

EXPLORING AMARTYA SEN'S DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK AND THE INDIAN ALLIANCE.

13-16 MAY 2003.

Romi Khosla, Jane Samuels, Nick Hall, Alison Barret, Smita Biswas, Michael Mutter, BK Agarwal, Sheela Patel, Celine D'Cruz, Sundar Burra, A. Jockin, and people from the alliance of SPARC, Mahila Milan and NSDF.

Day 4.
Morning Session.
Sahil
Summation

MD 14

Jane – we've got a general summing up of this week and as we ... I think it might be the other way round might be best. In order to really make sense of what's happening on the introduction to the 7th of July. I think we haven't quite reached our final conclusions from yesterday so it might be to have that session. I am just suggesting that. And then we'll do

Nick – a round up..

Jane – and there's a few more finishing points that we have to discuss.

Sheela – so we start the reflections first.

Jane – I think so.

Romi – well general summing up is reflections also

Sheela – because jane was suggesting something other than that.

Jane – it's reflections but it's also (waiter trips over wires in the background)
Is Jockin coming to this?

Sheela – Jockin will come later, he'll come by about 11.30

Jane – shall we wait and have that session for when he comes then?

Romi – we can split it up and see what you want to do. I think you can discuss the LSE event now. We don't need Jockin for that. And we can summarize, but the reflection is something that we need him.

Sheela – what I felt would be useful for us to do is to do all these things and then ... what do you think about it. that's a better way then he will..

Romi – I think you need to decide who's going for the N...

Nick – well that's part of the planning. Isn't it.

Michael – who, who will go.

Sheela – ok, who else is coming. Let's start with that before we decide who's coming.

Now?

Celine – LSE. To the party.

Sheela – ok, while all these things are happening could I ask all of you what you thought about the structure.

Michael – we want to think about a brief for the film for Janet Boston.

Romi – you can try giving her a brief.

Alison – and the film's just for the .. or it's for other uses?

Michael – other uses as well. Also, Sheela we want to , I mean it's a bit of the summing up. I think we need to think about what we are going to get out of the summing up. And the potential of goo...

Mr Agarwal enters. Greetings.

4.31

Sheela – what I felt, what I quickly wanted to do before we get into the substantive issues is that Celine, Jockin, sunder and I structured these last few days in a particular way, and it produced a sort of ritual of how you would relate to all of us. So it would be useful for us to get a feed back on that. In terms of specifics... (another waiter trips)

5.24 lets start with that so that will settle us down and then we can go.. because I think everybody is still ...

Alison – I think it was the reflection in the afternoon helped the visits the next day and also we were focusing on a different aspect. We weren't looking at how much money we were spending in buildings or the MUTP details. The mechanics of it, it was the debt... which I found very ..

Michael – yes, so it wasn't so much the projects as I think looking more widely at the over all process and outcome of you 20 years work. And that's important. Because to look at the individual project – you get a certain amount of information and understanding but looking at the totality of it, I think is that much more ..

Alison – it was something I remember right from my first visit. It was a sense that what you were doing in terms of CLIFF, or what you were doing in terms of relocations was based on something very fundamental and very valuable that you did this transfer very easily. When you have an analysis of this for the .. which is the visible relocations or buildings or whatever or funds belies in some way the depth of the experience, of the necessity for all that real solid social capital underneath, which is so hard to discuss and it is a danger to just talk about the topic without really understanding that.

Smita _ I think it was very valuable to have the direct interaction with the community because this process is so unique, this community based process that unless you have that, especially outsiders who may not be so much in tune would find it very hard to .. even this morning, it was the interaction with Laxmi for example was still setting off triggers in people's brains. Making them really realize the depth and the denseness of the process.

Nick – isn't that the key to the whole thing. That it's going to .. that direct engagement with the people intimately involved. How much of that do you need in order to go to share the model that is very evident here. That's the big challenge. It's the key challenge. How much of it do you need? Do you need any of it? do you need all of it? in order to be able to then go and share it and replicate it even.

Alison – or even just talk of the value of it.

Nick – How do you explain in words what lies in life work.

Michael – also to tell what's special about it. Because certainly if the things are normal everyday things. it's the way they are focused and the way in which they are utilized.

Alison – on the very practical point, the translation process was excellent. You were doing it both ways and it's valuable even to the people hearing it in English to know that the people are getting the translations back again. It gave a sense of a dialogue very well.

Sheela – actually that in many ways has been a very powerful basis of this whole process. Because if you actually came to the NSDF convention you will see that at any given time there are 4-5 simultaneous translations apart from .. So there is a fact that everybody doesn't know Hindi.. like the south Indian groups don't know Hindi. But if you talk to them in English then they translate into that local language or if somebody is talking in Tamil or Telugu and they do it in Hindi. I think that again is a very interesting thing that we take for granted. Something which we have begun to see as a very valuable output of this commitment to translate and ..

Jan e – it's just – as you have been doing this for some time and been in a position of being able to more recently to share it with a great many people. You've obviously really refined and refined this introduction so that I think we've had the privilege in the sense that to come along at this stage to experience it in a way that you have been able to reveal what you've now come to realize are the key points. And our ... other .. who realize it.. the sort of education, their own education and it seems like what you are up against even from someone like myself must insist that anyone who comes into this situation almost has to have a--- first of all, we'd only been here for what.. three days and it's only yesterday afternoon, I think I really began to get rid of my ideas. Because everyone have their own conceptual feelings or ideas, everyone who you bring here is going to be similar to us in that way. And they are wearing their own lenses. And it takes that sort of time to get to polish them down. And then you really begin to realize why you've gone through these step by step. It's like an introduction to an introduction, to an introduction. And I suppose the key thing for people not visiting, who are coming so fresh is to have that patience to listen to the whole story and to realize it's something you actually have to listen to. It's not anything you can .. read about in a book. Because it is so much in the oral tradition. That's what you are really challenged... by a whole way of sharing what you've done is to make observable something that really is experiential. So I think it's worked extremely well from that point of view.

Sheela – but also as you talk about this whole thing it's also the challenge of doing something which is most powerful in it's oral format in an environment which is dominated by the written word or by conceptual extrapolation. That's also part of what is.. the other thing for me which came out in our discussion in the morning was that – two things which for me were interesting in our breakfast

discussion. One was – Nick was saying that for the last 8 to 10 years he's been hearing about this process as close association with very many people who are involved in it. but has felt very excluded, as not being able to experience that and that's a feeling that lot of people have about this whole thing. somehow we are not able to communicate both our inability to deal with more than what we are doing right now and on the other hand find some other way to share this. We don't know any other way of sharing this experience for making it really .. that really is a challenge.

Nick –that could be something to do with me, uniquely rather than a lot of other people..

Sheela – No, but lot of other people have been saying that

Nick – I mean one aspect of that is, I do know the value of Horizontal exchanges because I have seen the value of that happening. I organized exchanges between different groups of Kenyans, in really different context in 1991 and so I have seen that enormous value of horizontal learning side of things. and I guess a lot of people would have done in other contexts. Plainly unrelated to SPARC or to urban slums. This was between rural ... and so

Rome – I think to a certain extent you have a judgment that you want to make. **Because you have a very big film and you have to show the trailer, essentially. And the package that you select is determined by what you think the other people are expecting to see and then there are certain kind of lets' say, event, which you include which is community interaction, discussion about the institution at one level and then a walk around. You are transferring the information of what you are doing through three of four events. 15.16 which tend to get repeated because they work alright and for the first time people experience it. I think what happens it that – what is missing in this package and what we were able to probe is that there is a deeper level of information. And that you can't see with the trailer.** Not with this trailer, it's not only sixth sense but suddenly you know.. any trailer. You realize there shouldn't be a feeling that .. **I think we shouldn't go back with the feeling that we saw the film. We shouldn't go back with the feeling that we saw the film. There may be a tendency for a lot of people to do that.** And that somewhat needs to be addressed. Saying, listen, you are not initiated here. There's only some words and phrases that we can exchange. Actually deep down there is a huge other part that will require from you sacrifices. You come and you spend the time, you learn the language, and we can show you... but it.. you know you tend to move and you tend to make a package, very simple package out of this very complex issue. At the international forum this will be coming like a very well defined package. Actually it's just the.. it's not..

Nick – it's always the case in any sort of dialogue that you never get a full understanding of where somebody else is feeling or doing or that the years of work that you've put into this, you couldn't in any way explain all of that in a way that you felt entirely confident that the other person, whoever they were, however sympathetic they were. But everything is always a trailer in that respect.

Rome – you see there's a danger there, one becomes reductionism and one ends up discussing only the trailer. In the forum etc. this is bound to happen simply because let's say that --- lets' take the role of SPARC. By the time we discuss this and see this SPARC is the interface between the institutions and the Federation. We don't go beyond that. We don't actually go beyond that. In fact SPARC is not that. It's just one end of SPARC. Similarly with the federation. The federation, we

also tend to think in terms of – it's a representative of slum dwellers. Here we've suddenly begin to probe at one very critical issue of how the members relate to the federation or the federation.. which is lying hidden. We are almost in a situation of saying – all the rest of it doesn't matter, this is so crucial. That the whole collective is .. we can believe in the idea of the collective because you know collectives are – again, when you say collective, it triggers off certain familiar notions of what a collective and we leave it at that.

18.32 But in fact what we are turning around to say suddenly at the end of this workshop is – forget the collective. This is what is happening and that is the .. this is the collective. It is not people sitting around and leaders sitting around and debating in the federation process. What I am saying is that I would like to see more that the visitors get a feeling that they are not ... really they haven't been able to see nothing yet. And that they would need much more effort.

Sheela – the way I would like to interpret what Rome has been saying is from this point of view – that very often, and I am not saying about this group, but very often we have people who come and spend a day and I have met them couple of years later and they say –'oh, I know everything about you, you know I was there that time.' I think he is addressing that element. And the reality is that most experiential learning is a long term process in which people have to make investments. And I think that at a meta level we have to unpackaged that process of learning, saying that just as if I come and attend one session of somebody's lecture doesn't mean that I understand everything that that institution – just as if I went to an academic institution and attended one day I could hardly say that now I know everything that that institution does.

Michael – One would normally feel 'oh I've now moved...

Sheela - .. now I know everything about this process. So I think somewhere along the line I think there is a need, specially when there's a need to use experiences, to develop insights and to transfer those things, then the kind of investments that we are saying people need to remake are those that have happened. And in may ways if you take you Alison, or you Michael, or you take many of the people who have made a long term commitment to understand Shack Dwellers International, you are doing that, you keep coming back and you keep unpeeling layers and going deeper into the process knowing that at any one time you are not going to get everything. Neither are we capable of giving everything at one time because we don't have a pill. I think that's how I'd like to do that.

Sunder – In fact – coming back to what Romi was saying – by way of selection of what to do and see these three days or talk about one area that we have completely left out, whether by design or default, I don't know, is the whole question of the relationship with the State. And very often when we get visitors we also take people to meet the State people and let them have an.. so that both at the level of –how do we imagine the State and what are the practical ways in which that whole part of that partnership that has been left out.

Michael – but, when Gautam's here it was easier to have that interaction.

Celine – we could do it with so many.

Sunder – but there are others.

Michael – maybe he invested his time..

Alison – but it was actually designed for this particular issue and in another visit you will see all of that level of stuff. we saw all that dialogue and you have that, we met all the different government people and you saw all the relocation processes. But they have no understanding of what's underneath that at all. They didn't see any of the stuff that Romi is saying by the third day or Jane is saying – by the third day we really started to understand. It's a different focus and it's a challenge because that last bit that I feel we're starting to understand is so fundamental. The others are meaningless without it.

Jane – there's also this situation that we are particularly probing into areas, and that's what we are doing as unveiling to a certain extent. So even revealing to the people who are here how to make observable particular areas, that maybe haven't been in focus before. So to an extent we are seeing areas that maybe other people would normally see anyway. But I think that's not the whole process isn't it. As it becomes more clear what it is that people, if you by what Romi is saying that people shouldn't go away thinking that they've seen everything. Somehow once you are clear what it is they haven't seen, you can begin to suggest or know what those key areas are and how to go about introducing it to people in different ways, when it's appropriate, when it's necessary, you don't want to reveal everything to everybody anyway.

Romi – I don't think you reveal but you tend to put forward the easily observable things. which are not necessarily the important things. **if you have a whole phenomena of activity going on, some parts of that activity are not easily observable but they may be very important.** I think probable you may tend to make the easily observable presented. Present what is easily observable. And we are saying actually that – in any case, not for the sake of your transfer of knowledge etc to other people, but we are saying in any case, how do we make some of this other stuff observable? And how do we transfer that into knowledge, rather than just practice. Just a diffuse and a kind of unformed ... how do we make those things observable.

I think that's interesting because probable is we say that – we went round today, round the collection and the lets say that although it's not just observing the collection but suddenly it was like asking the questions from these people. You are making observable something that hasn't been actually observable. Somebody from outside is coming and asking some questions to try and understand, but it's not recording it as an experience with them. They have observed something which was not normally observable and may not be normally in your package. And similarly the evening meeting that takes place with the collectors etc. that's not a observable process, but it's such a critical process. And then what we were discussing with Jockin that – I mean, can it be made observable. It shouldn't be probed. It should be made observable by the community itself, to what it chooses to make observable. Basically. So that it's there, but it's not interfering. I think those are some of the areas that one could try and talk about.

Smita – 25.52. I think it's really valuable and of course it depends on what level of investment the visitors is also willing to make and also what level you think is worth making, but one tool that I have seen is really effective is like this exposure and dialogue program where people – usually policy makers but it can be any level of people who really want to understand, will spend like 49 hours, you have a host woman from the community and he will live with her and do everything she does, I am sure you guys have seen it, you know World Bank has ... whatever you want to call it. but there's a lot of things. I agree, people laugh, there's a lot of negative publicity about it. but it can be a very powerful tool I think if it is facilitated quite strongly and if there is a period beforehand where

you have discussions about issues and then you have a major reflection after as well, with the thing. Celine is looking extremely cynical but I think it can have a lot of value. It can change people. Specially policy makers.

Celine – I think yesterday Romi said something which I am not able to articulate but it's this business of – how do you find the balance between keeping the oral as oral and writing what needs to be written and separating the two because everything that's oral can not be written. And we are all the time facing the challenge of wanting to take everything and put it together and write it and freeze it and we are not able to do that for the external world.

Michael – but you are..

Jane – I think this is the ..maybe there is way

Celine - .. all the nuances don't come in a report or in a write up.

Jane – I think this was what I found most fascinating about yesterday's session. I think anyone who is looking at this particular issue would – I mean the sheer quantity of information that was really coming about in each household and nothing was written down at all and yet, decision, very subtle decisions were being made at every step of the way that effected not just today but how some people related over the next three days, the five days. had to do with ... oh, so many different issues, whether rehabilitation or loan issues or ... the loans varied across all the different fields of experience. Whether it be education or just work or all the different things that affect aspects of life. And yet one person was just holding all this information. All that was being written down was a few number according to how many rupees, and in rupees was the whole history of every family. This is what needs to be made observable. But not maybe necessarily written down, as evaluators might evaluate or something. And I think this is maybe what you are saying – how you could begin to organize just how much is actually being done in each of these collection of each of these rupees. It is a wide spectrum of life.

Sheela – for me, this brings in the paradox of choice and control. **Very very strong in the whole process of Mahila Milan NSDF and our relationship is – who needs to know what to do what.** and what happens is that when we have external people, specially with whom we have a financial, transactional relationship there is this obsession that all that be written. That all that be written. To give you a very interesting example. We have decided in our interaction that SPARC will only be involved in the documentation of the externally taken loan because it requires monitoring and assessment that has some external accountability. And that SPARC will take on to do the documentation of those Mahila Milan groups who want us to do computerization of their internal savings and loan processes. But that we will not sit and do the documentation of 400,000 households doing itsy-bitsy savings everyday. Because we believe that there is no need to do that. That is our internal assessment. But when we have external people, they want – create a data base, every family, what is happening... and my whole point is – what are you going to do with all that? What the process is doing is making sure that the people who have to be involved in supporting those households have that data. And they are able to communicate that with the next lot of people who need to know it. writing all that information is going to get you nowhere. But there is such an obsession that capturing all that data – so that at some point, somebody will analyze it to produce something is..

Jane – what I think what we have been trying to – if you think of it from Sen's point of view, individual is the agent of change – this because of course as we

were going around today, that's what I was thinking. If you saw this in terms of every single time as she collected a rupee from somebody or somebody had to borrow it or there was another baby that was just born three weeks ago and this woman had already gone off to work and the .. was still there or... the issues, I couldn't even keep track of them all, because they were so many and she was saying – well I've known these people for 20 years, I don't even have to think about it. they were like a family practically. But every single rupee was actually from my point of view – removing some unfreedom of some sort. Making these people more capable of, capability if doing what it is they needed to do to sort of get to where they wanted to be in their life and it didn't matter whether they had the most temporary of shelters. And we saw that whole specter of people who had the most temporary. All the ones who had been there for maybe (I don't know how many years) one woman had been there 20 years. We saw, you see it. But this system seems to work equally across for both. And each is treated absolutely equally. This is what I found so stunning about this situation. So each time if you come along, if you have to begin to, you don't have to write everything down say. But .. were beginning to see that this person is now allowed to do this in their lives. He needed to buy something, he sells vegetables and he needed some loan to get this business going. Now this woman needed a loan .. she makes meals everyday at this shop. So she got her money to do this or this woman is doing milk, but their business is not doing so well at the moment. Each time you got a different story about what their whole life style was and what was necessary to make it work or not. you could begin to see how you are freeing them, whether it be from economic issues or health issues or education issues. Maybe there was this one family where selling, they had to move, they had been there for 15years. The woman who was head of the federation, and now she has just got a kind of lean to with her three children. I find that shocking that she was head of the Federation yet she seemed to have the most temporary of houses.

Sheela – median..

Michael – the point is Jane, these people know all of those things to ...

Jane – so it's a community, because I am trying..

Michael – no, no no. yes, but the point is all of those things are perfectly understood by the people themselves. It's just that we are coming to understand this.

Jane – yes, so,..

Michael – so what?

Jane _ it's creating a method, but you know this way of showing what's actually allowing these people – you don't have to be writing down everything that is happening, but what's actually significantly improving their lives in particular ways and ..

Michael – in order to impart the knowledge to other people.

Jane – yes, exactly.

Michael – If you want to , you could characterize the C 3 model in about 6 words. Or you could do it in three days, as we've done or you could do it in all the years that you and Celine have worked on it. you could do it in a set of principles and each would be valid in their own right. You've shown the text of the sort of experience you can get by spending a morning with one woman. I mean, there

are some rules and procedures. No politics, secular, daily savings and rigorous recording. Three key rules, six words. Finished. You can characterize it if you want. Or you can characterize it in those principles. I mean – subsidiarity means that only people who need to now, need to record. That's another way.. there are different levels at which you can characterize according to the need to present that information.

Romi – I think to some extent there's a development process going on that is undocumented. I think you'll always get the theory of change-wallas coming in various specs, looking at that phenomena from this prism and that prism.. From this theory from that theory. I think that's like an occupational hazard. Every time you cross the street this is the traffic you are going to encounter. they can come at you...

Michael – they drive on the right here up a one way street, it's unexpected.
Romi – I think if we look at it as an occupational hazard and we say that – it's alright, there's a development process going on and we are the Sen-wallas. We have come with this new basket, then you get livelihood-wallas will come. They are selling a different mango. And then millennium goal-walla and so on. All come and then all you do is, you say – ok, now these guys are wearing this colored spectacles, we just give them this *pudi* (packet) because they are happy with it.

Smita – but I think, why not? People have different needs in their lives.

Alison – it's also an issue, linking it up with visiting NGO's we were talking about earlier, that they go away and they think they know all about it. I think there maybe is some work, or maybe useful to look at what assumptions they go away with when they think they understand it. I just remember you saying something about – the survey process is not extractive. It is a very nice, neat phrase and we perhaps understand what that.. the survey process, the door numbering, and the enumeration is not extractive. We get the slum dwellers do it themselves. Now someone visiting from an NGO will hear that it might go in one ear and out the other or it might lodge in and they'll say – what does that mean? What's the value of that. But that's just the symptom almost the whole way in which you operate. But that's absolutely vital in a process which in Lucknow they might do in a – well, we'll shortcut it slightly and we'll do it in a different way. And not realize the real value. So another visit, there may be a need to .. or maybe you do it any way but – you really focus on the issues where there is a risk that they really don't see the real essence of that and the value of that in their replication and their mimicking of it. And I think that's where it breaks down, the sharing. And even this issue about whether they are paid or not. that came. She talked a lot about, that Laxmi and whether your collectors are paid. That's a minor thing. Oh well, we've got money so we'll pay them, but actually that totally undermines the whole methodology.

Michael – I think what is important for us for the 7th of July is – just to be able to reflect on what is the most important things from the experience here that can be of the greatest benefit to the rest of the World.

Sheela – so can we then move from this to this. which is basically summing up. So what do we want to sum up. What of all these and more of these..

Michael – in a way it's deciding on what needs to go on the trailer.

Romi – also I think .. the 7th of July is saying that – this is how the Sen-wallas saw.

Michael – so what we've heard this morning is that it forces recourses or you tune the things to the audience, whether you are sen-walla or a MDG-walla and now we've got a group now as LAC-wallas, so what are we going to do ...

Sheela – horses for courses.

Romi – actually you probable, you being by ..

Michael – so who are your audience and what do they think they are going to hear?

Romi – I think you begin by saying that this is what the Sen-wallas believe and this is how they have observed what they've observed. And that there are some aspects of which, which I endorse, other aspects which can not be penetrated. It's left a little bit like that but essentially the core question that we should be dealing with on the 7th is that – Is all of development observable. In other words, even if Sen comes up with a notion that there are five kinds of obstructions which need to be removed. Can we observe these obstructions from the outside.. and who is it, who needs to observe it. I think that's an important question.

The second question is whether – how much of the written tradition can access the oral tradition. Which is also part of the observable process. Are there areas in the oral tradition which are not documentable, not observable not..

Michael – and now we are also able to ask question – what is transferable?

Romi – what is transferable. Can you convert this development process into any form of (cough) to summarize I am saying that 41.28 **We have a very articulated expression of development from Sen. Which aims to be universal. However we have observed the development process that we've seen that you can't match it. Because this in one language and the development process is going on in another language. On the face of it, it seems that whatever is written down and observed by Sen is probably valid, but there is no way we can validate it. there is actually a barrier there, we can not validate it, in our existing situation.** The question is whether you can then make it observable and you can put the template on it and measure the thing right and

Nick – that's very fatalistic. You can't observe it, you can't...

Romi – not with our existing systems of observing and the existing ways of measuring.

Nick – but we've been observing it..

Romi – you've been observing it but it's not communicable.

Nick – is it not? what about .. this magazine 'Face to Face', there's tv programs, there's a video that we've now got of this event..

Romi – nooo, but if I were to say to you that – is the issue of economic opportunity is being addressed in this process of development. It's one of the five ..

Nick – I could have an opinion on that.

Smita – I think they would only be facts and figures..

Romi – you could have an opinion on it, it is different from saying that .. for me making an assertion – It is being dealt with. I'd say – show me.

Smita – but rum I – specially economic opportunities. The fact that you would – all these loans for different purposes, all trade related, those numbers do exist somewhere. They do in the system. And that will show straight away, that economic is ..

Romi – Information is there but it's not available. So we are not able ... now we've come for three days and we've got a template with us, right. And we are not able to match it because the information is not there.

Michael – we can't say at what point economic opportunity has doubled.

Nick – we can say it's changed...

Romi – how can you say that?

Nick – well we didn't come looking for that specifically, but if we come looking for that, I'm sure we could have analyzed the books and worked out that x number of people had x number of different opportunities for income change. We've come looking for the experiential stuff and below the line and so on. And that's what we've been focused on.

Smita – if we had looked – like the Rs 2000 now she has in her savings account and when she had started she had zero. These are indicators surely of economic opportunity.

Sunder – ... two things which are slightly different. In the sense that you are asking – is something in principle observable, is something in principle write up-able, measurable and the second set of things is – has it been observed, has it been recorded, to what extent has it been successful.

You seem to be saying a priori that some things can not be observed, some things can not be written. I am not clear about that. It may be that we have not done...

Jane – I'll try, tell me if you think I am wrong.^{45.22} **But he's talking about in the traditional development analysis, certain things were looked for, measured, evaluated as certain indicators. And that's led to a certain sort of development. I think what I an observing here, what we are observing here is a development that hasn't actually been acknowledged as a very profound way of development. And it's happening not just through these economic issues or just through transparency but it's actually happening through an oral tradition. That's working with individuals on a very multi-layered way. And this is a sort of development process that's bringing a different quality of life that people are choosing for themselves. That is a slightly different way of looking at development.** Which I think Amartya Sen is saying, which he has tried to say – Look, if you look at the individual as the agent of change and you look at these particular issues and you are removing (in his lens) unfreedoms and you are looking at how only if every single person is actually being able to move forward in their life through particular abilities to do that by freeing them up. Then you really have development as freedom. This is the ends of it. Then you have a way, you can actually begin to measure difference, or begin to identify difference or development.

Sheela – I want to go back to a much broader thing of what we started which is – what did we start off with. At least let me try and articulate what I thought we were trying to do in these four days. go back to why I agreed to explore this process in the first place. I think as I understood it, in our discussions in London and in our initial discussions here we were saying that through this work of Sen, he has articulated some of the things that stop people from exploring by this ‘freedoms’. The fulfillment of whatever are their dreams and aspirations and where they want to go. And that at the moment this was a conceptual framework that was at national and larger levels. The way I want to look at it, is to say – Can that framework of getting rid of the obstructions emerge out of processes that are designed and developed by communities and their organizations and produce a dialogue with a State for exploring that. Or is that only something that should be taken cognizance of by the state and by larger development institutions in how they sit to open up those so called gates that lead to freedom. 48.51 **And I thought that for me the exciting part of this exploration was that the agency for exploration of those transformation can be individuals who are involved in social movements and social organizations who can also take it upon themselves to do this. Because one of the things which concerned me was that very often because the discussion was being done by Sen in relationship to heads of governments and States and everything like that, it was getting more and more incorporated into development as things that the state or the International Aid had to do. And not what people themselves could do. I have seen the last four days or three days as a sharing these experiences of how an Alliance of people at the base can begin this process. That it is not only dependent or based on what the state or the formal institutions can do. That it is something that also opens up the possibility for people to take this on themselves and do.** That’s how.

And I would like to articulate that and explore how we can go further in having that discussion on the 7th. I would like to put that into.

Michael – I think it’s absolutely right. What the objective has been is to find a language that can, no matter how falteringly begin to express the kind of progress that is being made here. Such that funders and influences of government processes can have a better idea of what it is that is going on in the first place but in the second place build a confidence of making resources available to these kinds of processes without question, without saying – look, you are not adding up all the individual figures here. Because they don’t need to be added up. Because we.. there is coming out of the process a greater value that just adding up numbers.

Sheela - The sum total of the ...

Michael – yes, actually. Now if we can begin to find that language I think we’ll make tremendous progress.

Romi – I think there are two problems here that we need to deal with. One is that we need to find the common language. Measurement to me is the second part of it. And it seems to me that the common language is there because if we are saying that at the community level your discussion is about obstructions, in the community meetings that you have, you are asking them – what are your obstructions in life. And you are bringing a pool of these obstructions and all. At some point they can get reallocated into various kinds of unfreedoms. And these can be communicated to a much higher level. Right. 52.15 **So instead of us taking a measurable language just now which is what our tendency to do is, and adjusting all our facts to fit into those, we are saying that we’ve**

got these obstructions, but these obstructions remain one package . As we take it higher up the chain, they get reallocated by a template but they don't change. So they become observable at the higher, because Sen's grander theory makes it observable. But down at your community level you are not concerned with this. You are saying, we are here to address you obstructions and what are your main obstruction is what we are going for now. You got 15 others..

Sheela – that's right and for me the most exciting aspect of this exploration has been to .. and I think in many ways it's also our contribution if I could say so is to say that – **53.11 when people are really poor and vulnerable, their ability to face those obstructions on their own is not seen as possible and therefore creating a movement which reflects the critical mass of people sharing those obstructions produces the clout, the confidence and the knowledge pool that is needed to address those things and therefore you produce an agency that is non-State of pushing to open those, or to address those obstructions.**

Romi – The question that we would like to ask you is – can you change the dialogue with your community and talk about obstructions, in other words can you begin to emphasize the role of obstructions more? So that we begin to get a base of information that we can communicate.

Sheela – I want to go back to what you were saying earlier about differential templates. I think that if you identify how those ...54.20 **if you look at what Jockin was talking in the last 2-3 days about how choices are made and how aspirations are built up and how priorities are set. They are based on people's perceptions of the obstructions that are stopping them. So I think what it can produce for those of us, who are the interface, is not to sit and bun... because in their language they are talking about obstructions, but I think the important thing is that those of us who are the intermediaries in this process identify a new idiom of communicating that. First amongst ourselves, then with others.** If you ask me what is the one thing that I want to say, I would say, that's what I want to communicate. And that the creation of that instrumentality or that institutional arrangement is the investment that is essential in this kind of process because the State has neither the capacity, the capability or the intention – in most of third world countries- to actually create a relationship with the vulnerable individual as an individual. Because that is also what all of us in development have as an inheritance from the creation and the management of the Welfare State, because there the contract is between the individual and the state. Most of our development processes are trying to activate those individual contracts between the state and the individual, if you look at all the schemes, all the process. And in most cases they don't work! Because they got appropriated by those who have resources and capacities, until there is an agency that comes to protect it. sunder.

Sunder – one of the specific things and then some more general things. you know the book that I gave you, I don't know if you have it here – 'Readings in Human Development', that is brought out by the UNDP and there is a piece there by a lady called Sukiko... Parr. She's been one of the persons writing the Human Development ... and so on. And she makes two or three points about (of course this is we are talking about the Human Development Report and not Sen but to some extent there will be a relationship there) One of the things she is saying is that somehow an impression is given that – say you take health and Education (which are a key part of that HDI and also ..) Somehow it is only people who have these capabilities or who are ensured these basic things, it is they who can

bring about change. In a sense I don't think that is the intention – but in a sense one of the reasons why somebody like Jockin and others react very strongly to this question of education is because – 57.57 **what this model or this way of trying to do things is showing is that even uneducated, ignorant, illiterate women and men can actually bring about significant change** so. It may not be explicit, and it may not at all be the intention but somehow you go away with the feeling that poor people, they can't have agency and so on, that there is some threshold of this kind. This is one thing which this lady herself writes about. But in the context of human development reports.

The second point I think is that again, the same thing that Sheela was mentioning, that the inadequate stress upon the role of collectivities in accounts of social change and the corresponding over emphasis upon the role of the individual. To that extent I think this experience questions that assumption. Now, the other thing I want to say – to come back to what Romi was saying. All of us have frames of reference. It is not as if somebody can come with a tabularasa and observe the truth. We are all looking at it through some prism or other. As you say – you are sen-walls, there are rights-walls, there are livelihood-walls. All our work or for that matter anything at all can be looked at from some framework or other. The question is whether it is a value to look at it in this framework or not. and then I think it is of value but what I would like to suggest is that .. reiterating what Sheela was saying that 1.00.11 **Sen's framework is really to evaluate, societies and all their institutions. Whatever. Because obviously it is not in the hands of any one sort of group or something to be accountable or responsible for all those constraints or to remove them.** Methodologically speaking the first question is whether we can apply Sen's framework to a particular micro-experience or a micro-initiative or whatever you want to call this, or to a social movement or whatever. The way I see it is that it is helpful for us, I think the value for me for these three days has been, what you all have brought in is – it is something that has made us look at our own work in a slightly different way. Because we also have our own prism, whatever that might be, I am not sure, somewhere in between Sen and livelihoods and habitat and whatever it is. So we have been able to look at certain things in a sharper kind of way. But the question is whether we should – I agree with Sheela, we should not impose a vocabulary upon the community. Of course by interacting with them we are ... (waiter trips over the wires again)..

Romi – can I just, sorry just one thing. I'll give the commercial. Actually the sen-walls are selling something that's far superior to anything you have ever seen.

I think the advantage of Sen's approach is essentially that as we've been discussing – that at one level we can address obstructions, we are already addressing at the community level. I think there's a framework to communicate these obstructions in a pattern right up the line. I think what happens with other approaches is – (a) because it is not focused on any one thing, it's focused on the human condition that unless Human beings get obstructions removed they can't go forward. It doesn't say anything beyond that. It doesn't say – you've got to do this, in order to go forward. You've got to do livelihoods, you've got to do development, you've got to ... you've got to save. He doesn't say any of that. All he says is that if you want to move forward, try and remove the obstructions in front of human beings. To me that very very simple template can become very complex and sophisticated at the UN level. But essentially it remains the same and the UN and the national bodies can come up with all kinds of policies to remove obstructions. And that they can pass new laws, new regulations etc. but essentially the springing point of all thought becomes those obstructions. I haven't come across any development theory which so far is able to very easily communicate human conditions to high theoretical level. Which is immediate. And

I like the idea that in way that SPARC's ... 1.04.21 **SPARC in a way converts the template, from a community discussion which isn't formed at all but actually at SPARC level they look at this and then they make it into something that other people can understand outside it.** Even banks. So if we are able to convince a bank, that you know, you need to address actually obstructions in the way you give your loans, rather than you are in the ... maybe you're getting somewhere.

Nick – it is extraordinarily simple. That is it's joy.

Romi – I think that's the subject of , in a sense the 7th of July meeting. Whether we could spend much more effort in trying to talk about this.

nick– while presenting that is then is to show how complicated the other approaches to understanding development are. And really this is an opportunity for all of you to make your life so much simpler.

Smita – would there not be value also on the 7th of July to focus on the concept of agency and to unpack the concept of agency particularly from SPARC's point of view as one example of what SPARC is saying and Sheela said was her particular interest is how this alliance is an agent for change. So can we not unpack agents. Maybe even try and find indicators that measure agency. Because that doesn't exist and that is at different levels. And that can be tangible, can be intangible also, will be tangible.

Nick – I think that is quite a useful suggestion. yes, because the suggestion is that the State is the agent or the NGO is the agent, or the individual is the agent. And here you've got something which is clearly showing especially among this context, the urban poor, that collective is an agent which is very legitimate and in fact is the best agent.

Alison – yes, 1.06.25 **we mustn't forget that we've looked quite closely at that collective but we've also recognized that underneath there are other things individually done. And that people are empowered more of that individually at the same time as the collective is empowered.**

Michael – yes, but it's the collective that's empowering the interaction with the individual.

Sheela – I thought of another kudos to the Sen-wallas. See, when frameworks are developed and I can go back to whether it is this State . thing, livelihood thing, whatever we want to do usually it is a framework that is developed and that .. if whoever designs and develops this framework can trigger the imagination of governments and international agencies then they adopt it and then they impose it. if Amartya Sen is successful in being able.. and which look's like he is .. of exciting the imagination of the people on development to appropriate this model the chances are that the language or the discourse that emerges from that discussion will be imposed upon us, in the same way that today Log-frames are imposed on us. So whether they mean something or they don't mean something, your language of discourse as intermediaries. We can protect say, the communities form only talking in those languages, but we will be compelled to start talking in that language instead of what I see as this process.

This is the second thing which I feel this process is doing is that very early on in the evolution of exposure to this new way of looking at things, we and hopefully other people who aspire to participate in development and change also get to explore this concept, understand it and participate in it in the same way that

others are. So it's not just Michael and you and people living in England who have access to direct participation in events where these things are discussed, to come to it. but somebody like me or Jockin or somebody can come and say – this is how we look at it. This is what we think development investment should do if it appropriates this model. Like we were saying, how does it ... I am just saying, it opens the possibility for doing that.

Romi – first thing the World Bank writes to you and says – in order to qualify for this loan, you have a have a minimum of 18,00 obstructions! Please list them.
(laughter)

Alison – and the timetable by which they have been removed.

Sheela – and the removal timetable! Oh, this is beautiful, we have to put this up in whatever we do. But see, this is it, because if you look at what happened when ---lets take what Carolyn Moser did in terms of Social Capital. When she started doing that study for the World Bank on social Capital. When project teams come they want to do an assessment of Social Capital. And that Social Capital is seen as things that are leveragable by the project, not by communities. So we as representatives and communities don't do assessments or looking at how poor people who have collective behavior can negotiate with you t get it, but it is what the government of India will say – this is all in my *bugle* (under my arm) here there, you know I have so much social capital. Which means that it becomes reductionist because of the inability of different people who are local actors or national actors to appropriate that process and interpret it. Because after all that's what a theory should do. It should give you the freedom to interpret it in a way that fulfills your own dreams and aspirations. So it's not only something that gets imposed.

Michael – but isn't that possible for sdi to capture its own model framework and express it to everyone else.

Sheela – That's what I am saying, that if earlier --- and that for me is another point that I am trying to make. That very early on when these discussions are being done – who comes to that table for that discussion for a dialogue – the fact that in this case this discussion didn't only happen in London in your office, between us; and that my telling you something about this process did become adequate data for you to them say whatever you wanted to say to him or to others, but that begins to explore this process with us..

Alison – and now she's got Laxmi's input.

Sheela – that changes this test which Sunder always says – who comes to the table for the discussion. Who eats on the floor and who sits on the table.

Romi – I would then ask a question for the 7th is that – first of all do you think that there is something valuable in this approach to pursue in terms of the obstructions. Secondly how can we pursue it so that it begins to make things more observable and changes the perceptions of institutions towards development. Brings it closer to your perceptions. How can we process further, if you agree.

Sheela – the way I would like to change the way you say it is that – if it is accepted as an important thing to do and we design a rationale for that can we collectively produce the road map to that? Because I don't think we can do it on our own. So I think if we turn it around and say – yes, early on creating spaces for change agents at different levels to explore this and to identify how they'd like

to use it or explore it or give suggestions to it, changes not only the roles and relationships but also resource structures. And that how this is done. Because in that sense the designing of CLIFF was that process. Because it was a identification of an obstruction of finance, identifies by the federations and seen as recurring amongst the different sdi affiliates, that produced the CLIFF model.. and that right through it's first one and a half years of functioning a lot of the internal discourse is related at challenging the constant moving back to this vertical framework of who decides what is appropriate, how it should be done, what risks should be taken, not be taken, how money should be transacted – are constantly being challenged. I can not imagine challenging those issues n a routine project. Saying – why should you tell me what to do. I will decide. I know many other grants in which I don't have the freedom to make those challenges. Or I can not take the aspirations of people and just say – this is what they want to do. I will have to get a consent letter and then they will go to their legal officers. And here we are saying that we are going to judge CLIFF on that basis.

But I want to take an analogy which truck mw just now. If you take Amartya Sen's work on Hunger and famines and you look at what's happening today in India vis-à-vis food security. Where movements of people from all over the country are getting together to challenge the food distribution system and to address the issue of linking.. the democratization of food supplies to the poor is a parallel to this process. And I don't see many people making those parallels. For Instance I remember when he had come to Delhi in December for that NRI Mela, he had put together a food mela also. There were people from all over India, from districts which were facing draught and famine, seeming famine, of deaths, coming as groups and creating a network and challenging the State. Where for me this was another system of people saying – we are not going to wait for the Collector to come and tell us that yeah, yeah you have famine and maybe we should do something. But saying – get people to negotiate. And he was using his agency as a famous person that the State couldn't ignore, to bridge that process. I see this as a parallel that has tremendous potential. And that what it requires is for creating potential for those people who have just read his things on Freedoms to begin to interpret is at this level. Because at the community level the issue of .. if that process is working, those obstructions are getting identified.

The third part which I want to do is - focus on what Sunder was saying. Most obstructions ... like today for instance, I remember about 3 weeks ago going and talking to one of the people who actually writes out the Human Development Report. And he said – you know all the things that you all sent to me about slums, there was no space to write it. because the whole space was taken over by health, nutrition, education. So other aspects of concerns about people, about habitat, about things which are very fundamental and which they can not have access, today don't have agency. So for me that is ...

Nick – this is an opportunity to put the agency of the Urban Poor on to the agenda much more clearly. Using the agency of Sen to do it. if you read chandler's work, putting the last first, I mean he is saying pretty much the same thing in a different language. I don't think that what Sen has said is rocket science in any sense at all but what's different now is the fact that we've got a really strong example of a network of urban poor, a Federation of the poor to use as a vehicle for sort of raising the whole profile of the urban situation that the World is facing.

Sheela – but you know when you brought out the issue of Robert Chambers, I can tell you – For instance, you take 'Rapid Rural upraising'. What a powerful tool. It's screwing the poor. Because it is a tool that is used by consultants to

make poor people feel that they are participating in something that is extrapolated and taken away. So for me that's another example of how a very powerful conceptual analysis, if it is not made easily accessible and legitimately utilized to produce knowledge, and to produce negotiable transactions by communities of the poor, it becomes the none more tool or mechanism that is only accessible to one set of people and therefore becomes as exclusive. Every single thing that Chambers has produced is a powerful valid thing but because it gets hijacked so quickly by the Bank and the bi-lateral institutions, and gets utilized in their transactions it becomes an obstruction. For me that's another thing

Michael – creating unfreedoms

Alison – so you want to get in on this process as early as possible..

Sheela – open space for, that's what we are saying. Open space for other constituencies, specially those that have direct access to the people.

Alison – and do it first or try and just do it at all levels at the same time. The definition of this framework.

Sheela – I think the challenge to agencies that operate internationally is also as it is to the heavy weight intellectuals. How do you create conditions of equality for the expression of issues and concerns of local and the excluded in your discourse. Because there is now a rhetoric..

END OF MD 14

MD 15
Contd.

Nick – right, but they have somebody describe the actual process of designing a project that is so imaginative, such as CLIFF, which is CLIFF, which includes the banking sector, which includes a clear presentation about the leveraging and the percentages and all the nitty gritty. And the obstructions. But to describe the process of that which is as I understand it – has come through the dialogue with all the different agencies/agents.

As just an example of a people who want more than just conceptual, theoretical discussion about the idea of agency and so on you need to have something really tangible they can pick .. to

Smita – but using Sen's framework to give you a description.

Nick – yes, it can be done. Ruth Maybe the person to do that. Somebody I think needs to be able to present what has been achieved in terms of a project that could be understood by somebody from the bank.

Alison – I was just thinking that Jockin's vision of the design of CLIFF would be extremely different, from say Mark Hildebrand's or Kevin's. I mean just viewing that process from completely different lens... to Jockin and there's been frustration.

Romi – Sheela, who do you see coming from here? In order to be able to have this discussion in London. Who do you think would be of value to .. this is probably the kind of discussion, a slightly smaller version of what will take place there in whatever format happens.

Sheela – for us I am looking at it from the point of view of our learning and in terms of our ongoing thing. There is no question that Jockin has to be there. And it's important for us as a team to be there, because we are the interlocutors in this process and therefore for me it's a very important process, not to always be the only individual interlocutor but for us to come as a team.

Romi – I think the issue before us is simply that in order for us to have a discussion about trying to find a useful framework which is valid for the community and for the donor. There are two three routes we can take on that occasion. We can either take case history type of a thing where all the people are present and we run through basically what the major of the development process is and how it fits into the framework. Or we can start by having that as a very small capsule and then having the discussion. I am not very clear how you think it will be useful to proceed and arrive at a point where ..

Jane – I think what came out this morning, I'm just going around, this was debated as to whether to bring Laxmi along earlier. I just .. the more that she speaks... I mean Smita did a fabulous job of the rapport she has with her and the translation she did was superb. And what came across and I think what would be so striking in my opinion for people to hear in this situation is that if you were to introduce as herself. She just sat down .. I mean Tamlin, I was trying to help Tamlin come up with a question for his idea of how does this sum up his experience. And they said – what are your aspirations for the women's savings sort of thing for the future. And she just took control of the situation, she chose a spot where this interview was going to take place, in someone's hut. 'move that crying baby, get it out of the way,' you know. Sat herself down, Jane you sit here, Smita you sit here and she just launched into a 15 minute dialogue that covered so many points. Going back to her own experience, how to do training, how the people learned, what's passed on. The whole .. and she did it so articulately with the story ... without using that sort of word and her understanding of transference of knowledge and the individual. She says I know that I am a little bit exceptional in that I really care and take an interest. She put the whole thing in perspective and all you would need to do is to have ten minutes of her talking like that with Smita ...

Michael - Janet Boston our vehicle for that.

Jane – well, I think that the real person – there's nothing that lives up to that ten minute experience that we had. And she is so engaged in it, so interactive..

Sheela – Celine what's your response to that.

Celine – I think all of us are like that. You just make us perform and we all perform. We all do the same. And any of the Mahila Milan women will do that , not just Laxmi.

Jane – what's happened is this whole process of what – you know you have con... this way of knowing what you've been in and this whole transformation of how she has actually been able to engage at both levels. Where she could have the style of ...

Celine – and we would see that with lots of women down the line, not just Laxmi.

Sheela – so the question then is – Is Laxmi's or anybody from Mahila Milan's presence in London can reproduce this feeling.

Jane – and also the concern was part of this day ..

Celine – I think we need to do that internally and look at those pros and cons.

Alison – because we don't want it to be a token

Jane – and even I was thinking about how we are doing this. There is an afternoon session which is very participatory. It is going to be divided into different tables where these issues are going to be discussed. And a good part of the afternoon is going to be to allow people who come from all these different areas and backgrounds to try and voice their.. word their own words to get into a dialogue. Because that's really where people begin to have their understanding is when they speak. And I thought, well maybe – what would happen to her in this situation. But in fact in our situation you (Smita) would have to agree to do this. Because you must be such a wonderful .. and you do it so well, you were very vivacious and interesting. Is if you were to be with her in that situation.

Smita – yeah, they will all be there. Whoever is there...

Jane – you know you'd have to be there at this table but someone would have to be there translating all the time. I don't know whether I am being over ambitious. But she was so articulate this morning.

Everyone talking together.

Romi - ... if you had fifty of them...

Sheela – actually that is our concern. One of the things – there are two three issues why you will find some hesitation on our part. We have a thumb rule in our organization, which is so, even when we go on peer exchanges. None of them travel alone. You have at least four of them going together. For one reason which is that – you can not understand how alienated they feel, when they are the only person to whom everybody is telling... That's one. And that drains the spontaneity and the vivaciousness which attracts you to that experience.

I think we take with full, we accept completely what you are trying to do and it's not that we haven't tried it ourselves. The other thing which happens is that for people who have not experienced that powerful experience on the ground, there is a minimalistic-ness of that. You know 'this cute little woman saying these cute little thing.' and it romanticizes that process. There's that concern.

The third thing is that when we take individual women, you know this woman you were talking about, Medina. Who you say was living in a lean to and everything. When we first started SPARC, she was one of the more verbal talkative persons. And she became like a prima donna. She is the only person in Mahila Milan who calls herself the Head of Mahila Milan. Everybody else says they are part of the collective. But Medina always calls herself the president of Mahila Milan. Because the external world, because..

Celine – she said just like Sheela is to SPARC, I am to Mahila Milan.

Sheela – because the outside world treated her like that. Because she got lot of individual attention. It's like, you meet Laxmi, the next time you come and say – where is Laxmi? At that time we ourselves were not aware of the impact of this and she was really Miss Prima Donna. She would get five ..

Celine – Laxmi is the same and the rest of the group has to keep pulling her down.

Sheela – it's human nature and we accept that and it's a frailty that we protect. So I am just ..

Jane-Romi – we will do it in film.

Sheela – I am saying this to you also to share the internal dynamic with you because that's a ... after everybody leaves we have to deal with all those things.

Celine – and Laxmi is a great talker but there are other women there who have a very deep analysis, deeper than Laxmi, of what's happening. But they don't articulate and do all the acting that Laxmi does. It's very difficult... but collectively they are powerful. Singularly you would be killing Laxmi if you just ..

Sheela – we are just saying it to help you look at the internal dynamics. But I think the idea of doing something with the film..

Nick – I think maybe that's the brief, that Janet Boston has to try to capture not just Laxmi, because you don't want the individual, you want the collective, but capture the sort of thing that Laxmi is achieving or doing on a five or ten minute film which can be shown. And you can even stand up and say – look we could have brought Laxmi here, we could have brought this lady and say those very reasons why you didn't and people will appreciate that very easily.

Michael – it's given the flavor of the context as well, which is so important. I think when we had the exchange visit before, it was the large number of groups of responding people – we have the slum dwellers of London come to meet the slum dwellers from Sdi.

Sheela - We had 20 people there.

Michel – and it just so happened to be that we were also doing 'Bridging the finance Gap' and it also happened that we launched C3 with ... So she came in to just see the tail end of what we were doing there with that particular exchange visit in London. It worked, because they were respondents.

Sheela – and we try and do it at some point. We should keep that as an opportunity to explore in the future of... for instance when all of us were there in Coventry, then there is a peer group for all the community leaders. And there's a different dynamic.

Michael – different agenda as well.

BREAK.

(During the break Sheela and Michael etc have an informal talk)

Sheela – 12.14 .. Imagining .. Like you are going to sell this to us, If I get into it I have to sell it to Shack Dwellers International. Big headache to sell anything to sdi. If I have something which is there and I say Ruth, these five people came and .. and there's Jockin, I would want to do Jockin's. So there's Jockin's, yours .. like this different. And we need not have all of them shown there but we actually have, it's like each one of us write that script. It'll be so exciting.

Michael – yes, with tremendous diversity within it.

Sheela – which is really the exciting thing about this framework.

Michael – and that's strange, this ... kind of diversity not being reductionist, not

Romi – but you are finding it very complex.

Sheela – this is a sub-group.

Romi – I would be much happier if Janet had a specific brief which dealt with the same ... let's say, just the savings. And that's the springing point for a whole range of people looking at it differently.

Michael – that's more a workshop then.

Romi – what's happening is that you are looking at it one way. The phenomena is common. All she does is document. That's all that Janet..

Michael – the savings process,

Romi – the process, the savings circle, what is it? How does that happen. And that's it. That's the beginning and end of the film.

Sheela – is Tamlin using the DV tape, does he have a DV tape, can Subhash make a copy of that?

Romi – all that he's filmed?

Sheela – in the morning. Because then that will be useful as a starting point for ..

Jane – with Janet? We thought that's what we would do in London, just to go through that with her.

Sheela – but what I am saying is that we do that, but it will also be a useful thing for us to have.

Romi – let him .. give them so they can just zap them. But in a sense if we say that we have this 5-10 minute film or whatever it is on savings circle and that's it. And then everybody who's here at this workshop has got a different take on it actually because they are coming from somewhere else. And that would be essentially the book also. Everybody is talking about the same thing but they are talking in different specs. And they are all sen-walla. That's the other part of it. if you hold it together they are all Sen-wallas.

Michael – we'll all put our Senspectales on. Our Sen's Lenses.

Romi – we are all selling the same product. The same *pudi* but they have a different sales pitch.

Alison – can I just say that when you are talking about savings, I get nervous that it links to numbers and money and we need to get a focus..

Romi – no, the savings circle. The collective. The people involved.

Alison – because savings, then you put a particular lens on , If I just said savings.

Romi – no, we've seen that it is the pulse of the collective. If you don't have it you can't have a collective,

Alison – so is the discussion, so is the ..

Michael – yeah, yeah, yeah. To show that that is what is happens.

Romi – It would be very interesting, almost actually I would say that – it could give us quite an interesting format for the 7th also, rather than discuss the case study. If we had a film capsule and then each of us talked on a different aspect of it, then I think that other agencies, coming from other places would react also to that and that would be useful. So you know, the livelihood-wallas would then react to that. And then you would have the Sen-wallas reacting t it. I mean the event is being organized by the Sen-wallas, they have captured it, so they are letting some guys from the opposition in the back benches say a few things after the main debate is over.

Michael – and the objective is to develop it's legitimacy in the eyes of people who don't really understand it as yet. The donor groups.

Romi - and I think that it would be very good to use that to explain how there is a problem of transferring of this information.

Michael – ok, can I just explain how much money in the future will work.

Romi – Money.

Michael – Money!! (laughter) and the crucial, the way in which DIFD for example is that it in the future will just give it's money to the government. Why do projects, why do interventions, it will be five people in Delhi not 55 or 155 r however many. The .. projects will just have economists and that's the other point about Sen. It's considered by the economists to be theirs. And not the social ..

Sheela – which is it's plus point.

Michael – well it is in a funny sort of a way. But what we want to try and get is an explanation that this is also where you could have confidence of just saying – a hundred million's available for those activities. Whatever they are. doesn't matter, because the way in which the grant support is being given to government is – here's the money, doesn't matter what it is. You know what you are going to do with it. The MDG's are there, you are ...

(coffee will not be served inside)

Michael - .. but there's an instrument called the PRSP against which that money will then be judged in the future.

Sheela – PRSP. That horrible bank..

Michael – exactly. Now what we want to do it to work towards just an instrument of confidence. Whatever it is. We decide what it is or sdi decides what it is. What's the instrument to come from this? it can put to the international community to say in a similar way – here is money, go away and do with it what you say is going to improve the lives of hundreds of millions of slum dwellers.

Sheela – the thing here is the challenge to the development agencies to say – can you participate in the design of a process which is so alien to you.

Michael – well they already have, they are all aware that they have, but they already have. (laughs)

BREAK ENDS

20.02

Sheela – planning for the 7th of July and the output will be like a book. Don't make faces. So we've come to the point where we've decided that for the 7th July meeting, we talked other things also which you ... for the 7th July meeting everybody agreed that most interesting thing would be to direct Subhash and one lady called Janet Boston to make a film which starts with looking at the power of the savings group and the whole process.. that's what we were talking about.

Romi – he (Jockin) directs the film.
Laughter

Alison – one of those chairs with his name on the back.

Jockin – I can't compete with Hema Malini!

Nick – you've got to be the Director.

Sheela – he can be actor Director..

Romi – Kamal Hassan. (laughter)

Jockin – then I have to ..

Sheela – that's the thing that we pulled out of our hat when all of you went out for tea, which is looking at the kind of audio visual that we could produce, that could be the back drop for some of this discussion.

Romi – I am thinking the out put of this workshop in terms of the book or the film or even the 7th is basically saying that you have to refer everything to a collective. You don't go away and make a theory. Because we can go on the 7th and we can discuss very important theoretical frameworks etc and leave the collective out of it. In a way one is saying that if somebody from the Federation is directing the film or is actually the critical person with whom everybody is discussing the book, the other idea being that there's somebody from SPARC and somebody from the federation and the book consists of different people with different ideas. They are trying to communicate with them, they don't understand it, they say – what are you talking about? What is this nonsense they will say. That should be put in, in the book. Rather than we talk to each other about things and then federation go gnnnnn gnnnn.

Sheela – I don't understand all the .. where is it?

Romi – I am saying that all of the outputs are really emerged out of the collective every time and referred to the collective. And what doesn't make sense to the collective, then it should go somewhere else and discuss that with somebody else and not discuss what's happening here.

In a way saying – don't separate our abstraction from the reality. Don't dip yourself into reality then go and abstract about it. it doesn't make sense. But keep it at dialogue.. so the film, the book and the 7th is a dialogue.

Michael – the book can include a CD which is the film.

24.41

Romi – so is that idea, Jokin is that ok, you can direct a film, no?

Jockin – I am not going to think in terms of that whatever words we out it, but something has to come out.

Sheela – but it's got to be something which you feel reflects that process.

Jockin – what do you think ought to be filmed. You say – ok, I think that we should film this, we should film that. Even if it doesn't make sense.

Jane – because we were.. you were seeing that the women's Saving circle becomes the heart in this... I wish all the discussion ... so they are more closely filmed to show the step by step process of the women's saving circle. What we did this morning, we... well how this has happened is we went this morning and Tamlin was there and he filmed the whole thing..

Celine – but we've got so much of this data already on film..

Jane – he is passing the film on and .. so that they can see what our experience was this morning. Because it's so powerful. So it's getting that vignette, you know, that's the focus of that whole experience somehow. And then that becomes the real discussion point, of what's happening, why is it so successful. How come it's going to so many countries.

Alison – one very powerful thing this morning was the fact that you got some essence of the longitudinal nature of the changes over time. I mean, even this woman used to live there and she's moved here, here there used to be *jhuggis* (shantys) and they've moved to the transit camp. But also her story of .. and that if you can get on the film, would be brilliant. The changes and the strength that comes out of it. even to the point that there is a slum kid and he is now working in SPARC and has done his B.Com.

Nick - that is what Sen is about as much as anything. He is about the progressive removal of obstructions over time. It's not a fixed point.

Sheela – ok, so how shall we structure the 7th.

Romi – I thought the 7th the core would be the film actually, as the starting point. And in a way whoever is the speaker is will be reacting or explaining it in terms of their own perspectives.

Celine- and what kind of people would be there at the meeting, besides us?

Jane – I don't know, I just backtrack there. I think that the beginning has to be really an introduction to ..

Romi – we've passed that. I think you'd have the .. all the introductions and .. describe the Sen product and ..

Michael – instead of the structure that we had,

Jane – what we discussed with nick and ... in London,..

Michael – this is a development. Rather than have a range of other .. the film becomes the talking point

Everybody talking.

Nick – how long is the film, 10-15 minutes?

Sheela – not more than 10, max ten minutes.

Jane – how long was the one in Brussels? Was that ten.

Michael – ten. But that's with all the other example bits in it. 5-7 minutes.

Alison – I wonder whether, because people know about SPARC and the NSDF and a lot of the big things you are doing, then just a short reflection .. either before the movie or after saying – this is really the building block. You've seen about relocation, 10,000 families, seven story buildings, but this is actually what it's all build on. So that your freedoms thing you really start addressing freedoms at that level, but this is where the freedoms are challenged at the start.

Romi – and in the book everything is there.

Alison – I am just saying in your structure, you just need a short presentation to contextualise because people will want to make those links with all the other things they've heard about SPARC.

Smita – can we have like a theme. To me Freedoms, yes, but agency to me is really...

Romi – that would be one of the things. Somebody would react with how this is important for agency, somebody would react how this is important for city planning, somebody would react how it's important for culture. So that you get a very simple, you get a saving circle but in a way it contains the essence of the whole of the development process like that,

Sheela – that could in fact be the way in which you structure the afternoon in terms of having groups in which different issues and different aspects and all of us split into those aspects and trigger that discussion.

Nick – We've got the film, we're going to start with the film,

Romi – no, I think you will have introductions and you will have to, I don't know, speak about what the background to what we are doing and...

Sheela – and when does the great man come?

Nick – In the afternoon, he comes at 4 o'clock.

Alison – you could give him a copy of the video before.

Romi – I think the dialogue with him would be what we were discussing, that we are trying to see how origins of these obstructions can be looked at. And how actually the concept of freedom itself is not communicable at all. When you talk about obstructions people think unfreedoms.

Jane -...

Michael – the session in the morning would be the variety of views in reaction to the film.

Jane – ok, and then the afternoon would be ..

Michael – Romi's would be one, for some considerable time. Then we need to then work out, structuring how other people from different perspectives come to react to that. So maybe from a rights based approach, perspective, there are similarities here. And other people might like to talk about how global resources are brought to development and how these can shift in time. That sort of thing.

Nick – how's that going to happen. Because the people, they need to be briefed very carefully before hand. Somebody has to do that in order for them to be able to make a presentation that is coherent.

Romi – can they receive the film before and then they can react to that.

Michael – yeah, alright. They would receive the film.

Nick – we need therefore to have a days session in London with those people who are going to be invited. Are we talking about Rose.. and ...

Michael – I have no idea.

Smita – I am sorry I want in on the earlier discussions but isn't the value of this thing that these people have been sitting here and doing this. Isn't it a bit challenging now to bring in outsiders to talk about this? do we not have enough resources, I am saying here, to just have the three or four main view points, including SPARC people to talk about say, agency. That's something to me makes sense. That somebody from SPARC should ..

Sheela – yeah, but what I would suggest then is that if we do that then we structure ways by which we identify critical people who reflect being champions of different perspectives to be respondents or have a ...

Michael – maybe that's how the afternoon session .. with the tables rather than being the same question on the tables, having these different perspectives at the tables. As this is the oral discussion that it becomes the powerful medium for that interaction with the different perspectives. So they are not making presentations but they can start their table.

Everybody together.

Nick – what about ... earlier having Jockin on one side. After the film what about having the CLIFF process described by perhaps by Jockin and perhaps Ruth and perhaps have a Bankers perspective in it as well.

Jane – I think to jump into the CLIFF at this stage is going to ... because we are really working at the fundamentals of what the ideas of this .. well for example we are talking about the freedoms ... on Amartya Sen. And then looking at the process, the saving circle, I think we are trying for doing interpretation, to suddenly jump into the – how CLIFF is developed will be a

... everybody

Michael – but surely the output of the final conclusion of the film is something – say, that these buildings, these resettlements scales up through a CLIFF type process and that's what..

Jane - begin to look at ways of interpreting development. I think it's going to be such a huge picture and I thought from all our other discussions about what was going to take place and also ... and so on, we decided just to focus on the process of the Savings circle and seeing how that gets interpreted by these ...

Sheela - that becomes a bit minimalistic..

Michael - it's very small and I feel that .. especially when you've got all these big ..

Sheela - because you know what will happen, it will be, we shouldn't let it become.. because that's my concern - it feels good but then it stays there. You have to create a link.

Romi -I think we have to just ask why we are doing it. then only we can decide what to do. Then only we can decide what to do. If the best person to explain to us - who are we ..

Sheela - why are we doing all this?

Michael - 35.42 **because we are attempting to influence a much broader international development audience to convince it that there is something at work here that responds to internationally recognized understanding of development. Ie, Sen. And to the extent that this is a movement and a methodology for up scaling, dramatically up scaling the influence of the way in which slum dwellers can be encouraged to work themselves, but with the objectives that the international community can meet with it's resources and influence as well.** I think that's the overall...

Romi - so we want to influence policy makers.

Alison - I liked your comment about this need for a new instrument of confidence.

Michael - yes, it's building confidence. Otherwise it's static

Alison - so that ... if they say we need this instrument of confidence, how do we create that? So that they have the confidence to invest in this process.

Romi - if you are starting this saving circle then we are assuming that the discussion is going to be about development. Up scaling and about alternative ways of deepening and also the problems of communicating the real substance of development to agencies. I think that's probably hardly expand out and .. I imagine that CLIFF is set to get included in the discussion anyway.

Michael - well, it's a by the by in a sort of way. It just so happens to have been there as things began to expand.

Sheela - it is like a starting point.

Alison - I would really to really communicate that there is this enormously wonderful thing at the community level. Btu you also have a thousand plans for slums, you've got all the information, you are ready to go, you are ready to go to scale. So you have got not only this wonderful building block that - this way you started 15 years ago and built on that but you've got now the potential from this to really go to scale. And that we need to put across somehow I think, in that meeting.

Michael – and the most dramatic aspect of it is, this isn't grant money. people saying – 'oh dear', or 'oh, what wonderful work you are doing here, have some more money'. That isn't the idea of the whole thing as well. But what it is, is, here are resources, how can you strategically use them to remove obstacles.

Jockin – yeah. And it gives people like Jockin .. like today for instance I can not imagine Jockin going and doing these negotiations if we didn't have this resource structure. And that this process is not just .. the reason I want to bring this in is – also to bring it at the discourse level. For instance, 10 years ago when Michael of DFID were talking about setting up guarantee funds or setting up those municipal funds or this that, I saw no connectivity between our ability to manage CLIFF and that. But today I do. And I feel I want to be part of those discussions so that in those discussions I can identify and reflect ways by which these aspirations are included in that and that doesn't go in some other direction . there is that fruit that is beginning to develop and that can be articulated in these words. So that becomes like an illustration. Because if you are going to talk to policy makers and you don't have an illustration, then it's all fuzzy.

Nick – that's why I think that the CLIFF thing is quite useful because it's our example.

Celine – in the sdi network this is not the only solution that people have found for creating a fund. Cambodia has a different thing, Thailand has a different thing, South Africa has a different thing... I would position CLIFF as one of the many options.

Sheela – but that's the way we would present it.

Sunder – but what about having other sdi countries, that this another visible...

Celine – they have not done this preparatory homework so they will just get lost and ..

Sheela – I think what we need to do this .. and I think one of the important things is that if for instance Jockin and Celine and all of us feel that we can start this discussion with the other sdi members and they are interested in it, then we bring it there. But we have to do that preparation and see the validity of it before we do that.

Celine – and SPARC should try it out first and then decide how should we . into them.

Sheela – because that's how we all ... we become like the toe that's testing the water.

Sunder - .. because there is such a broad range of international agencies, so why only the Indian, that was my ..

Celine – I agree sunder, but I feel there's no preparatory work done and they really get upset with this whole language and discourse and everything.

Sheela – there's a sense of being dragged into his.

Romi – in that case the kind of presentations we are looking for – I mean we haven't, I'm not putting them in any order in which they are presented, but if you have a film on the saving circle, you have a presentation by SPARC, you have a

presentation by the Federation, so that the key components which are not explained in the film, because the film is .. and then we need the key component of the Sen framework. I think these three or four and maybe one we had about Human development, that would be the larger context of the international world. There are only three or four initial presentations which deal with the introductions also. And after that if there was the film, I think basically we are talking about the partners here reacting to that film more specifically. But if the conference begins with three or four major presentations from the key partners, they will each of them address very big issues. I think they are not going to talk about nitty gritty.

Nick – so if we have an Introduction maybe you, the broad picture, the film, then Jockin and then Michael may be putting it into this big international sort of framework. At that point we've And perhaps Antonio ...

Alison – you could end with the questions.

Jane – No, I think Antonio is going to

Everyone together

Smita – who is Antonio?

Romi – he is the UNDP guy who's involved with the Human Development.

Sunder – it means that you will have the small groups in the morning.

Michael – after the main presentations..

Sunder – you will have small groups, but that means the Sen and lord Desai will not be able to see the film.

Michael – they will have already seen the film.

Nick – we'll make sure they get a copy of it.

Jane – I think this culture bit.. because the culture aspect is absolutely essential as far as I am concerned. Because it goes into the heart of where all these .. issues come from and that's an aspect that's not been talked about with all the development ... I have been reading about. And I see this as an opportunity to really focus on that and bring that to the fore front. I think it is essential.

So I don't know how we want to include that in the introductions with the livelihoods and everything elsewhere. This .. is absolutely crucial because in the chapter 'culture and Human Rights' it looks at the origin, ... values and principles that are directing these issues and it's looking at .. it's what I want to you about afterwards. So, do that.

Michael – well, I think that, that comes very much as part of Romi's introduction but maybe with some specific parts introduced by yourself . I mean that;s the way we did talk about it earlier.

Alison – will that bring out the issue we were speaking about yesterday, of the differences which do support the collective and the differences which don't. Because that was quite an interesting issue.

Nick – that's something that Romi would bring out in his introductory.

Romi – I think if you say that we have some presentations and then there's a film, then there is somebody who needs smaller presentations that actually identify what your wake discussions would be. So these are also from within whoever's been involved in this .

Nick – and you'll bring up, create that by having a some sort of plenary discussion where the questions that will then be discussed in the round tables are tabled and proposed and there is an opportunity for the audience participants to actually propose other questions or ..

Romi – your question is, whether, when you are divided into tables are you discussing alternate development models or are you discussing the complexity of issues around this. so this is a very important issue to decide on.

Sheela – what I felt is that in terms of a process thing – if after this presentation the small table discussions are actually to help people ask deeper questions. So if those of us who are involved in this process break into and are available on each of the tables to answer the questions, have a discussion, think of the issues that are emerging. That closes that first morning. Otherwise what happens, it's all half and half. What I think will be useful for us to do in the afternoon session is – you identify people whom you feel are critical, are strategic in terms of being able to bridge between this process and other kinds of outside environments. Ask them to make their comments and their .. and then table the issues, because if for instance you are going to have this round table with Sen and Lord Desai and everybody at the 4 o'clock thing then these are all the issues that we present to them which come out of our own reflections and also the reflections of the people who are there.

Alison – so you sort of have a table reviewing it and then go into ..

Sheela – it also gives everybody else an opportunity to say – this is rubbish, this is good, I don't know about this.

Nick – so if we have the presentations up till 11 o'clock or something like that and the film and then you have a plenary with some people on the table who are not part of the immediate presenters. The Ross hab.. and the Carolyn and ant.. and who will almost chair a discussion of the whole plenary. Out of the respondents and then chairs and then out of that comes the sort of focal points for the discussion around tables over lunch through the afternoon. Is that it?

Jane _ I'll just say that if we are going to do it in that way then we're not, no longer going to be doing that World café idea which ..

Alison – Is that not the afternoon, I thought that was the afternoon. Do you know this World Café thing? Please explain it.

Nick – yeah, it's basically run from across lunch.

Jane – when we originally started this idea, we were trying to think of a way of participatory event that really would get the whole concept of the oral tradition actually happening. As the way that actually happens, in women's saving circle, for example. We just thought that you just get all this information that otherwise is not there. And this is a participatory event which is set up along this, to allow that to happen. So we call it the world Café, because in café's people sit down informally and chat, chat, chat and talk and talk and talk. And sometimes all these ideas come back and then get new ideas and then they move forward on that. So this idea was – it's come about, I experienced it. I was to come along to go to an experience to see what I thought of this as a participatory tool. For big

events of 30, 40, 50 people. How do you get 50 people in one room to participate, so that everyone feels that their voice .. for one thing that they've had an experience, another thing that they have actually taken part. And another thing that they have gone home feeling that they have engaged in something that's actually not just stagnated but that you can build upon. Ok. This is the motivation behind this tool.

So they set it up, so that you would have say- six different tables. And everyone would sit wherever you want. Let's just play for a minute. Everyone sits wherever they want in this room, at least six tables, say, 35 people. And then there's a facilitator who says , ok, we all have this huge morning session, all these ideas have been discussed, everyone there is a bit of an expert or professional or whatever they do. And then they suggest - ok, we are going to discuss this subject by asking one question or two question same as to say - one broad question - what is really the main question here, what we are talking about. And then everyone sits down at these different tables and for 15 minutes these group of people talk and what happens is, you write down, although you would probably remember every little detail, but some people can't always remember every detail, how that discussions go . so they notes on this table cloth. And it's really like a café. Cups of coffee and you are chatting and talking informally. The whole idea is that it's informal then after 15 minutes two people move on from each table. It's like you are moving along your street, talking to somebody else. Seriously, this is the idea. Only two people move on to the next table and they say hello, what have you been talking about at this table and suddenly you start .. various people enter in. but you can also choose to stay at the same table and after 15 minutes then you will run again, ok, but ..

Alison - you get to recap when you bring your stuff to the table...

Jane - exactly. Mean while someone staying at the table saying - ok, now what do these new people have to say. They've come in completely new. And they've heard what happened and suddenly they've got a different perspective. But what happens is that normally at these discussions everyone stays at their own table and it all gets .. you have this one experience. So then after an hour or a hour and a half, hour and fifty minutes, you've actually had a chance, at least someone's moved around these tables throughout the whole hour and a half so there has always been a constant flow of new ideas and there's been a breathing space. And an intake and out take of ideas and experiences. Meanwhile everything's been done. So at the end, what happens - every one stops. The facilitator say - ok, has there been (well there has been one person who stayed at each table through this whole interchange) and that person says - oh yes, I have. I have been here the whole time and I've written down these notes and so now I am going to present what happened at this table. What was the oral expressions that we had at this table. Well we started off like this and then it went like this and then suddenly someone said this. and then someone arrived who hadn't been there at all. And they had a really interesting idea but basically what's evolving is the whole discussion and then the next table will say what they did, and then the next table will present what they have done. And what's amazing about it is that you actually take part in you realize that you manage, if you move to somehow add something to these tables and you can hear what you added, actually contributed to the discussion and moved it forward in some way or not.

Sunder - sort of conversation musical chairs.

Jane - yes, yes, this is the idea. The draw back is that you can't focus on - like this table is doing this discussion and this table is doing that discussion. But what you do get is an extraordinary interchange between everybody there to really

work through a concept and go away with a greater understanding in that way. So you have to now decide whether you think there is a validity to this process.

Alison – the question for the afternoon is – whether we want to open things up or whether we want to come down to a conclusion. This seems like a process of opening up. Is that what we want to do in the afternoon so you end up with lots of different ideas, or do you actually want to ...

Michael – 53.26 a broad insight is which is always useful but does that work towards building confidence in the international community which is one of the objectives we are working towards.

Sheela – my concern is more about the time frame.

Michael – because we want to stop at 4 o'clock. We want a conclusion, sort of

Sheela – no, and then .. my concern is that you truly need a solid time frame to do that. You can't say you will do it only for .. when you are saying 15 minutes and if you have a group of 5 or 10 people when you do that. I don't know how.. the concept I like very much but I don't see how – from there you move to what is going to next be a very formal session. That's my imagery of that session.

Jane – I left out a bit. What happens – the facilitator then takes all these issues and works out what the priorities are or what the main subjects were and then you would actually go into more specific groups to then focus on those particular areas. So it's a sort of filtration process of heightening the level of discussions so then we would then go deeper into these issues. That would be how ..

Michael – it needs a really sharp facilitator, doesn't it to pull that all together into something that is really good thinking and forward, and that's really – the actual big challenge is to go from the very broad to the very focused, in a short space of time. We need a really sharp facilitator to do that.

Sunder – also I had one concern not directly related to what Jane is saying. Because this one day seems to have two or three objectives. I am not sure whether they are meshing here in terms of , you like Michael what you are saying about giving urban a bigger, better emphasis from the point of view of the international community. That seems one thing. but, to what extent is Amartya Sen's work useful or otherwise in looking at, say, this community based initiative. That is a parallel thing, or could be parallel or could .. so I am just saying, when you are designing the day .. otherwise it can run on separate tracks and there would be nothing holding the whole thing together.

Jane – Just restate the objectives again.

Romi – I think, it's a commercial. We are presenting a commercial to the policy makers. I think that presentation should be very strong and very clear from our point of view. We are selling, very hard sell. We are saying it's not a fully developed product, it needs more work done on that, but we are selling it to you as an initial thing and we want you to react to it.

Michael – so that it has a demonstrable legitimacy that is observable on the ground.

Sheela – coming from up and down.

Romi – so, I think the presentation that you make in terms of the ideas of what's happening is a very articulate and a very clear process. I am not concerned to discuss the issues which are not resolved here. We have a very clear idea of what we want to say. That's all the time there is. For us to explore the more tentative ideas that we ourselves are discussing about, we may need some other location in some other .. and we don't want to talk about that because..

Michel – it's a highlight event.

Romi – it's a highlight. It's a straight commercial. And then we are saying – come on, you tell us – we know what's wrong with your approach, what's wrong with ours.

Alison – Is Sen reacting to the outcomes of the day or you want Sen to say his own thing.

Romi – In a way, Sen then comes in and then the chairman of the board comes in and says 'aha,'. (laughter) he comes and announces the discount!

Sunder – if it is a commercial then we should not have, you know, we may not be interested then in that much participation, if it is highlight event.

Romi – I don't think so..

Sheela – but you see the techniques of .. you don't have to bang people on the head. You can use many techniques. Soft sell.

Everybody together. Laughter.

Jane – the idea is, you've got all these people who might be skeptical. They might be skeptical about what SPARC's doing. They might be skeptical about this woman's savings or they might be skeptical about Sen. Just by giving oral presentations and discussing things at a more academic level I don't think that changes people's hearts. Or if they are really going to take this on board. I mean, I don't know, you have gone to hundreds of these conferences. My understanding of why these participation tools have developed, is that it comes from experiences like what we've seen in the women's savings circle. That when people actually do it because they believe in it, because they want to, it's their thing, they've initiated it, you have to do it. the way Jockin was talking about why he doesn't have to be in all these different countries. It's because there's been some transformation in people's ideas realizing they are taking initiative. But they can't do that unless – if you get these people, all of us are going to be at these different tables. All of us who are here, are going to be a different tables. And we could be at these tables, discussing these things with people who are skeptical, hearing them trying to voice their concerns, telling them – well what about this, what about that. Discussing this more in depthly, so that all their fears and all their concerns would be lifted and unveiled, so that they are much more on board.

Smita – but aren't we agreed almost that there will be break our sessions in groups. Isn't it more about a format for those sessions, whether it's a café format of something.

Romi – I think, you and Michael have attended many more of these kind of .. the audience that we are talking about. I'm not very clear about this, it's not my .. I'm don't know how you sell ideas..

Smita – I think it's quite important for people to have an opportunity to discuss. If you have an all day of them just listening, I don't know, it will be very negatively perceived.

Michael – the main point about it is – you don't know what the outcome's going to be. And the outcome might be – we don't think this is a way of carry forward.

Smita – but can't we strategically champion... to facilitate them...

Michael – yes, yes, that's what Jane was saying. ... yes. So you mean it's a foregone conclusion.

Sheela – but I think what we are also trying to say is that this is a exploration we are getting involved in. We are taking something which is exciting. You want to join us? We're going to do it anyway. Look at the way we do it. what we do is – we say – we are going to do it anyway. You want to come and join us, join us. if you don't want to join us, don't join us but we are going to it.

Alison – but with the procurement process it doesn't allow you to go away.

Nick – you will be part of the future, don't want to be part of the future ..

Celine – I remember Celine taking at that Cities Alliance meeting in Canada. She says – we are going to have a party, want to come, you have to be part of the group.

Michael – I think we can finalize that but we do have to recognize that it's not the open theoretical discussion that I think you've described as the café. I mean it could be manipulated, ..

Smita – I think there has to be some structures question before hand, which like Nick suggestion was that they come out of this two hour plenary. My thinking workshop experience is – that's also dangerous. Because if you have some questions, you have them before hand..

Michael – yes, I agree,

Alison – you need to have them beforehand to fascipulate and manipulate

Sheela – but I feel that supposing after this main discussion we have a morning session in which all the speechifying is over, then you have the second half of the morning, in which we spilt into groups, in which we are all there and the purpose of that discussion is – (1) clarifying anything that you thought was being asked and 920 tabling of issues and concerns that come from the group that you want to discuss and bring to the next session.

Alison – tabled issues and over lunch time you can order those into ...

Sheela- and then we actually have some people who are part of this process and some people who are from different other .. like you are talking about these other people, who actually comment on this issue because they are observers in this discussion and they make those observations. And then those things are then synthesized.

Alison – the respond to them. They could respond to them from after lunch.

Sheela – but for me, what – I can see the linkage between session 1, 2 and 3, but I can't envision session 4 (with Sen) in terms of what he says and how is that connected. I mean I would have understood it if he came in the morning, said everything, left and then we were reacting to everything. But now he is going to come in the evening, so then how does he relate to all this?

Jane – I think this whole concept of having these sessions and tabling ideas so on and so forth is exact very much the opposite of what I've been saying. Because I think the idea what I am trying to say is that this happens naturally, the group of people I went to, who did this, were very articulate, very international, very involved with cities, and sort of top international, multi-national companies and who were all discussing these things. They certainly were very .. what came out was this happened on it's own. And what came out on it's own was far more interesting, than you try to impose an organize sort of – right, now we are going to table this, now we are going to do this. what happened when the people just said – right, they are already motivated, they already want to see an output. So this is the idea behind this process. If we decide to this whole process out then that's fine but this is the opportunity that I am presenting -is to allow to try something out that I feel has very much come out of the women's savings circle. Which is that if you just allow groups of people to come together, I mean, this is where you have to trust it, or you don't trust it. they come out with these issues. It becomes really clear, you know.

Sheela- I think the problem is not so much whether we trust it or not but when as a group we haven't ... what we are trying to do is to genuinely explore in a situation where we have not experienced this process – which is not to say that in that thing it didn't work out, but it's to say how are we going to set it up and what are we going to do. If somebody feels confident about that, I don't have a problem, because I agree that if that's going to be the discussion that will come out and if all of us are involved, we will talk about it. All I want to do is work out a way by which we ..

Alison – we could almost leave that to the managers to decide. I mean the organizers.

Sheela – what you are saying is, then this would be session two.

Michael – well, I am beginning to think that, It might be a better idea, remember we did explore that earlier, that the international café happens in the second half of the morning .. because then everything is open and exploratory.

Sheela – and the third session ..

Michael – third session is respondents like most ..

Sheela – because what happens is, you've got to have something which again gets back to being – you know you can't suddenly come from the café thing and go straight into a .. because I can't even ...

Jane – alright, so how we do that session in the morning, then when people present their ideas, what's happened at those tables, those will begun to direct what the afternoon discussions will be.

Sheela – that's right.

Michael – that will become deductive. In the afternoon. Leading towards.. so we give that more time to write about it. whereas normally that's someone's scribbling away in a back room trying to sort of summarize it.

Jane – and it give the lunch time to the man who facilitated to work out what all the themes are so that he'll go away. After lunch they come back – these are the main themes on these tables da-da-da. Does that sound like a good idea/

Sheela – that's better.

Michael – how about then some respondents in the afternoon session following the round tables cafes, most able vigilante and Davies. Because then you've got livelihoods, rights, human development index and it's revaluation.

Alison – you need to have somebody who also going to do what Walters ...

Jane – I think you could have it outlined but it will come .. it will be like going into this workshop, it will like us coming here and trying to direct Sheela and Sunder to say – well, we want to see this before we know it's actually going to be there. Something might come out of all these people who are so good.

Romi – but I think we will have to indicate who should respond. At least some two or three people. Otherwise you will suddenly get into a dead lock..

Alison – I think you can tell them that you are responding to the film and to this idea, and also there will be some new stuff. So you'll have to think on your feet as well.

Sheela – and that they are prepared for that.

Romi – they'll prepare for it. That's three people or four people, that's say ten minutes.

Sheela- three people..

Romi – three people, ten minutes each, five minutes each, nothing mote than that.

Michael – in the afternoon.

Romi – yeah. Just a focus as the .. they will be just simply five seven minute presentations. Reflections. By three..

Michael – and then by the time Sen comes in there is a conclusion.

Alison – you could then have a plenary.

Michael – it looks as though we are going this way. How would you react to that/

Celine – yeah..

Nick – so we need one person then to hold together the whole lot. So that when Sen comes, you can actually say – this is what happened during the day, this is the range of the discussion, this is how they responded to and it is actually very clear to him, what has come out for the day.

Alison – you could do that by having these external respondents.

Jane – I've already told him that. I have already said to Amartya that . Romi is going to sum up what's happened and I can have a dialogue...

Everybody talking together

Alison – you could do that..

Michael – absolutely fine.

Alison – you could do that by having those external respondents.

Michael – Romi could sum up.

Michael – and you could then have another ... which includes

(Puns between Sunder and Sheela etc.) Not Sen's and nonsense. Making Sense of Sen.

Jane – but he also then, when he sums up, he really gets into a dialogue if you want to add issues or Jockin wants the ...

Michael – I'm happy.

Alison – it looks good.

Jane – If something crops up like say, although certain people you are going to tell that to do the afternoon – is there still room so that if something comes out of this World Café set situation, issues that we didn't anticipate – this is what I am trying to .. then we can .. there's still possibility to discuss those things as well.

Michael – yeah. Absolutely. To show those responded to, responding to the film which we are having in advance. They will have heard the presentations and they have heard the output from the café, ..

Alison – and then they respond, so that they will be responding on their feet.

Nick – and then Romi sums the whole day up ..

Jane – ok,

Nick – could we go on to the next thing quickly, which is, who is coming and how the finances are working for that.

1.11.52 .. that's where the problem lies at the moment. I don't know exactly how much we've spent at this point, so I don't know how much is left over. But what we anticipated was bring able to pay fares for – and this is following from the e-mail I sent just before we came here. About 5 or 6 people – air fares and two days accommodation in London. Is that about right Jane, can you remember?

Jane – say it again

Nick – we've got about five fares, sufficient for five people, presuming they don't get full price economy or club class.

Sunder – can one person use it five times.?

Nick – we've got five people accommodation for two nights plus flights in the UK. Now I've heard that some ...

END OF MD 15.
MD 16
Contd.

Nick - ... what's the obvious – Jockin, Sheela, sunder and Celine. That's four.

Michael – we need more, do we? Tell me if we need more.

Alison – because we need enough people to take it forward afterwards.

Sheela – yeah. What we were thinking of is – for us it will be very strategic to have Dr. Nayak there.

Michael – but presumably he can pay for himself. Will he pay for himself?

Sheela – what I am trying to say is that if we work what we want to do is ... we also want to develop a connection between him and .. because .. and what ..

Alison – he from government

Sheela – what we are also trying to do is, we are checking this out, but I think two of us, two or three of us are going for a meeting in Germany which is on the 2nd and 3rd. that's why we wanted to understand what else is being happening so the idea ... that's why we were saying .. then after that it would be foolish for us to come back and then come back again.

Michael – Nick, just give them the money.

Jane – from our point of view, which is Introducing Amartya Sen's Ideas, it's very important that people who are doing this work in other parts of the world, so it's not just a close knit one group of people. And what Romi has been encouraging me to do right from the start was to have dialogue with key people working in, you know Brazil. People working in .. the UNDP man is working in Cairo. To bring in, you know, people from many parts of the World. This is an opportunity...This is an initial opening up of the hearts they ... and to get these key people there right from the start, who then go back to their countries wherever they are is also an important aspect. I know Michael agrees with this. and so, unfortunately We don't have vast amounts of money to do it all. So we have to...

Nick – so we've got to make choices, that's the issue really.

Jane – we don't want to .. I mean we've realized maybe we can only have .. do one person from elsewhere, but there's one person that crops up and that's why if there's any way of using this money as wisely as possible so that we can bring in .. I mean even to your advantage there's one man who is working in Rio, in the Favellas, who I think would be amazed to hear what you are doing. And he is very influential there I was saying. So to have him there would actually .. all of this is actually to share what you are doing to other parts of the World, although you already are doing this anyway, there's other key people who are doing in their work who might be ... so this is I see all as one, it's all interconnected.

Nick – I mean, one way of doing it would be to literally just to give you a lot of money and say – spend that as wisely and wisely as you can, stay with David Sathertwaite, create a slum dwelling in London and save the accommodation

coast, whatever. You know, do it as cheaply as possible, rather than the assumption, you've got a 100 pounds a day per day. I mean you are going to stay in the Savoy or something. Do it most economically as possible. And then a basic minimum amount of money that ...

Celine – we are used to roughing it out..

Nick – and then what you need then to do is to come back to us and say this is – maybe we can do that next week when we meet in London and say how much is the minimum you can get by with and then..

Sheela – I'll work out what our costs are.

Nick – and then by the middle of next week, we'll have an idea how much balance .. then we can start saying right xyz..

Alison – Just make sure this German things not cancelled.

Nick – how about the.. I don't think it's possible at this second to say – we've got 2000 pounds available, like the Americans or

Sheela – ok, we will do that. Let me get back to you..

Smita – yeah, because you have to stay, but, in London Sheela. You are going to be in Germany 2nd and 3rd, where are you going to sleep on the 4th and 5th and 6th, please tell me.

Nick – in your bedroom?

Smita – yeah, sure, but, you know. I think it's ..

Nick - it has to be managed.

Smita – to me, it's like, you are traveling for a purpose ..

Sheela – so lets work that.

Nick – try and work that out, I mean bear in mind that – what we don't want .. is booking agency in London for trying to spend... because it can be very time consuming to find .. space in everybody's..

Sheela – no, no. That we will work out

Nick – because we just don't have the resources to do that.

Celine – and the meeting will be at the LSE or at DFID?

Michael – at LSE.

Celine – so we need a space somewhere... or we can trains also.

Nick – we can but it costs money for get to ...

Celine – but cheaper than the hotel room.

Jane – make sure you've got yourself covered ... I'm just saying just to be – that if you use it as wisely as you can..

Sunder – LSE doesn't have dorms which should be closed...

Sheela/Celine – we don't want to live in dorms.

Smita – no, there has to be.. Sundar. It's not, I mean, if you were going to promote some community exchange it's one thing. you are coming, all these World Bank people and all over are come, sorry, they are going to stay in five star hotels – why shouldn't you be entitled to stay in proper accommodation.

Nick- exactly.

Smita – you are selling your ... you know they are coming to hear you! Why should you slum it in my bedroom?

Jane – I think we are telling everybody who is coming to this conference – not a sort of five star hotel..

Everybody together.

Sheela – I think the point is well taken, I will sit and work this out and I am in London next week, so I'll work out those arrangements, find somebody to help us out with that.

Sunder – check with the queen whether there is space in .. (laughter)

Everybody together.

Jane – when I want to find a really amazing accommodation in the center of London, there is a web site called – www.laterooms.com I've looked into all of them, they are like half the price of the normal, they are really, when the top rooms that have a price, you have to book it like ten days before and it's just fantastic because you are right into London. So there you go, it's a wonderful way of , it's a good way.

Celine – could Tamlin help us find that, we will give him some homework to do.

Jane – oh, no. I've actually .. I already know the good ones, I've looked into them. When people come, it's a fabulous way to stay in some of the really good hotels, or ...

Nick – And Dr Naik... what's

Sheela – Nayak. We'll send you his e-mail. N-a-y-a-k.

Alison – you will communicate with him, rather than..

Sheela - you will, but we will also. What I want to do is – we'll also talk to Mr Madan. Are you (Mr Agarwal) on the way – you are going to be in the US, right.

Agarwal – yes, till 12th I am in the US.

Sheela – that's what I thought. So the other thing which I am going to do is, I am going to ask Mr Madan, (I think you've met him at Sundar's house). So what we are doing is – he is going to come with us to Germany. So we'll bring him.

Nick – the only, what we have got to be fairly careful about is, not being too open with the.. because we've really got a limited..

Sheela – no, no, no. that's what I am saying, that just completes the circle of ..

Nick – yeah, ok, fine. because we've got a limited number of people..

Sheela – what we have to do is to get Michael to send an invitation letter to him.
So that – what he told us was ...

That's it.

Logistics of travel in the afternoon.

End of recording.

End of meeting.