

INDIA'S GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT PRESENCE AND ENGAGEMENT OF INDIAN CIVIL SOCIETY

Organized by



In Partnership with



WORKSHOP REPORT

31 May 2013
India Habitat Centre
New Delhi

1. Background

During the past decade, India's global presence has been acknowledged in various multilateral and bilateral global arenas. India is seen as a rapidly rising global power by virtue of being the largest democracy and having younger demographics, and is one of the top five economies of the world today. As a member of the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and Asian Development Bank (ADB), India has increased its stakes and influence following the global financial crisis of 2008. In new multi-lateral mechanisms like G-20, IBSA and BRICS, India's influence is increasingly being felt. Indian business enterprises (both public and private) have been making their presence felt around the world. Indian investment abroad in 2012 was higher than foreign investment in India. However, most Indian civil society organizations (CSOs) have largely remained domestically focused in their development efforts. A recent study on 'Civil Society @ Crossroads' (PRIA was a part of the consortium that conducted the study) suggested that most Indian civil society actors have not come to terms with this changing global reality, except in respect of rapidly declining international funding for their domestic programmes.

India's official development cooperation also seems to have increased during the past decade. In order to streamline the growing programme of development cooperation, the Ministry of External Affairs has created a separate unit – the Development Partnership Administration (DPA). Senior officials of DPA have shown an interest in interacting more regularly with Indian CSOs, especially those having experience in overseas programmes in developing countries. Research and Information System for Developing Countries (RIS) convened a meeting in January 2013 to explore this interaction between DPA and Indian CSOs and academia. Following that meeting, a Forum for Indian Development Cooperation (FIDC) was launched.

In this context, a workshop on India's Global Development Presence and Engagement of Indian Civil Society' was organized by PRIA (Participatory Research in Asia) in collaboration with RIS on 31 May 2013 at India Habitat Centre, New Delhi. The objectives of the workshop were:

- To develop a deeper understanding of India's global development presence bilaterally and multilaterally in G-20, IBSA, BRICS etc.
- To explore approaches and modalities of broad-based cooperation between Indian civil society and DPA, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India
- To evolve a set of mechanisms that can support ongoing and critical engagements of Indian civil society with India's global influence in bilateral and multi-lateral fora.

The workshop was attended by more than fifty civil society leaders and representatives from different parts of the country.

In order to unfold the objectives, four sessions were organized. The day began with an overview of India's global development presence. This was followed by discussions on the approaches and modalities of broad-based cooperation between Indian CSOs and DPA. The third session focused mainly on experiences of Indian CSO engagements in G-20, IBSA, BRICS and other multilateral fora. The concluding session attempted to chalk out some supportive mechanisms for ongoing and critical engagement of Indian civil society organizations with India's global influence in bilateral and multilateral fora.

2. Perspectives on India's Global Development Presence

Rajesh Tandon, president of PRIA gave a background and rationale behind the workshop. He said, over the last few years many of us in the Indian civil society have been talking about or doing something in different ways to ensure India's presence in the global arena. He said the positioning of India in the global context as well as the role of India's policy, investments and international activities have dramatically changed during the last few years. Referring to the 2003 budget speech of the then finance minister, he said the FM had announced that India is a big donor and a figure of a billion dollars a year was mentioned. But the question is: who is receiving it? From where is it going? And what purpose is it serving? He said though collectively we are concerned about the declining support for the Indian CSOs for development activities we are not collectively focused on the 'impact of India outside India'. Hence it is important for the Indian CSOs to find a way to effectively and critically engage with what the Indian government and private sector is doing internationally.

Ashok Khosla, President, Development Alternatives mentioned that the Indian government must support NGO activities in other countries by which a deep relationship with those societies could be established. Indian civil societies through their years of domestic and international work have accumulated enormous knowledge and expertise. Opportunities exist for India's foreign policy to make use of these resources. It is important to put all experiences together to develop a better understanding on how India should plan its presence in the international arena. On the issue of India's global development presence, he said the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) has been for the last fifty years providing scholarship and financial assistance to various friendly nations in order to deepen the bilateral relationships.

Biswajit Dhar, director general, RIS shared that India is marking its global presence. Hence it is important for us to come together and share those experiences collectively that where and how India is contributing to the global development. He said that the West often uses



'new partners' or 'new donors' as a term to describe India and other emerging economies in the global development partnership. However, when we look at the experiences of countries like India and China, we may recognize that these are not new initiatives, for example, ITEC was initiated in 1964 and has grown tremendously. It is almost a six-decade long involvement of India in development partnership and it is growing overtime. During the past decade there has been a significant scaling-up of what we have been doing. Most of our influences are in the immediate neighbourhood like, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Afghanistan etc. India is providing different forms of assistance but the principles on which this assistance is provided is largely 'demand driven'. This is the official position and underlying principle on which we participate in development assistance programmes in different countries. More recently, when India went on to Africa in 2008, India's profile as a development partner expanded. He also pointed out that in 2011 India offered 5 billion dollars of soft lines of credit to Africa. However, when DPA tried to find out figures to what extent India was contributing to the global development partnership pool, these numbers were not readily available. Even these

numbers are also not available with the Government of India. He further added that currently sectoral ministries are working in silos and often do not share information with each other in systematic manner.

He said the emergence of the developing economies like (IBSA, BRICS) on the global stage has resulted in significant change in the development assistance discourse. The legacy of the OECD/DAC is characterized by aid conditionalities, the donor-recipient relationships and imposition of pressures by the donors on the recipient countries. OECD/DAC has always insisted upon 'aid effectiveness' and the effectiveness of aid was assessed from the point of view of the donors. Aid effectiveness framework is reinforced in 2005 when DAC convened a high-level forum on aid effectiveness and came up with the 'Paris Declaration'. In 2011 (after the global economic crises), the aid effectiveness meeting was held in Busan where the 'aid effectiveness' narrative was changed into 'development effectiveness'. Thereafter, 'development effectiveness' has been seen as a benchmark in relationships between donors and recipients. However, the contribution of countries like India is not quite as much as it is required. We are still reacting to something put on the table by advanced countries. Being India's position in world community the status which is required is still missing, our proactiveness is not there. In post-Busan period the dynamics of important forums like post-Busan framework is missing. The current MDGs are also constructed by OECD and it is a donor-driven agenda. He strongly advocated for such forums to engage on development discourse. Currently, we are looking at what we are doing. But, we also need to look what we could do. We need more such coalitions to take it forward.

Bibek Debroy, research professor, Centre for Policy Research highlighted India's potential as global economic power. He said, according to OECD India is the third largest economy in terms of Purchasing Power Parity after USA and China.

He mentioned that there is a significant outflow of private capital from India, part of which is historical in nature as India has been investing abroad since years and part of it is recent because of the growth in competitive pressure in the era of liberalization post 1991. However, in the last few years capital is flowing out of India due to the push factor. Overall, there has been an increase in outflow of capital from India in countries like Africa. He also pointed out that as compared to the quantum of private capital outflow from India, Indian foreign aid is peanuts. He further added that none of India's foreign aid is classic in nature, but it is the lines of credit. More so, the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) in India is grossly understaffed and there is a lack of coordination between the MEA and Ministry of Commerce. Furthermore, there is not any significant think tank in India working on foreign policy strategy. In other words, there is a vacuum so far as intellectual engagement in foreign policy is concerned. He also stressed on developing a consultative mechanism so that conversations can be initiated with the government on matters related to India's global development presence. If the government continues to be distrustful about the NGO sector as whole, then it will be very difficult to form any such consultative apparatus.

It was argued during the deliberations that as compared to the global scenario, Indian official aid is minuscule. It is never thought in terms of volume as compared to private investment. With reference to the global development presence of India, it is argued that first we need to look into what are the outcome indicators of development investment from the point of view of national diplomacy and only then we can see the role of civil society. Another question is what exactly is civil society doing? And what are the areas in which civil society can provide credible support? Currently, civil society doesn't have a clear realization and clarity about its role. Civil society should be very clear that whether it represents people or it is in facilitator's role? It is suggested that regarding the engagement of civil society

with the global development processes, civil society needs to be a little cautious. Its experiences are not good so far with the Government of India as well as bilateral institutions like UNDP etc. Referring to the Planning Commission's consultations with civil society and UN consultations on post MDGs, it is argued that they are continuously engaged with civil society through consultations but when it comes to incorporating recommendations of civil society, these are least visible in the final policy documents. Hence, it is important for civil society to engage with government on foreign policy but also equally important is engaging with people at the same time.

3. Civil Society Experiences of Engaging with New Multilateral Entities

In the session on 'Experience of Indian Civil Society Engagements in G-20, IBSA, BRICS and Other Multilateral Fora' panellists shared varied experiences.

To give an overview of civil society's engagement and experiences, George Mathew, chairman, Institute of Social Sciences said, at present the discourse and concept of governance has moved beyond government or government-controlled organizations. In other words, governance is too important to be left to governments alone; it is due to deepening of democracy. This happens because of unprecedented empowerment of citizens. Hence, civil society has a major role in deciding the governance agenda. He added, since civil society is gaining strength and presence, we saw many positive changes as well and these positive changes are global as well as national. These are recognized in terms of empowerment of women and marginalized, gender justice, inclusive politics, climate changes and sustainable development. The most important of this is the development at local level. The critical issue is strengthening local governments. In the last twenty or thirty years a critical issue that has

come forward is south-south cooperation. Here the IBSA Local Governance Forum (LGF) came to



the forefront. So people who are working in India on the issues of local governance, are very eager to know about what is happening in Brazil and South Africa and to learn from their experiences. Similar is the case of people who are working in these countries. Referring to the recently concluded IBSA meeting in Delhi, he said it shows the real need for development from below with people's participation. He also shared that there is a charter for the IBSA LGF in which many CSOs are active.

Pradeep Mehta, secretary general, CUTS International said the credibility of Indian CSOs to effectively partner with Government of India at the international level is the main deciding factor. The critical point is the credibility and the track record of the CSOs. Government though have a distrustful attitude towards the CSOs. He also said that CSOs are not elected bodies, so they do not have obligations; the accountability of the CSOs is always questioned and CSOs cannot become part of the government, though in a sense they can influence governance. The world is becoming multipolar with a shift in focus from the West to the East; overall, the rise of East Africa, the fascinating economic growth of China – all these factors are leading to this power shift including development of a number of multilateral forums; but the Indian government is not always as vociferous as we expect. By design or by default, there is a lack of information sharing on forums like G-20, IBSA etc. It is understood that in these

forums the expectation from India is quite high as India is not seen just as country, but as a voice representing many other developing countries. There is a need to translate, disseminate and demystify the issues that are discussed in the multilateral forums inside India; this will help in mobilizing players like the media. The CSOs should be entrusted with greater responsibilities to fill these gaps. The CSOs should be engaged in the right kind of research including economic and trade researches related to WTO etc. and put it in the hands of the policy makers. Civil society is not a monolithic entity and divergence of opinion is quite common within civil society but it is important to find out how to work together with a common approach. Some specific questions which become pertinent in this respect are how inter-governmental agencies are viewing the civil society and who controls the multilateral forums?

Harsh Jaitli, CEO, Voluntary Action Network India (VANI) referring to his experiences of G-20 summit held in Paris, France, shared that a delegation of CSO representatives met with the president Nicolas Sarkozy. During the discussion an issue was raised by the CSO representatives that G-20 generally defines growth and development purely in economic sense and why don't you use human rights, democracy etc. for that? Sarkozy replied that we are interested to incorporate these but India and China may have an objection to this. He also shared his experiences about poor coordination and response of the Indian delegation participating in the summit with the civil society representatives and media. He said in case of India's participation in such important events and summits, there is a complete lack of information in the public domain, poor media coverage, no accountability in the Parliament and even no information in the government system except with few officers on key positions in respective ministries. He also shared that there is a very high level of expectation from India in such platforms/forums. In these forums, India is seen as a voice of under-developed and developing countries. But India is

not able to meet these expectations. So the question is how can we make our government accountable to various positions that they take in the international fora? How we can ask them to make information available in the public domain? If we fail to monitor what is happening in G-20, it will also become a purely inter-governmental agency.

Referring to the experiences of the recently held civil society conventions in VANI, he said Indian civil society was also not able to connect to itself with such issues. This is because we are not being able to articulate that what impact the conversations in G-20, BRICS etc. would have on grass-root organizations or marginalized people in the country. This gap has to be filled and civil society should closely watch what is happening inside these forums and we must translate, demystify and disseminate those issues/ information in our country so that we can mobilize people, voluntary organizations, media and members of Parliament to ask the questions in the Parliament. We also need to think of bringing out position papers in different areas on the basis of experiences and learning's within the country as a continuous process. We also need to think of tracking G-20 not only as an event but as a continuous platform for engagement.

Kaustuv K. Bandyopadhyay, Director, PRIA, talked about the engagement of civil society with BRICS. He said that the Civil Society-BRICS engagement initiative undertaken by PRIA is not yet a full-scale official engagement with BRICS but still an effort to find out what is happening in BRICS. BRICS as a multilateral entity has an ambitious agenda. It has the potential to significantly change the established norms and practices of international development and cooperation, which is largely established by the OECD/DAC. It has the potential to change the architecture of global governance institutions like the World Bank, IMF, and World Trade Organisation etc. In addition, as the Indian government intends to spend a significant amount of resources in other developing

countries it is pertinent to ask questions like ‘how are these decisions taken? What values and norms would guide such decision-making?’ Information on these is available in a very limited manner. There is a need for the CSOs to engage with BRICS in a more constructive manner. Need to inform the local CSOs and to consult with CSOs and academics in other BRICS countries, thereby bringing these actors together to understand and form a uniform position, wherever possible. BRICS summits have talked about broadening cooperation between the BRICS countries beyond the respective governments to include people to people cooperation through sports, cultural exchanges etc. The BRICS academic forum has been formalized through the ‘BRICS Think Tank Council’. But there has been a conspicuous absence of civil society from the whole process. In the consultations organized under the BRICS-Civil Society engagement initiative it has been decided that civil society should engage with BRICS on its own terms to know more about how things move within BRICS. Under this initiative, there have been interactions with the BRICS officials in China and Brazil who have responded positively so far as engagement with civil society is concerned. There is a need to brainstorm on what will be the value-addition of civil society in BRICS. It is important to bring forth the contribution of civil society through dialogues and talks. Civil society interventions in the last few decades in India have successfully shaped many social policies, be it in the sector of health, education and so on. It is important to acknowledge civil society contributions in innovation and applications of development methodologies particularly in the context of local diversities. There is also an additional dilemma for civil society to engage with foreign policies or even to encourage the government to spend money outside the country because the country itself is characterized by a huge list of domestic problems, which also simultaneously needs to be addressed. It is very urgent to create/generate an information hub through which information on BRICS-related development could be accessed. Also, there is no

information on what is actually happening in the BRICS Bank. Even the Durban Summit could not provide any coherent articulation on this. It is not easy to establish credibility in the eyes of the government; demonstrating the credibility of civil society and educating the government on the contribution of civil society in an ongoing basis is very crucial. There is a need to foster dialogues between civil society and BRICS policy makers. Also, there is a need to foster dialogues between the domestic and the international civil society so as the former could take lead in engaging with the BRICS policy makers. The governments in China and Russia are often critical about the non-BRICS international civil society engaging in the BRICS process. We need to engage more with academic community as many of them have official access to BRICS by which they can bring relevant information. Thus, engaging with the academic community needs to be done in a more concretized way.

R. Iniyan Ilango, coordinator, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative spoke about their work in IBSA. They were looking at the political coordination between three IBSA countries. He said that the business angle is more prominent in IBSA meetings as compared to other issues. And this is the common concern for all of us. Referring to the IBSA Trust fund, he said though it is a small fund there is not much information on how that money is spent and how the projects are decided? He said this money is given to UNDP for execution but the information is also not available on the UNDP website. Summarizing his experiences he said that there is a need for democratic values and ideals to become stronger. He said IBSA has a lower profile and after BRICS there is a big debate on whether IBSA is still relevant or not. Referring to the Brazil experiences, he said there is an opportunity for civil society to learn from civil societies in other two countries especially on the issue of engaging with government on foreign policy issues.

During the deliberations it is strongly felt by the participants that there is a need for the CSO to engage in these forums in a constructive manner. Hence, it is important to constantly engage in dialogues with the civil society of the other BRICS countries, as well as the BRICS policy makers so as to bring forth the civil society contributions in all these countries. Also, engagement with the academic community can prove to be crucial as they have official access to BRICS and can bring relevant information.

The challenge is how to mobilize civil society partners for such global development platforms. Panellists suggested creating an information hub. It was also suggested that a meeting of civil society on foreign policy should be coordinated. Capacity building programme for civil society on diplomacy was also necessary. Probably before sending representatives to the international forums from civil society, there is a need to conduct pre-summit meetings focusing on what should be the approach of civil society in such forums. There is also a need to build the capacity of Ministry of External Affairs to influence other ministries.

Questions were also raised on how to engage parliamentarians and media in such processes. Civil society could also prepare/give an agenda for discussion in such forums. The platform available in the form of parliamentary standing committees should be explored. It was strongly advocated that the process be institutionalized so that even if people in the ministry change, the dialogue continues.

4. Approaches and Mechanisms for Broad-Based Cooperation between Indian Civil Society and DPA

The session on 'Approaches and Modalities of Broad-based Cooperation between Indian Civil Society and DPA' discussed India's presence in the area of development assistance.

Kumar Tuhin, joint secretary, DPA, provided information related to the functioning of DPA and its role in development assistance. He shared that DPA was established in early 2012 to increase the efficiency in Government of India's interventions



abroad. It has been designed as the implementing arm of MEA. DPA has three divisions: Division 1 manages lines of credits as well as grant projects going to the African countries. Division 2 is the nodal department for managing capacity-building programmes and disaster relief as well as grant projects in Latin America, Eurasia, and South East Asia and so on. Division 3 deals with grants projects in the neighbourhood countries. In the past one year, DPA has tried to put some procedures in place and has developed capacities of the government staff. Since a large number of grant projects are handled by DPA, it is not fully-equipped at the moment to handle everything effectively. Hence, there is a need to hire consultants or skilled people (which can also be from the civil society). He mentioned that given the existence of a strong and vibrant civil society in India, with some of them having experiences of working in abroad as well, there is a sufficiently large opportunity to learn from the civil society as well as to share the DPA views. Overall, it is important to initiate a dialogue on development policy between DPA and the Indian civil society. While talking about approaches and modalities, he recalled the meeting organized by RIS in 15 January 2013 following which FIDC was constituted. He said that only through participation in more and more meetings and workshops will it be possible for DPA to identify civil society skills or gather information on civil society activities in India. He felt these seminars

can not only come up with a lot of case studies representing the work of the civil society, but also be apt platforms to discuss South-South cooperation and development effectiveness in the post-2015 times. Overall, he said modalities can also grow based on the manner in which mutual conversations between DPA and civil society are handled in the coming few months, which is going to be very crucial.

On the issue of South-South cooperation, Sachin Chaturvedi, research fellow, RIS said it is not aid. It has five features: grants, technology transfer, trade, lines of credit and investment. India was the first country in the world in 2008 to announce a quota-free trade to least developing countries. It was stressed that the North needs to learn from the features of South-South cooperation, which is real partnership for development. How can we make a new framework of global partnership? Is Indian civil society willing to develop its own indicators for South-South cooperation?

Following this detailed session on the mandate, functioning and possible collaboration of DPA with the civil society, Rajesh Tandon mentioned that in a seminar organized by DPA and RIS in April 2013 the idea to prepare profiles of Indian NGOs working outside India was mooted. This can act as a knowledge bank so that all information relating to the same could be clubbed, articulated and made available to DPA on civil society in a hassle-free manner.

Jagadananda, information commissioner, Odisha State Information Commission shared that DPA is new and looking for ideas and programmes. Since India can be considered as the future power centre, so it is important to reengineer and reorganize the missing bits. India's presence in global processes, its innovation, values, experiences, argumentative minds – all these are the country's assets. Similarly, civil society in India is quite matured and has demonstrated skills in redressing complex issues of poverty and under-development. He felt that DPA and the government of India should recognize the value of

a strong and vibrant civil society existing in India at the moment. The need for capacity building, more so South-South capacity building, has been well addressed by the Indian CSOs to understand and learn social accountability, participatory mechanisms and so on. CSOs are also taking part in global processes through various global platforms. He felt that at present the Indian civil society is capable enough to multiply its activities inside and even outside the country.

This is very positive. Quoting South-South capacity building efforts through the International Forum on Capacity Building processes, CIVICUS, SAARC Poverty Commission etc., he said civil society in India is very mature and has demonstrated its capacities. India's self-help group model is a leader in the world and many Latin American countries would like to emulate it. On water and sanitation, CSO models for activating local government has demonstrated substantial engagement between government and CSOs and it is possible to replicate this elsewhere. Civil society could engage in a watchdog role; but it needs to become actors, collaborators and engage with the government. In the current setup, the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act and Income Tax laws do not support this. Indian CSOs should be able to participate in DPA's call for proposals. He also felt that domestic research needs to be conducted regarding South-South cooperation, apart from dialogues which should be continued and converted into programmatic plan of action in the approaching months. Civil society could support DPA by providing information and capacity building on specific experiences throughout the country. A mechanism to share the information through networks needs to be created. This may directly meet the demand as well as become a mechanism to articulate that demand.

Participants also argued that there is a split within civil society in the country. Though civil society is gaining maturity, there is also confusion about the stands being taken. Probably we need to go

beyond instrumentalities of engagement and showcase the work of the Indian civil society which has addressed complex societal problems



and created a deep-rooted impact. At the global level, it is not only the instruments of engagement but also the ethos of development that is important. It was strongly advocated that civil society needs to deploy its 'values'. The trust on civil society needs to be institutionalized. Civil society in India simultaneously needs to go beyond the system of contracting and service delivery, needs to redefine the spirit of partnership and needs to be viewed as agencies to be invested in.

A major argument which emerged from the discussion was the issue of changing the legal framework. How it will enable Indian CSOs to work outside in a legitimate way; probably civil society needs to work with DPA in this regard.

In general, it was discussed that at the global levels, there is a lack of coordination between the government and civil society and whether this gap could be addressed through interactions with DPA. Probably, there is a need to project the relationship between the government and the voluntary organizations at least at global scale in those countries which are in the government's priority list. On the other hand, in the government delegations outside India, possibilities to include a component of the development sector alongside the industrial sector could make a major difference in setting government's priorities at the global stage. Furthermore, institutional

cooperation between civil societies in India and other countries facilitated by the government can also prove to be crucial. It is also drawn from the discussion that CSOs could support DPA by providing information and capacity building on the specific experiences throughout the country through periodic structured discussions. At the same time, it is important for DPA to understand the concerns of Indian CSOs. DPA should also engage civil society experiences related to community-based projects. A mechanism to share the information through networks needs to be created. These may be directly meeting the demand as well as mechanisms to articulate that demand in a structured manner.

In the last session on exploring supportive mechanisms for engagements of civil society, Rajesh Tandon, president, PRIA, kicked off the discussion by posing a question what Indian civil society can do collectively?

Mini Bedi, executive director, Development Support Team, said that India has a long history of civil societies' role and contribution to the development. But, internationally, India has been on the receiving end for long. She said if aid comes without people's participation it is meaningless. It is very important to remind policy makers that whatever aid is coming should have to be meaningful to people and timely. If this has to be meaningful, civil society needs to come forward and makes this process sustainable. It is important for the civil society to find out alternative strategies which should evolve from the demand side. She gave many examples like the Karnataka model of sheep breeding to remind everyone of the role of civil society in meaningful utilization of aid with participation of beneficiaries.

Nafisa Barot, executive trustee, Utthan, while addressing the issues of civil society engagement raised very pertinent questions. She asked if there is any common vision between the government and civil society. Can there be scope of evolving a common vision? This is needed mainly because in

the absence of a common vision, it will be extremely difficult to arrive in any coherent articulation of issues. Thus, it is crucial to have a common vision, strategy and joint monitoring mechanisms to see how the partnership between government and civil society is evolving. She also questioned what the implications international interventions for civil society were? She said there is a need for civil society to prepare itself regarding how to intervene at a global platform and there is also a need to make civil society understand the micro-macro linkages. This requires greater consultation, orientation and understanding. There has to be a linkage between what civil society is doing inside India and what it has been doing outside the country. This organic link is very important for change. Again, it is important to analyse whether we are looking towards the cooperation for economic benefit or just to strike a change. How do we understand the demand and from where is it coming? It is important to understand this as alternative strategies should evolve from demand. To get few people as potential leaders and train them, so that they can take Indian the CS forward in the international arena. We need to identify proper networks from among the existing pool. Priorities will differ so far as national, intermediary and community level subsets of organizations are concerned.

Subrat Das, executive director, Centre for Budget and Governance Analysis (CBGA) shared that they are doing research in a way that provokes discussion around the issues in public discourse. He said that government's attitude towards civil society needs to be addressed and legislations like FCRA need to be discussed. With regard to India's development partnership agenda, there should be some institutional mechanisms for sharing and dissemination of information about what the government is engaging with? What's in their agenda? What kind of issues are they addressing? And there should also be some institutional mechanism for participation by civil society in those efforts. Also, the role civil societies can play

in capacity building efforts has to be highlighted. He mainly focused on how the Indian civil society is likely to respond to these opportunities of engagement. When we look at the international NGOs, CBOs and people's movements, their priorities are going to differ in this particular area. We also have to keep in mind whether we will be able to influence their priorities, whether they would pay more attention to these issues of India's development partnership globally, also the extent of awareness and sensitisation about these things. And in this context maybe we can make a distinction between the two subsets- one is India's development aid or assistance to other countries and the other is India's role in forums like G-20, BRICS and IBSA. He said, with regard to the first one I am not be very optimistic about being able to influence the priorities of Indian civil society right away. He further added that no one had understood the lines of credit adequately. So one needs to understand the implications of the lines of credit better to figure out what one is going to convey to the larger civil society. But the second area of India's role in global development discourse may appeal to Indian civil society more. Referring to the points on the agendas of G-20, BRICS and IBSA he said several of these were relevant to the work of civil society in India. These agendas include, enhancing food security and addressing price volatility on the G-20 agenda; climate change and sustainable development on all these forums; and addressing unemployment, social protection policies, fight against corruption, reforming international financial architecture, millennium development goals, South-South cooperation. These issues are not only important but are also much easier to use as tools to convince our civil society partners that their engagement on these issues in global policy discourses can reinforce their policy advocacy efforts within the country at the national level. The importance relevant policies must be in place if we expect the support mechanisms to create opportunities for sharing of knowledge and experiences between state and non-state actors from developing countries on relevant issues like

inequality, urban poverty, local governance or domestic resource mobilization. So, in our efforts we need to keep in mind both, what we should expect from the government in terms of support mechanisms and what appeals to Indian civil society more in the near future and last, what are the issues on which we need to develop our own understanding?

During the deliberations, a major argument that came up was to keep alive the consultative mechanisms through platforms like workshops, seminars etc., in order to ensure information dissemination in good time as well as creation of a space for the civil society representatives to come and exchange ideas and views. At the same time, civil society needs to prepare itself so as to properly intervene in global forums and to understand more minutely the micro-macro linkages. In the process, few leaders of civil society could be identified and trained so that they can further take this forward effectively.

Furthermore, it should be recognized that aid is an instrument of real politics and is not just altruistic in nature. Probably, there is a need to find out what India's vision of giving aid is and what values India is following in this respect. There is a need to have a common vision between CSOs and government. A joint monitoring mechanism need to be evolved. What we are doing domestically must be linked to our work outside India. Technology transfer needs to be interrogated and the process of endogenous problem solving needs to be promoted. There should be some institutional mechanism to disseminate the government's agenda. There is a strong need to understand India's role on global forums. Only then it would be easy for us to convince our civil society partners for future engagement. There is a need to create

opportunities for sharing of knowledge. It is very important to keep in mind that what civil society should expect from the government and what are the interests of the civil society. An idea was mooted to use the forthcoming IBSA Summit to be held in India as a larger platform to initiate a discussion on how to engage civil society in India, Brazil and South Africa through IBSA.

The workshop concludes with the agreement on the following broad agenda for future:

- Dialogue with MEA to jointly define the vision of India's development policy.
- Modalities, mechanisms for institutionalization of such dialogue processes with civil society.
- Creating mechanisms for sharing of information and inform civil society on the same.
- Mechanisms for rigorous assessment and review of India's development partnership programmes.

Overall, it was clear from the discussions that there is a need for a collaborative and critical engagement with the Indian government on the part of the civil society so far as India's global development presence is concerned. The possibility to form a joint review mission to review not only the existing bilateral policies but also to articulate the expected impact of India's global presence should be explored. On the whole, it was stressed that the leading CSOs in India should come forward and demand engagement with the government not only through the understanding of the Ministry of External Affairs, but also probably by using the values and principles which the civil society in India has been championing for decades.

PROGRAMME

Time	Sessions
09.15 a.m. to 09.45 a.m.	: Registration
09.45 a.m. to 10.00 a.m.	: Welcome Note and Background of the Workshop - Rajesh Tandon, President, PRIA
10.00 a.m. to 11.00 a.m.	: Session 1: India's Global Development Presence: An Overview Chair: Ashok Khosla, President, Development Alternatives, New Delhi Speakers: - Biswajit Dhar, Director General, Research and Information System for Developing Countries, New Delhi - Bibek Debroy, Research Professor, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi Open Discussion
11.00 a.m. to 11.20 a.m.	: Tea/Coffee Break
11.20 a.m. to 01.00 p.m.	: Session 2: Approaches and Modalities of Broad-based Cooperation between Indian Civil Society and Development Partnership Administration, Ministry of External Affairs, Govt. of India Chair: Rajesh Tandon, President, PRIA Speakers: - Kumar Tuhin, Joint Secretary, Development Partnership Administration, Ministry of External Affairs, Govt. of India - Sachin Chaturvedi, Research Fellow, Research and Information System for Developing Countries, New Delhi Discussant: - Jagadananda, Information Commissioner, Odisha State Information Commission, Bhubaneswar Open Discussion
01.00 p.m. to 02.00 p.m.	: Lunch
02.00 p.m. to 03.30 p.m.	: Session 3: Experience of Indian Civil Society Engagements in G-20, IBSA, BRICS and Other Multi-lateral Fora Chair: George Mathew, Chairman, Institute of Social Science, New Delhi Discussants: - Harsh Jaitli, Chief Executive Officer, Voluntary Action Network India, New Delhi

- Pradeep Mehta, Secretary General, CUTS International, Jaipur
- R. Iniyan Ilango, Coordinator, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi
- Kaustuv K Bandyopadhyay, Director, PRIA, New Delhi

Open Discussion

03.30 p.m. to 03.50 p.m. : ***Tea/Coffee Break***

03.50 p.m. to 04.50 p.m. : ***Session 4: Supportive Mechanisms for On-going and Critical Engagements of Indian Civil Society Organisations with India's Global Influence in Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral Fora***

Chair: Rajesh Tandon, President, PRIA

Discussants:

- Mini Bedi, Executive Director, Development Support Team, Pune
- Nafisa Barot, Executive Trustee, Utthan, Ahmedabad
- Subrat Das, Executive Director, Centre for Budget and Governance Analysis, New Delhi

Open Discussion

04.50 p.m. to 05.00 p.m. : **Summary and Closure**

List of Participants

Sl. No.	Name	E-mail
1	Alka Tomar, Director- CMS Environment , Centre for Media Studies, New Delhi	alka@cmsindia.org; info@cmsindia.org
2	Alok Pandey, Sr Programme Manager, PRIA, New Delhi	alok.pandey@pria.org
3	Amit Kumar, Gorakhpur Environmental Action Group, Gorakhpur	geag@geagindia.org ; amitxiss@rediffmail.com ; ucei@geagindia.org ; geag@vsnl.com
4	Anshuman Karol, Asst Programme Manager, PRIA, New Delhi	anshuman.karol@pria.org
5	Anuradha Chenoy, Professor, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi	chenoy@gmail.com
6	Ashok Khosla, President, Development Alternatives, New Delhi	akhosla@devalt.org ; akhosla@gmail.com
7	Benny Kuruvilla, Action Aid India, New Delhi	Benny.Kuruvilla@actionaid.org
8	Bibek Debroy, Research Professor, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi	bdebroy@gmail.com
9	Binoy Acharya, Executive Director, Unnati, Ahmedabad	binoyacharya@unnati.org ; binoyacharya@gmail.com
10	Biswajit Dhar, Director General, Research and Information System for Developing Countries New Delhi	biswajit@ris.org.in
11	Chandra Bhushan, Deputy Director General, Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi	chandra@cseindia.org
12	D.K. Manavalan, Executive Director, AFPRO (Action For Food Production), New Delhi	ed@afpro.org
13	Debika Goswami, Programme Officer, PRIA, New Delhi	debika.goswami@pria.org
14	Dimple Tresa, Research Associate, Centre for Women's Development Studies, New Delhi	dimple@cwds.ac.in
15	George Mathew, Chairman, Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi	gemathew@yahoo.co.in ; sapna@issin.org
16	Harsh Jaitli, Chief Executive Officer, Voluntary Action Network India, New Delhi	harsh@vaniindia.org ; info@vaniindia.org
17	Jagadananda, Information Commissioner, Odisha Information Commission, Bhubaneswar	jagadaj@gmail.com ; odishasoochana@nic.in
18	Kalamani, APMAS, Hyderabad	info@apmas.org ; kalamani@apmas.org ;
19	Kaustuv Kanti Bandyopadhyay, Director, PRIA, New Delhi	Kaustuv.bandyopadhyay@pria.org

20	Khushal Lagdhiyan, Research Associate, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi	-
21	Kshitiz Sharma, CUTS International, Jaipur	ks@cuts.org; cuts@cuts.org
22	Kumar Tuhin, Joint Secretary, DPA, MEA, GOI, New Delhi	jstc@mea.gov.in; jsdpa@mea.gov.in
23	Maja Daruwala, Executive Director, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, New Delhi	director@humanrightsinitiative.org; maja.daruwala@gmail.com
24	Meena Nair, Head, PGRG, Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore	mail@pacindia.org; meena@pacindia.org
25	Mini Bedi, Executive Director, Development Support Team, Pune	dstpune@dataone.in
26	Nafisa Barot, Executive Trustee, Utthan, Ahmedabad	nafisa.utthan@gmail.com; utthan.ahmedabad@gmail.com
27	P K Sahoo, Chairman, Centre for Youth and Social Development, Bhubaneswar	chairman@cysd.org
28	Pallavi Patel, Director, CHETNA, Ahmedabad	chetna456@gmail.com
29	Pradeep Mehta, Secretary General, CUTS International, Jaipur	psm@cuts.org; cuts@cuts.org
30	Pradeep Narayanan, Director - Research and Consultancies, PRAXIS, New Delhi	info@praxisindia.org
31	Pradeepta Nayak, Programme Coordinator, Sampradan - Indian Centre for Philanthropy, New Delhi	info@sampradaan.org ; sicp.pradeepta@gmail.com
32	Pradeep Patra, National Foundation of India, New Delhi	barsha@nfi.org.in
33	Pranay Sinha	PKS846@bham.ac.uk
34	Prashant Prakash, Research Officer, Centre for Budget and Governance Analysis (CBGA), New Delhi	prashant@cbgaindia.org
35	R. Iniyana Ilango, Coordinator, Strategic Initiatives Programme, CHRI, New Delhi	iniyan@humanrightsinitiative.org
36	Rajesh Tandon, President, PRIA, New Delhi	rajesh.tandon@pria.org
37	Rajib Haldar, Associate Director, Child in Need Institute, Kolkata	cini@cinindia.org ; rajib@cinindia.org
38	Ranajit Bhattacharya, ASER Centre, Pratham, New Delhi	info@pratham.org ; ranajit59@gmail.com
39	Rita Sarin, Country Representative, The Hunger Project, New Delhi	rita@thp.org
40	Sachin Chaturvedi, Research Fellow, Research and Information System for Developing Countries New Delhi	sachin@ris.org.in
41	Alok Vyas, CECOEDECON, Jaipur	info@cecoedecon.org.in ; cecoedecon@gmail.com
42	Shalini Yog, Programme Coordinator, Heinrich	Shalini.Yog@in.boell.org

	Boell Foundation, New Delhi	
43	Shree Kant Kumar, Project Director- Setu Africa Project, VimoSEWA, Ahmedabad	shreekant99@gmail.com; vimosale@sewass.org
44	Subrat Das, Executive Director, Centre for Budget and Governance Analysis, New Delhi	subrat@cbgaindia.org
45	Supriya Roychoudhury, Programme Coordinator - India & The World, Oxfam India, New Delhi	Supriya@oxfamindia.org
46	Syed Mazher Hussain, Executive Director, COVA, Hyderabad	covanetwork@gmail.com
47	Vanita Viswanathan, Executive Director, UDYOGINI, New Delhi	vanitaviswanath@udyogini.org
48	Vijay Mahajan, Managing Director, Basix, Hyderabad	vijaymahajan@basixindia.com
49	Anoop Kaul, National Head, Basix, New Delhi	anoop.k@basixindia.com
50	Jyotsna M. Singh, Programme Officer, VANI, New Delhi	jyotsna@vaniindia.org
51	Manisha Piryam, Fellow, ICSSR, New Delhi	priyam.manisha@gmail.com
52	Vibhuti Pandey, Plan India, New Delhi	vibhutipandey@planindia.org
53	Jayanti V. Raman, RIS, New Delhi	-
54	Shashank, RFI, New Delhi	mshashank9@gmail.com