, and CNI SBSS, including general public. The initiative corroborates the principles of transparency and accountability at CNI SBSS. The programme is evolving, is accessible to all staff, and is open for public access.

6.2 **Cost Reimbursement Model**

SBSS, has adopted cost reimbursement approach in place of grants approach. In principle, SBSS reimburses the actual expenditure incurred on the programmes to the DBSS. It does not give grants. Each DBSS prepares six months’ cash flow in each cycle. Each DBSS is given two months’ expected expenditure as seed money, based on the cash flow. The seed money is used for the first month programmes. DBSS sends the monthly expenditure statement to CNI SBSS, which reimburses the actual amount of expenditure. Cash flow statement supports cost reimbursement system. The system is to ensure transparency and accountability.

Even if non-budgeted programmes and programmes on governance are more than the budgeted/community-based programmes, CNI SBSS enlightens DBSS to appreciate the activity in the spirit of our (CNI SBSS) values.

**Organizational restructuring: A continuous process:** To strengthen the conviction to vision, mission, ideological perspectives and values of CNI SBSS, the sixteen month organizational development (OD) process, ten year perspective plan document preparation and organizational restructuring was initiated in the year 2004. These initiatives led to new systems that are evolving. It has evolved a process of continuous reflection and renewal. Learning appraisal, systems appraisal and developing PME desk are key features.
Accompaniment Model: The OD process lead to accompaniment of the CNI SBSS staff/CNI RCSA staff to disseminate and deepen the DBSS staff’s rights-based approach and ideological perspective. Finance and programme associates regularly visit the DBSS and communities. Reports are shared with DBSS and SBSS. They promote the capacities of DBSS, facilitate the people’s organization in people’s movement. A segment of CNI SBSS staff are capacitated and are clear in the role clarity, shared understanding and perspective. Third level of leadership is emerging. Many women are in executive functions.

Gender Policy: 30% of the positions in the CNI SBSS board are meant for women. Women are in second line leadership positions in CNI SBSS. Many staff members are formally trained in gender issues. Still, the trained staff members have not taken initiatives to establish the gender sensitivity in programme implementation. CNI SBSS believes that the staff may be given some more time to establish the complex issue of gender organizational planning.

Church Mission Engagement: DBSSs need to identify four leaders from each congregation and build their capacities to take up responsible positions in the future. CNI SBSS is to guide the DBSS in the effort. However, Church is the vertical structure. CME promotes horizontal approach, based on human rights philosophy. It is a challenging task for CNI SBSS.

Local committee for peace (LCP): This is a new vertical approach, initiated in few dioceses; in the next phase the LCP framework would be used for planning.

Development communication systems: PARAM and ZOHO are the important initiatives of development communication team. Resource centre for disaster management teaching. CNI SBSS has established a system to develop the core competencies of the staff in the larger interest of the society.

Human resource development

Human Process Laboratory: Self reflection and process-based approach. All the staff of CNI SBSS is sent for human process labs to internalize the self reflection and process-based approach to interventions.

Appreciative Enquiry: Staff appraisal system is initiated to create openness amongst all the staff to express their annual performance, successes, failures, reasons and remedies with a commitment for future achievement of realistic objectives for the next year. The process is a commitment to oneself and others.

Accompaniers meet: Annual accompaniers meet is held to strengthen the perspectives, roles and responsibilities of staff in an open and transparent way. The impact and field realities are discussed. The process is to take stock of one’s performance as a team member and to internalize the commitment to teamwork and the guiding principles of CNI SBSS.
Performance

- **CNI SBSS**: Every three years, CNI SBSS goes through external evaluation. The necessary recommendations are incorporated. The annual reports are another reflection for performance measure. Every six months, planning exercise is initiated to visualize the work performed and the needs for the future.
- **CNI SBSS staff performance**: Staff performance is an annual process which is done through tools like appreciative enquiry accommoders meet and various other open-ended processes.
- **CNI SBSS partners – DBSS performance**: CNI SBSS accompaniment services are enabling it to partner DBSS to build, develop and promote people’s organizations. DBSS’ staff goes through similar process of appreciative enquiry. The ideological perspective and values of CNI SBSS are articulated in all the PME systems. The CNI SBSS practices are shared. The thrust is to accompany DBSS in the endeavour. Mid- and end-term appraisals involving DBSS partners by externals are key processes.
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1. Coordinating centralized training programmes is the responsibility. The CC will build up a resource team consisting of persons drawn from NEERA partners, DATA consultants and experts from outside. The CC also organizes ToT programmes and approach to orient and equip the staff of partner-groups. Training on accounting procedure will be arranged by the CC. Organizing training on community savings and credit and training on rural entrepreneurship development will also be the responsibility of the CC.

2. The regional meetings usually consist of two or three partner-groups of a particular region who come together and organize training programmes for their staff

3. Usually these kinds of trainings are organized by the partner groups for their own staff, community members and community leaders as per local needs. Exposure visits will be organized by the partner-groups themselves
## Abbreviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACM</td>
<td>Antyodaya Chaitya Mandal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADI</td>
<td>Adivasi Livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRD</td>
<td>Association for Integrated Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>Action for Rural Transformation and Self Reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW</td>
<td>Aktionsgemeinschaft Solidarische Welt (Action for World Solidarity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>Bihar Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFW</td>
<td>Bread for the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC</td>
<td>Collective Forms of Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CME</td>
<td>Church Mission Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNI</td>
<td>Church of North India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNI RCSA</td>
<td>Church of North India Resource Centre for Social Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNI SBSS</td>
<td>Church of North India Synodical Board of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDS</td>
<td>Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Church Auxiliary for Social Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Coordination Committee (NEERA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCEP</td>
<td>Collective for Community Enterprise Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&amp;S</td>
<td>Chief Coordinator &amp; Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Communication and Development Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>Centre for People’s Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Centre for People Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSW</td>
<td>Council for Professional Social Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CReNIO</td>
<td>Centre for Research in New International Economic Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREST</td>
<td>Centre for Rural Employment and Skill Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Centre for Sustainable Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Centre for Agriculture and Social Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>Development Association for Training and Technology Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBSS</td>
<td>Diocesan Board of Social Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWEEP</td>
<td>Dalit Women Empowerment and Education Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EED</td>
<td>Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst e.V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>Family Counselling Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCFC</td>
<td>Forum of Collective Form of Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCFC +</td>
<td>CFCs which are part of FCFC and also partners/members of others networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCRA</td>
<td>Foreign Contribution (Regulation) ACT 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLS</td>
<td>Goa Lok Samiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GV</td>
<td>Gram Vikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDT</td>
<td>Habitat Development Trust and Habitat Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Indian Association for Savings and Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDWSI</td>
<td>Integrated Rural Development of Weaker Sections in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRN</td>
<td>Indian River Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRC</td>
<td>Jharkhand Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWRDC</td>
<td>Jharkhand Watershed Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Lobbying Advocacy &amp; Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASS</td>
<td>Manav Adhikar Sangharsha Samiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEALS</td>
<td>Motivating Equipping Accompanying Linking and Sustaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEKAS</td>
<td>Mazdoor Evam Kisan Adhikar Sanghatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACM</td>
<td>National Annual Consultative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAT</td>
<td>National Action Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDF</td>
<td>National Dalit Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEERA</td>
<td>Network for Education and Empowerment of Rural Artisans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGDO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Developmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEU</td>
<td>National Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>National Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJT</td>
<td>Navjeevan Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREGA</td>
<td>National Rural Employment Guarantee Act 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>National Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>National Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAAA</td>
<td>Orissa Adivasi Adhikar Abhiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODAF</td>
<td>Orissa Development Action Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>Orissa Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Programme Action Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAM</td>
<td>Programme Activity Review and Accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Programme Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>People’s Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIDT</td>
<td>People Institute for Development and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPAR</td>
<td>Peoples Institute for Participatory Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
<td>Programme Facilitation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Project Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Programme Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNJSSS</td>
<td>Purbanchal Nari Jagriti Sangharsha Samiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>People’s Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>Panchayat Raj Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Programme Resource Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>Participatory Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Programme Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWDS</td>
<td>Palmyra Workers Development Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACM</td>
<td>Regional Annual Consultative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Rural Action for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDD</td>
<td>Rural Education for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>Reconstruction for livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPCED</td>
<td>Resource Centre for People’s Education and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>State Action Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Seva Bharati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCINDeA</td>
<td>South Central India Network for Development Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDCO</td>
<td>Scientific Educational Development for Community Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDP</td>
<td>Socio Economic Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHG</td>
<td>Self Help Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>St Joseph’s Development Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAR</td>
<td>Society for Participatory Action and Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPVK</td>
<td>Samajik Parivartan Vikas Kendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>State Resource Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>Samajik Vikas Kendram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Transparency and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIPS</td>
<td>Team for Income Generation and Product Promotion Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSRD</td>
<td>Tagore Society for Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMRSP</td>
<td>Vision Mission Role Strategy and Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASSAN</td>
<td>Watershed Support Services and Activities Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFPR</td>
<td>Western India Forum for Panchayat Raj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWH</td>
<td>Working Women’s Hostel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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