Sustainable Development Policy Institute

Monograph Series: M-014

Citizen Organizations as Policy Entrepreneurs

Adil Najam

06 April 2000

Citizen Organizations as Policy Entrepreneurs

by

Adil Najam

Monograph Series # 14
2000

A publication of the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI).

Sustainable Development Policy Institute is an independent, non-profit research institute on sustainable development.

Mailing Address: PO Box 2342, Islamabad, Pakistan.
Telephone ++ (92-51) 278134, 2278136, 2277146, 2270674-76
Fax ++(92-51) 2278135, URL:www.sdpi.org

Table of Contents

The Sustainable Development Policy Institute is an independent, non-profit, non-government policy research institute, meant to provide expert advice to the government (at all levels), public interest and political organizations, and the mass media. It is administered by an independent Board of Governors.

In the Monograph Series the SDPI Publisher Monographs written by the regular or affiliated staff of the Institute. The monograph are finished research products of a length which makes detailed treatment of subjects possible. The monographs deal either directly with sustainable development or related policy issues which affect sustainable and just development.

Citizen Organizations as Policy Entrepreneurs[1]

Adil Najam

The Rise and Rise of the Citizen Sector

Writing in *Foreign Affairs*, Lester Salamon (1994: 109) proclaims that "a striking upsurge is underway around the globe in organized voluntary activity and the creation of private, nonprofit or nongovernmental organizations.… Indeed, we are in the midst of a global 'associational revolution' that may prove to be as significant to the latter twentieth century as the rise of the nation-state was to the later nineteenth." Strong words indeed; but a view increasingly being shared by others. Julie Fisher (1993: xi-xii), for example, points towards "a nongovernmental revolution… already sweeping the Third World" and considers citizen organizations to be "essential contributors" in being able to cope with "the 'steep and rocky path' that we must locate, construct, and somehow pull ourselves along if we are to survive without destroying the lives of future generations." Princen et al. (1995: 54) proposes that "by supplementing, replacing, bypassing, and sometimes even substituting for traditional politics, [citizen associations] are increasingly picking up where governmental action stops—or has yet to begin."

Citizen organizations—whether you prefer to label them as nongovernmental organizations, as nonprofit entities, or by any of their many other names—are not a new phenomenon. What is new, however, is:

a) the realization that there is a rapid and sustained growth in their numbers across the globe (e.g., Fisher, 1993; Uvin, 1996);

b) the more nuanced recognition that the rise of such organizations is a global phenomenon, not simply because they are growing all across the globe but because they are leaving significant imprints on global processes ranging from economic development to democracy to

ecology (e.g., Gordenker and Weiss, 1996; Mathews, 1997); and

c) the resulting growth of scholarly interest—to which this volume is itself a testament—in studying them at the international, and even global, level in a comparative as well as a theory building sense (e.g., Hulme and Edwards, 1997; Salamon and Anheier, 1997).

The same trends which point towards the increasing influence these organizations are having at all levels of operation in all corners of the world, are leading some to wonder if the act can live up to the advertisement and whether reality may not have been overextended by rhetoric. Even as the global rise in stock of the citizen sector is celebrated by all, the perceptive scholar is left to unravel the implications of this newfound fascination:

> *The Media love NGOs. The world's public—at least those who have any compassion for the struggling poor—love NGOs. And increasingly official aid agencies and many Third World governments are courting them. Is this glowing image realistic? Can NGOs deliver all that is expected from them? (Clark, 1991: 52)*

Thomas Dichter (1988: 36) ponders upon the dilemma that citizen organizations everywhere face: "they are being asked to take on more and more even while not, in truth, being certain of what will work over the long haul… this means new opportunities and a great challenge ahead. But the risks are also great, especially given [their] tendency to shortchange reflection in favor of action." It is worth nothing that such concerns are being raised by the sector's long-time friends and supporters. This heightened sense of introspection is a sea change worth noting, especially when juxtaposed with the unadulterated admiration of erstwhile distracters who have suddenly become new converts to the magic of civic association.

The task of unraveling these concerns while keeping track of the meteoric rise in the size and scope of the sector is not an easy one. This is so in no small part because the terrain of the global citizen

sector is characterized by an amazing degree of diversity in size, scope, structure, goals, ideological leanings, operational approach, financial base, etc. (*see* James, 1987; Clark, 1991; Fisher, 1993). More relevantly, our conceptual and analytic understanding of this terrain is even more scant than the terrain is expansive (Drabek, 1987; Cernea, 1988). Despite a few notable exceptions, the broader literature on the subject continues to be restrictive for at least three important reasons.[2] First, the scholarship has been overwhelmingly *descriptive* with little effort to synthesize the wealth of descriptive evidence into analytic frameworks, empirical typologies, or holistic conceptual maps of the entire sector as a sector. Second, the focus of the literature is largely *sectarian* in that studies have tended to concentrate on restricted bands of the larger, and much broader, spectrum of activities that these organizations indulge in. Third, much of the literature is *parochial* in that most studies focus exclusively on narrow segments of the sector that they are familiar with (or aware of) with little effort to establish connections with other segments. The result of these chronic deficiencies is a sporadic and temperamental appreciation of the behavior of this sector, as a sector.

These ailments are brought sharply into focus by the existence of what David Lewis (this volume) calls the two "parallel universes" of research into the set of organizations that collectively make up the global citizen sector;[3] one devoted to understanding the so-called non-*governmental* organizations (NGOs) in the developing countries of the South and the other to study of the so-called non-*profit* organizations in the industrialized countries of the North. For a very long time an unhealthy, and in many ways unnatural, chasm has existed between the two universes. There has been little to no contact between the scholars of the two domains and each has remained ambivalent (at best) to apprehensive (at worst) about the extent that it could learn from the other. Very little exists in way of trying to bridge this chasm and, for most part, studies that focus on NGOs in developing countries tend to ignore the learning on nonprofits in industrialized countries as consistently, unabashedly, and routinely as studies that focus on the later ignore the former.

As this book testifies, this is finally—and not a moment too soon—beginning to change. Appropriately, much of the emerging literature in this stream focus on aspects that are unique to citizen organizations in each respective universe and how the two differ from each other. While not denying the utility of mapping these differences, this monograph takes a somewhat different route towards the same ultimate goal of getting these two worlds to talk to and learn from each other. It seeks to build on that which is common between the two universes.

In doing so, the lens of policy influence provides us with a useful starting point. Although policy is no less context driven than issues related to governance, legitimacy and effectiveness (the other themes discussed in this volume), it does have one distinct advantage over the others. There exist large and robust general literatures on public policy in the developing and industrialized countries respectively; and while those literatures also do not tend to talk to each other as much as they should, they do talk more than do the literatures on nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations. As a result, we already know that policy processes in the two contexts do have some important commonalties and, at the broadest level, the process can be diagrammed along the same lines whether it is in the South or the North (*see* Najam, 1995). At the same time, and again at the same broad level, the separate literatures on nongovernmental and nonprofit organizations tend to throw up very similar categories of ways in which citizen organizations try to influence the policy process in their respective contexts.

By placing these two elements together this monograph proposes a simple yet effective template for mapping how citizen organizations, whether they be in the North or South, influence policy. It is argued that having a common template, even if it is at the broadest level of generality, is a first step towards enabling a dialogue. More importantly, the dialogue can be enriched by enabling a better view of the overall richness of the tapestry that is the global citizen sector. The hope is that by being able to view the full tapestry we will be better positioned to appreciate the embedded grains and textures of the various strands that are either

common or differentiated between citizen organizations in North and South.

To make the analysis more manageable, this monograph will survey citizen organizations working in the broadly defined area of 'sustainable development.' This allows us to capture two segments in which the sector tends to be heavily engaged—environment and development—while casting a wide enough net to capture the richness of organizations in both North and South. A conscious effort is made to use examples from both North and South, from various sub-regions within each, and from organizations that range in size from multinational to national to local. The purpose is not to camouflage the many important differences between these organizations, but to highlight how—despite the differences—they tend to operate in broadly similar ways in trying to influence the public policy process at its various stages.

In summary, this monograph seeks to better understand how citizen organizations, in their various roles, interact with the policy process at its various stages. To resist the temptation of being either too descriptive, too sectarian, or too parochial it sets itself the task of *constructing an analytical template* of the *full range of policy services* that citizen organizations provide in a selected substantive area (in this case, sustainable development) *using examples from both North and South*. In doing so, it argues that at the broad level the same template can be used for organizations in North as well as South and that starting from points of broad similarities can bring us closer to developing behavioral explanations that span the entire global citizen sector rather that only its various substantive or geographic sub-sectors.

A Definitional Note

A discussion about what we mean by the terms *citizen sector*, *sustainable development*, or *policy* could easily land us into a definitional quagmire. This paper will avoid prolonged definitional debates about any of the above because despite their pervasive use none has a precise definition attached to it. Although seeking greater conceptual clarity regarding any of the three is a challenge with great intellectual appeal, it is an

endeavor of limited productive relevance to our immediate purpose. However, because of the very same reasons it is necessary to lay out what this monograph understands each of the three concepts to mean.

Trying to define the **citizen sector**—or the set of institutions which is variously referred to as civil society or the nonprofit, the nongovernmental, the voluntary, the independent, the charitable, the people's, the philanthropic, the associational, or the third sector—has been a confounding exercise for many.[4] Those who have taken such expeditions of faith have been quick to recognize the arduousness of their trek (Esman and Uphoff, 1984; Douglas, 1987; Hansmann, 1987; Weisbrod, 1988; Brown and Korten, 1991; Salamon and Anheier, 1997; Najam, 1996a). For example, at the very onset of their typological endeavor, Esman and Uphoff (1984: 58) warn their reader that "[a]lmost anything that one can say about [the citizen sector] is true—or false—in at least some instance, somewhere." On a similar note Cernea (1988: 9) observes that "the residual nature of the term itself offers such a broad umbrella for a kaleidoscopic collection of organizations, that attempts at simple definitions are quickly rendered meaningless." Clark (1991:40) all but gives up the attempt by starting from the premise that such organizations "do not comprise a tight community but a broad spectrum—too broad, perhaps, to leave the term with much meaning."

In fact, as I have argued elsewhere (Najam, 1996a) the absence of a robust conceptual definition for the sector as a whole and the residual nature of the terms *non*-governmental or *non*-profit organizations has intellectually impoverished our understanding of the sector. Building on earlier works by Nerfin (1986), Brown and Korten (1991) and others, I have argued that citizens organizations do in fact constitute a distinct institutional sector, with distinct motivations and structural preferences. I suggest that the institutional landscape, especially for any policy relevant discussion, is best understood as constituting three distinct sets of institutions—those of the Prince, the Merchant, and the Citizen. The first of these—the state sector—is primarily concerned with the preservation of social order; does so through its legitimate authority and coercive sanction from society; represents the

interests of the majority (or dominant groups); and operates in the realm of the political system. The second—the market sector—is concerned with the production of goods and services; does so through mechanisms of negotiated economic exchange and profit maximization; represents individual self-interest; and operates in the realm of the market. The third—the voluntary associational, or citizen, sector—is most concerned with the articulation and actualization of particular social visions; does so through the shared normative values of its patrons, members and clients; represents the interests of those who consider their interests marginalized, and operates in the realm of civil society. [5]

If the citizen sector is a difficult concept to define, **sustainable development** is only more so. In using the term, this monograph makes no claim of possessing a precise definition for the term. It is used here in its popular, if vague, sense of implying the quest for a balance between ecological and economic imperatives. The most popularly quoted definition of the term comes from the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, 1987: 8) which defined it as development "that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Although lacking in analytic detail for meaningful policy use, this definition is as good as any. Politically, and semantically, the term is a convenient marriage between the desire for sustaining ecological integrity and furthering economic and human development. One of the most comprehensive review of the literature on defining sustainable development is provided by Lélé (1991: 607) who points out that "to some extent, the value of the phrase does lie in its broad vagueness." The term is used here in a similar spirit of being a 'constructive ambiguity.' In an operational sense, organizations working on issues that lie on the nexus of environment and development concerns will be described as working in the field of sustainable development.

The popular understanding of the term 'policy' also tends to be expansive and all consuming. This monograph's conception of **policy** emanates from three related streams in the policy literature. First, in *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, John Kingdon (1984) describes the generation of policy

alternatives as being "best seen as a selection process, analogous to biological natural selection. In… the policy primeval soup, many ideas float around, bumping into one another, encountering new ideas, and forming combinations and recombinations." Importantly, he adds that "in the process of consideration in the policy community, ideas themselves are important." Second, in *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*, Deborah Stone (1988: 14) asserts that "public policy is about communities trying to achieve something as communities. This is true even though there is almost always conflict within a community over what its goals should be and who its members are…." Finally, in *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process*, Giandomenico Majone (1989) introduces the notion that the policy process is not simply one of presenting objective evidence but of dialectical argumentation and persuasion.

At a minimum, then, policy is seen as a social device to accelerate, decelerate, circumvent, or create particular changes. The narrow view of policy as a set of legally binding edicts handed down by some 'competent authority' is rejected. Instead, the policy enterprise is conceptualized as a dynamic dialectic dialogue (Majone, 1989) between the sometimes competing and sometimes converging notions of the 'public interest' held by the various actors and interests in the larger community (Stone, 1988)—it is in the interaction between these various notions in the policy stream that policy is shaped, reshaped, and reshaped again in a constantly evolving process (Kingdon, 1984). Within such a conception of the process, citizen organizations—who, by definition, are agents of change and whose goal is to articulate and actualize a particular social vision—are best identified as being policy entrepreneurs (Najam, 1996a). The normative values they represent and the social visions they seek to actualize are their contribution to what has been called the 'primeval policy soup' or 'policy stream.'

Citizen Organizations in the Policy Stream

Citizen organizations have an abiding interest in the content of public policy. As McCormick (1993: 142) puts its, "the fundamental objective of an NGO is to influence public policy from outside the formal structure of elected government." One of

the more robust definitions of the sector, provided by Hall (1987: 3), describes them firmly as policy entrepreneurs in the very same sense as that used here:

> *…a nonprofit organization [is] a body of individuals who associate for any of three purposes: (1) to perform public tasks that have been delegated to them by the state; (2) to perform public tasks for which there is a demand that neither the state nor for-profit organizations are willing to fulfill; or (3) to influence the direction of policy in the state, the for-profit sector or other nonprofit organizations.*

Indeed, we can define citizen organizations as 'para-policy organizations' on the basis of their principal normative characteristic being: (a) the bringing together—in associations—of actors with shared normative values, (b) for the purpose of actualizing particular social visions (Najam, 1996a). The later are the goals and the former are the interests that the organizations bring to the policy stream. It is in interacting with other actors in the stream that they seek to express these interests and forward these goals so as to influence the ever emerging shape of policy.[6] The work of Smith and Lipsky (1993: vii-viii) on the rise of public service contracting in the US supports this view of citizen groups as policy entrepreneurs: "We believe that the experiences and behaviors of the people who work in nonprofit organizations and other parts of the service system, taken together *add up* to—in a sense, become—the nation's social policy" (*original emphasis*). Organizations operating in the South are similarly preoccupied with issues of public policy. In fact, so much of what they do--e.g., build roads and wells or provide education and healthcare--is so much like what governments are supposed to do that one might sometimes confuse them for governmental agencies were it not for their having proudly labeled themselves as being 'non'-governmental.

The other actor in the policy stream that we focus on is the government or, in our earlier conceptual metaphor, the prince. Although interaction in the policy stream with other policy

players—including other citizen organizations, donor agencies and philanthropists, commercial sector organizations, political parties, etc.—will also impact their ultimate influence on policy, it is the shape of policy as enunciated by government institutions that the policy enterprise is most directly concerned with and it makes sense to select this as a focus of our enquiry.[7]

It is not without irony that the government sector should be as central as it is to the activities of the very group of organizations that so often define themselves as *non*governmental.[8] That they are, in themselves, not governmental is seen to be a badge of honor by most citizen organizations; this, however, does not imply that they are not interested in the government. Far from it, much of citizen action and aspiration—in developing as well as industrialized countries—can be boiled down to doing itself, or wanting the government to do, things that it (i.e. the government) is either (a) refuse to do, (b) do not do enough of, (c) are incapable of doing, or (d) are unable to do.[9]

Some mutual apprehension will always be a part of all Citizen-Prince relationships because, as Clark (1991: 74) points out, citizen groups "are often distrustful and critical of governments and... these sentiments are often reciprocated." Within the sustainable development area, for example, the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) is often considered a major breakthrough in close collaboration between governments and the citizen sector on a set of global issues. Yet, as Finger (1994: 186) reports that "a fundamental tension existed throughout the UNCED process, a tension between [a citizen] role as defined by states and one defined by [citizen organizations] themselves" (*also see* Enge and Malkenes, 1993; McMahon, 1993). Having said that, the growing trend is towards more, rather than less, cooperation between the domains of the Prince and the Citizen (Uvin, 1996; Fisher, 1998; Najam, 1996c). To stick with the UNCED case, for example, its principal document (the *Agenda 21*) extols governments to explicitly invite citizen organizations to take part in the formulation and implementation of sustainable development policies.

Noting this global trend, Lester Salamon (1994: 120) strips away at what he calls the "myth of voluntarism" to point out that contrary to popular opinion, even amongst scholars, "the relationship between government and the nonprofit sector has been characterized more by cooperation than conflict." Moreover, he suggests that such cooperation is on the rise and is likely to remain so into the next century. According to Smith and Lipsky (1993), for example, the striking growth in the use of nonprofit groups as public service contractors is one of the more striking trends in this sector in the United States today. The evidence from the developing countries suggests that this trend is not unique to industrialized welfare states (*see* Hulme and Edwards, 1997; Opoku-Mensah, 1997; Fisher, 1998; Najam, 1996b and 1996c).[10] For example, Diaz-Albertini (1993: 332) reports from Peru:

The relations between the government and the NGDO [nongovernmental development organizations]… are becoming frequent and intricate, making the differentiation between the actors more difficult. In Peru, NGDOs are collaborating in diverse projects under many different kinds of arrangements: as consultants, as managing or co-managing government programs and services, as large-scale projects in conjunction with multilateral lending institutions, and so on.

Paul Opoku-Mensah (1997: 19), in studying the relationship between citizen organizations and the government in Ghana finds that "contrary to the rhetoric of conflict, relations between the [citizen] sector and the state in Ghana have generally been collaborative." He goes on to extrapolate this discussion to Africa in general and argues that accommodation between citizen organizations and governments is on the rise throughout the continent.

Korten (1991: 30) reports a similar trend in Asia:

> *NGOs in many Asian countries have demonstrated substantial adeptness in building alliances with those in government who are both influential and sympathetic to their cause. Alliance building is often a conscious political*

> *strategy aimed at securing political protection for the NGO and its activities. With time the alliance may become the basis of a coalition advocating constructive policy changes to which the NGO and the concerned officials have mutual commitment.*

Annis (1987: 132), focusing on citizen organizations in Latin America, forwards a possible explanation:

> *Just as the poor are deeply interested in the resources of their governments, so too, their governments are deeply interested in them—even if for all the wrong reasons…. First, extending services implies political obligation…. Second, local organizations are often viewed by the state as appropriate instruments for carrying out high profile, state-sponsored service campaigns… Third, states are able to see potential benefits of "cost sharing" and "cost recovery"…. Fourth, even the most unenlightened and bureaucratic state agencies recognize that services are likely to be delivered more efficiently if there is input from those who are supposed to receive the service…. In other words, at the same time that grassroots organizations are trying to wrest services and concessions from the state, the state is generally trying to break itself into finer units of political and bureaucratic control. What happens in practice is a kind of interpenetration—a blending in which the so-called "governmental" and "non-governmental" meld together.*

This growing trend towards increased Citizen-Prince contacts should, however, not necessarily be seen as a threat either to state sovereignty or to citizen autonomy.[11] As Drabek (1987: xiii) points out, "one of the fundamental reasons that NGOs have received so much attention of late is that they are perceived to be able to do something that national governments cannot or will not do. Yet NGOs have no intention or desire to supplant or compete

with the state in their development efforts; on the contrary, in both the North and South most NGOs continue to interact heavily with governments." Instead, this trend should be viewed as an expected corollary of increasing citizen presence in the policy domain. Indeed, it could be viewed as *de facto* recognition of citizen organizations having come of age and being taken seriously by other--especially governmental--actors in the policy stream. As the level and sophistication of citizen-government relations increases, it is important to invest scholarly attention and enquiry into understanding the nature of and variance in such relations, and the possible sources of variance.[12]

This growing interaction between citizen organizations and governments suggests that the citizen shadow over the policy enterprise is likely to enlarge rather than shrink. As the following discussion will illustrate, much of the citizen influence on policy comes not from conventional advocacy but from more subtle forms of interaction within the primeval soup that is the policy stream. To limit our investigation of the policy influence of citizen organizations to the conventionally narrow confines of policy 'advocacy' is to limit our understanding of this shadow.

Constructing a Policy Map

There is a wealth of descriptive literature from all over the world which suggests that citizen organizations are both interested in and have influence upon the policy process. Much of this happens through conventional 'advocacy' but even more happens in other, more indirect, ways. The rest of this monograph will survey that part of this vast literature which deals with the broad area of sustainable development to develop an improved understanding of how citizen organizations operate within the policy stream. Since the scale, scope and diversity of the examples can be overwhelming, we will begin by constructing an organizing template to assist us in better appreciating the various roles that citizen organizations play as entrepreneurs in the various stages of the policy enterprise.

The proposed framework is a two dimensional matrix of policy competencies with the various stages of the policy process

defining one axis of the matrix and the different roles that citizen organizations play in the policy enterprise defining the other. Given the meandering nature of the policy stream and the diversity of roles that the citizen sector plays within this stream, one could potentially draw out long laundry lists along either dimension. However, for this exercise to be conceptually and analytically useful it is important that the number of categories along both axes be few enough to be manageable, defined enough to be meaningful, and broad enough to (between them) cover the conceivable spectrum of possibilities.

Although the policy process is complex and unsympathetic to simple conceptualizations—and although the term 'stages' is itself misleading in that policy moves less along well-defined linear stages and more in seemingly haphazard patterns better defined by metaphors such as 'garbage cans' (Cohen et al., 1972) and 'primeval soups' (Kingdon, 1984)—most scholars of policy sciences would agree that at its broadest level the process can be reasonably depicted as one of *agenda setting*, *policy development*, and *policy implementation*.[13]

- **Agenda setting** is about *setting priorities*. At this stage, the various actors in the policy stream seek to highlight the importance of the issues and interests that they most closely identify with. The essential task is to decide the issues on which policy should focus. By the very nature of the policy enterprise, there are always more interests to be satisfied than there are resources or time. Therefore, prioritization becomes a key task.
- **Policy development** is about *choosing from alternatives and options*. It is here that policy takes a formal, sometimes legally binding, shape. In national and local politics this could range from legislative action to judicial edict to agency regulation to norms of community practice. In international politics it could range from a binding convention or treaty (hard law) to a normative declaration (soft law). The key issue in this phase is the battle about which, of the invariably many, options or alternatives is selected to seek the desired effect. While the debate in agenda setting is related more to which

issues should be tackled as priority, the question here is what approach should be adopted in tackling it.

- **Policy implementation** is about *action*. It is in this phase that steps are taken to convert intent into action. Often, but not always, broad policy statements are converted into more specifically defined projects in this phase. The key issue here is to ensure that the tasks set out in the policy are carried out. However, the process of implementation is never as clean as this and very often policy is itself, *de facto*, reformulated during implementation (Najam, 1995).

A survey of the literature throws up a long list of roles that citizen organizations play in the policy stream at the local, national and international levels. Rejecting the laundry list approach preferred by some, this paper identifies four broad areas as the key loci of citizen involvement in the policy stream. One way of conceptualizing these four roles is as follows: As ***monitors***, citizen organizations ensure that government (and the commercial sector) is doing what it is supposed to be doing; as ***advocates*** they prod government agencies to do what they consider to be the 'right' thing; as ***innovators*** they suggest how things might be done differently; and as ***service providers*** they themselves act directly to do what--in their opinion--needs to be done.[14]

- **As monitors,** citizen organizations perform the function of keeping policy 'honest'. In this capacity, they not only act as 'whistle-blowers' for policies that are not being implemented properly but they also keep track of events that are likely to, or should, impact the shape of new policies.
- **As advocates,** citizen organizations lobby directly for the policy options they prefer, or against the ones they oppose. They build strategic coalitions and public support which might tilt the balance in favor of their preferred policy option. This includes a multitude of related functions including information dissemination, public education, and resource mobilization.
- **As innovators,** citizen organizations develop and demonstrate ways of doing things differently and

highlight the policy value being missed by options that are not adopted or considered. This includes the innovative contributions they can make to policy by virtue of their practical, technical and managerial expertise. This is one of the more catalytic roles they play in the policy stream and it is not uncommon for the 'citizen innovation' of today may become the 'government wisdom' of tomorrow.

- **As service providers,** citizen organizations directly act to fulfill a service need, especially to the marginalized and under-served. This would also include services provided directly to communities in substantive sectors that are considered to be part of governmental competency or mandate such as the provision of clean water, reliable roads or even telecommunication infrastructure.[15]

Citizen organizations perform all four of these role at the three stages of the policy process described above. To get a full picture of their involvement in the policy enterprise we can construct a 3x4 matrix with the policy roles they play on one axis and policy phases on the other. Matrix I defines a map of the policy space within which citizen organizations influence public policy. As will be highlighted later, it is important that the matrix not be seen as a set of rigid boxes. It should be seen, instead, as a map of the larger policy space that the global citizen sector inhabits; a space which is characterized not by stringent internal and external compartmentalization but by a set of very porous and somewhat dynamic boundaries.

Matrix I: Citizen Organizations as Policy Entrepreneurs—The Policy Space They Occupy

	Monitors	Advocates	Innovators	Service Providers
Agenda Setting				
Policy Development				
Policy Implementation				

The following sections will discuss examples from all over the world of how citizen organizations working for sustainable development have influenced policy in each of these roles and at each of these stages. This discussion will lead to a composite matrix which will lay out, with examples, the broad map of citizen involvement as policy entrepreneurs in the quest for sustainable development (Matrix II). Although the examples used in this monograph are predominantly 'positive'—partly because the literature on the subject has tended to highlight the sector's positive contributions far more extensively than its negative impacts—this paper does not imply any value judgment regarding such contributions being necessarily positive. Similarly, that the chosen examples are generally ones where citizen organizations have played such policy roles 'effectively' should also not be taken to imply that they always do so as effectively. Indeed, as a number of perceptive scholars have pointed out, not all goals of citizen organizations may be socially desirable; not all organizations are alike; not all organizations possess the much publicized 'strengths' of the sector; and, in fact, not all publicized strengths are necessarily always strengths (see Tendler, 1982; Annis, 1987; Dichter, 1988; Clark, 1991).

Citizen Organizations as Monitors

Some of the biggest, certainly most visible, 'policy successes' of environmental organizations—and more generally of citizen organizations in other substantive areas, especially in the human right area—have come in their role as monitors, especially as monitors, whistle-blowers and watchdogs over policy implementation (Dawkins, 1991; Lindborg, 1992; Stairs and Taylor; 1992). They have been effective monitors at both the national and international levels; at the later this has become one of their principal hallmarks (Chayes and Chayes, 1993). So much so that Spiro (1995: 45-6) considers them to be "prime movers" in this area, and they are now seen as "a sort of new world police force," and that "international regimes protecting human rights and the environment would arguably amount to nothing without initial and continuing NGO pressure."

The institutional strengths that citizen organizations bring to their role as policy monitors include their claim of independence from the governmental and commercial sectors, their substantive expertise in a number of environmental issues, and their ability to gather information not easily available to individual citizens which they then disseminate to their constituents and the media. Importantly, as Princen et al. (1995: 51) point out, they "do not have to be nice to anyone. They can be, and often are, in the business of monitoring, exposing, criticizing, and condemning. They need not compromise on either ecological or ethical principles, or at least they need do so much less than states for which the essence of maintaining good relations is, indeed, compromise."

Moreover, there is an implicit moral claim that these organizations make in their role as policy monitors on behalf of citizens. This is made explicit by Korten (1990: 187) who reminds his readers: “Abuse feeds on silence. Often the fear of exposure is in itself enough to check the potential abuser.” He adds that “the judiciary is a passive instrument” and “the press can communicate only the information it has”; it is, therefore, up to citizen organizations to become the “eyes and ears” that call attention to abuses of policy.

Although the monitoring role is most intensive at the policy implementation stage, it is not inconsequential at the other two stages. In the **agenda setting** phase, the monitoring role of the citizen sector is most often related to collecting and publicizing information that can help the shape of the emerging policy agenda. Although related to the advocacy role, this needs to be recognized as a separate activity which is conceptually a precursor to advocacy and deals more with the identification of problems than of solutions. Many environmental groups have literally defined the agenda for policy through their monitoring activities. An immediate example is the role played by IUCN-The World Conservation Union in extensively researching and documenting the effects of trade in endangered species which was significantly instrumental in making this an issue worthy of an international treaty (Porter and Brown, 1991: 61-2). Another powerful example is the series of *Citizen’s Reports on the State of*

India's Environment (CSE 1982) coordinated by the New Delhi-based Center for Science and Environment (CSE). Written in collaboration with, and with contributions from, local and national organizations dealing with environment and development issues, these reports served as well documented monitoring efforts that can be credited for having a substantial impact on India's policy agenda definition in the general area of sustainable development.

The monitoring carried out by various citizen organizations as part of their publications strategy has also had significant influence on the shape of national and international policy agendas. For example, periodicals such as *World Watch* (World Watch Institute, USA) and *Third World Resurgence* (Third World Network, Penang, Malaysia) and the bi-annual publication of *World Resources* (World Resources Institute, USA) have had such impact. Similarly powerful as a monitoring effort is *Vital Signs*, a new annual publication of the World Watch Institute, which traces trends (mostly quantitatively) in environmental quality. Figures, charts, and arguments from such publications have an uncanny way to showing up in policy debates regarding the agenda direction and are frequently used not only by other citizen organizations but also by government decision-makers.

The monitoring role played by citizen organizations at the **policy development** stage has also benefited from advances in information technologies and the attendant ease in information gathering and dissemination. One prominent example from the international policy arena is that of the 'Earth Negotiations Bulletin' (ENB) of the Canada-based International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). This initiative has electronically produced and distributed regular reports--often on a daily basis--on most of the prominent sustainable development-related policy negotiations since UNCED. This serves the very valuable purpose of monitoring the evolving shape of extremely complex, time-consuming, distant, and protracted policy developments on a regular and immediate basis. This has had the significant impact of enabling other citizen organizations and activists--and even government officials--to keep abreast of events without exorbitant costs in time, energy and money.

There also seems to be a growing trend at the national level towards citizen organizations closely monitoring policy development to keep the process 'honest'. In the US, for example, most major environmental groups maintains an office in Washington which tracks policy development discussions on issues of particular interest to the membership. While the principal function of these offices is advocacy, a separate monitoring function should not be neglected and is most evident in the various 'policy updates' that such groups periodically send to their supporters. In a Southern context, the development of the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy (PNCS) was publicly monitored through a special newsletter published by IUCN-Pakistan with inputs from other citizen organizations. At the completion of the policy development phase the newsletter turned into the magazine *The Way Ahead* whose primary mandate is to monitor the implementation of the Strategy but which also serves the important function of monitoring the development phase of other related policies. Most recently, this included the new national law pertaining to NGO registration.

The most visible and consistent impact that the citizen sector has in its role as a policy monitor is at the level of **policy implementation**. Examples abound at all levels—local, national, international. Examples from international policy include the success of Greenpeace and Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) in documenting and publicizing violations of the Antarctic Treaty System (Laws, 1991); Greenpeace has had similar success in bringing world attention to violations of the International Convention on Regulation of Whaling (Stairs and Taylor, 1992). Monitoring *as part of* policy implementation—as opposed to monitoring *of* policy implementation—is also a task that citizen groups have been adept at. For example, Princen et al. (1995: 53) remind us that in wildlife trade, Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce, the Environmental Investigation Agency, IUCN and other nongovernmental organizations assume a major share of what would otherwise be a primarily intergovernmental function, namely monitoring.

Examples at the local level are similarly numerous. Bolivia's Beni land reserve, for instance, was declared a UNESCO "Man and Biosphere Reserve" in 1986 but over the next two years loggers continued to operate in the reserve in violation of the concession granted to them; a local organization of the Moxos Indians has been monitoring this violation and has been able to direct national as well as international attention to this infringement (Dawkins, 1991: 83). In Malaysia, the Consumers Association of Penang was able to win a suit against a Japanese company that was mining rare earths and polluting the waterways on the basis of having monitored the firm's activities and documenting how it violated national policy (Livernash, 1992: 226). In Pakistan, local citizen groups, such as Shehri (literal translation "urban citizen", have begun playing a similar monitoring role and are pioneering the use of legal action as a strategy for environmental activism by highlighting instances where policy is not being implemented as it should (Yusuf, 1992).

Citizen Organizations as Advocates

If monitoring serves as the 'eyes and ears' of citizen interests otherwise unrepresented in the policy stream, advocacy (or lobbying) serves as the mouthpiece. A conceptual distinction between the two roles is highlighted by Korten (1990: 186):

> *…unlike the monitoring and protest role… the first priority of the [citizen organization] in the catalyst role is **pro-action** to create positive change more than re-action to police negative behavior. Thus the focus is on **advocacy**—acting **for**—rather than **protest**—acting **against**. (original emphasis)*

All citizen organizations are, by definition, advocates. Yet, for some of them formal advocacy is not only an overarching theme but the bulk of their formal activity. It is advocacy as a specific activity rather than as the overarching defining theme that we are concerned with here. Advocacy, in this more specific sense is by far the most recognized of the policy roles played by citizen organizations. Efficacy in this role is enhanced, especially in

established electoral democracies, by the ability to mobilize public opinion which can translate to direct and indirect pressure on government decision-makers:

> *Backed by the credibility they bring to an issue, [citizen organizations] can effectively use the media, public demonstrations, consumer boycotts and other grassroots channels to mobilize public opinion. This capability is critically important for two reasons: the ability of the media, consumers and voters to pressure—and thereby influence—actions of government officials engaged in the [policy development] process, and the impact of public opinion and resulting changes in behavior on the problem itself." (Lindborg, 1992)*

However, as Diaz-Albertini (1993: 323) points out, such strategies are not always available or applicable in "weakly institutionalized political systems" where the advocacy role played by the citizen sector hinges more on "attempting to strengthen or restructure state agencies so that they become capable of processing political claims… by institutionalizing channels for representation—bargaining, negotiating, and building capability for assuming long-term agreements and development programs." The ability to mobilize resources and training opportunities can be a source of strength in this task—it can give advocacy efforts similar legitimacy with state agencies as the ability to mobilize mass public support might do elsewhere. McCormick (1993: 140) seems to believe that "lobbying and other forms of interest-group activity are essentially Western concepts, and although there are effective and vocal national NGOs in many non-Western countries, they are not always relevant or appropriate in terms of understanding how policy is influenced and made in those countries." This is an ill-informed view. While the *nature* of advocacy and lobbying may be different in Southern countries, all evidence suggests that citizen groups in these countries are no less active, or successful, in their advocacy. In focusing on the experience in Africa, for example, Bratton (1990: 87) found that organizations in non-Western settings *are* able to lobby effectively, albeit differently. He also

identified some key structural attributes for effective advocacy: "policy advocacy is most likely to be effective in organizations that have several key characteristics: an homogeneous membership, a federated structure, a focused programme, informal ties with political leaders, and a domestic funding base."

Citizen organizations have had dramatic success as advocates for sustainable development policy at the **agenda setting** stage.[16] Princen et al. (1995: 52) testify that citizen organizations "are increasingly prominent forces in framing environmental issues. They help establish a common language and, sometimes, common world views. Indeed, the history of international environmental politics shows that new ideas have not come from governments or even designated international organizations, but from environmental lobbies and activist groups" (*also see* Porter and Brown, 1991; Najam, 1993). Most of the big international groups such as Sierra Club, Friends of Earth, Greenpeace, etc. are particularly adept at advocacy at all, and especially at the agenda setting, stages. More recently, a number of developing country groups such as the Malaysia-based Third World Network (TWN) and the Philippine-based Green Forum have also become active in lobbying at the agenda setting stage of international environmental policymaking.

A specific example of the impact that citizen organizations can have as advocates at the agenda setting stage is of the International Waterfowl Research Bureau (IWRB). Advocacy efforts by this group and a series of meetings convened by it in the 1960's resulted in the signing of the 1971 'Ramsar' Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Lyster, 1985). The Women Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) has been similarly instrumental in influencing the agenda of many recent international policy negotiations (Chen, 1996). In relation to more domestic policy, various advocacy campaigns launched by the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) in Pakistan have successfully afforded increased prominence to environmental issues—e.g., the use of plastic grocery bags, domestic water conservation, etc.—on the policy agenda. The advocacy work of the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) in the mid-Western states of USA on renewable energy

options has, similarly, given a new prominence to the issue in domestic US energy policy debates. Population groups in a number of countries, such as the Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association (PBKI) which began operating in 1957, have been particularly successful in advocacy at the agenda setting stage and in many cases have succeeded in bringing population issues from the policy wilderness to prominence (Fisher, 1993: 128).

Probably the most widely cited example of the impact that citizen organizations can have in the **policy development** phase relates to their participation in the UNCED negotiations (Lindborg, 1992; Enge and Malkenes, 1993).[17] Examples abound, however, of less visible but equally profound impacts elsewhere. One such example is the role played by citizen organizations in the US in influencing the final shape of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Without advocacy and lobbying by such groups in Canada, USA and Mexico the shape of the ultimate agreement would have been significantly different from what it now is—instrumental in this role was the tri-national coalition of citizen groups which came about as a result of efforts initiated by the Mexican advocacy organization Grupo de los Cien (Nunez, 1994; Ferber et al., 1995). These examples suggest a trend towards more sophisticated advocacy by citizen organizations:

Environmental NGOs [have begun to] use the law for strategic political purposes as an instrument of advocacy and influence, rather than as a means of achieving a substantive legal end.… [This] does not suggest that the use of law by environmental NGOs is new, but that it is increasing, that it is increasingly sophisticated, and that it is increasingly international (Sands, 1992: 31).

Despite such successes at the international level, the domestic setting remains the locus of most advocacy by citizen groups in both North and South. For example, a mix of activism and advocacy by the California Coalition for Clean Air and the Sierra Club forced the United States Environmental Protection Agency to "reluctantly" issue guidelines in 1990 calling for days in which Southern California drivers would not be permitted to use their cars if state and regional plans by the year 2000 are unsuccessful

in reducing carbon monoxide emissions; a month later the California Air Resources Board adopted the strictest "smog laws" in the nation calling for mass production of low-polluting cars and other measures (Dawkins, 1991: 82). As another example, the Committee of Earthquake Victims (CUD) formed as a coalition of various barrio organizations, local voluntary organizations, and university groups and coordinated by the Urban Popular Movement (MUP) in Mexico City in the aftermath of the 1985 earthquake articulated, advocated for, and was able to get the government to accept a defined policy package, which they had designed, setting out the ground rules for reconstruction (Annis, 1988).

Policy advocacy at the local level is often ignored because it is so dispersed. One should, however, not assume that it does not exist. For example, it was policy advocacy by literally thousands of local groups all around the United States that led local governments to adopt policies relating to recycling, landfills, wetlands, etc. Parallel examples in developing countries, although often undocumented, are nonetheless available; one instance being in the Pakistani village of Gunyar where a youth group (ABNJ) was able to convince village elders to experiment with 'social fencing' as an alternative to the prevalent approach [/policy] of open grazing (Ali, 1993). This example is an interesting one because it demonstrates the 'policy' influence that grassroots organizations can have even in situations where operational policy comes not through governmental dictates but via community practice.

Examples of advocacy by citizen organizations at the **policy implementation** stage—which very often means the project level—are also abundant. Since citizen organizations, especially in the South, are most involved at the level of project implementation it is not surprising that this has also been the setting of much advocacy by them. Very often, advocacy at this level takes the shape of protesting against particular policy implementation or project choices; implicit in this rejection, however, are notions of what alternatives are preferred. Similarly, advocacy on particular episodes of implementation or on specific projects often has a feedback relationship to broader policy

advocacy. In advocating against a particular project an organization is *de facto* advocating for broader policy choices; however, since it is easier to mobilize opposition (or support) for tangible 'projects' than for the more distant notions of 'policy', citizen organizations (especially smaller ones) often concentrate their advocacy efforts on project implementation. [18]

One of the most publicized recent episode of citizen advocacy at the policy implementation level is the controversy over the construction of the Narmada Dam in Gujrat, India. The lead group in this continuing saga is the Indian activist coalition, the Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA), but a large number of other groups in India and internationally—especially the International Rivers Network (IRN)—have also been active in the effort. Although the Narmada saga is a continuing one, citizen advocacy has, till now, resulted in the World Bank taking back its decision to fund the project and the Indian Water Resources Ministry having conceded to a number of project design changes advocates by the NBA (Triedman, 1993).[19]

Another less publicized example is from Pakistan where a coalition of Pakistani citizen organizations—including the Sustainable Development Policy Institute, Shirkat Gah Women's Resource Center and Sungi Development Foundation—and Greenpeace International averted the import of polluting mercury-based chloro-alkali production technology from Denmark to Pakistan. The plant had been legislatively closed down in Denmark, but a local Pakistani company managed to gain permission to relocate it in Pakistan. National citizen advocacy triggered the very first environmental hearing in the Pakistan Senate. Following the hearing, negotiations between these groups and the local firm importing the plant resulted in a decision by the firm to voluntarily upgrade the plant to a cleaner level. (Samee, 1995)

Other instances of advocacy by citizen organizations at the policy implementation level includes the Green Belt Movement in Kenya, which has successfully advocated for national tree plantation programs which have reportedly resulted in the plantation of some 10 million trees with the involvement of

50,000 Kenyan women; in doing so the Green Belt movement has itself taken on the role of defining the national tree planting policy (Livernash, 1992: 225). Similarly, a women's community group in Uttar Pardesh, India, successfully lobbied against a soapstone mining concession that would have blocked their access to fuelwood by destroying the forest that they depended upon—in doing so they were able to reverse the government's mining concession (Starke, 1990: 69-70).

Citizen Organizations as Innovators

Many scholars of the subject consider innovation in the policy stream to be a distinctive contribution of the citizen sector. Brown and Korten (1991: 48) argue that citizen organizations have important advantages over government as catalysts of social and institutional innovation because they "can test innovative programs that governments would not undertake until the programs are proven politically feasible." Korten (1991: 35) adds that organizations in this sector are in a position to take such risks where government might not because their institutional motivation is essentially different and intrinsically biased in favor innovation:

The bottom-line question for the technocrat is whether NGOs are more cost-effective than government in the delivery of basic services. By contrast, some social activists may argue that the question is irrelevant and reflects a lack of understanding of the real business of NGOs, which is to serve as catalysts of social change.

Clark (1991: 59) echoes this view, pointing out that citizen organizations "are less subject to the straightjacket of development orthodoxy than official aid agencies and governments. Their staff normally have greater flexibility to experiment, adapt and attempt new approaches. This is partly because the numbers involved in decision making are smaller, because local officials will probably not be as minutely involved, because scrutiny from outside is slight, the consequences of failure are much less, and because the ethos of 'volunteerism' encourages the individual to develop his or her ideas." However,

he poignantly adds that "the same factors could be cited as a problem—namely 'amateurism'. It fosters idiosyncrasy, lack of continuity and poor learning abilities."

Citizen organizations working in the broad area of sustainable development, especially in the South, have a more than impressive record in this area. Arguably, much of the credibility that environmental groups currently enjoy is because of their achievement in championing innovative policy approaches at the local, national and international levels.

At the **agenda setting** phase citizen organizations as innovators play, what Clark (1991: 59) calls, a 'seeding role' by "demonstrating the efficacy of a new idea, publicizing it, perhaps persuading those with access to greater power and budgets to take notice, and then encouraging the wide-spread adoption by others of the idea." It is no mean testimony to the agenda setting role that citizen organizations have been able to play that a term like 'participatory planning'—which was once mocked at by government decision makers—is now *lingua franca* for governmental development planners. Or, for that matter, 'sustainable development'—a term coined by IUCN and WWF in the 1980 *World Conservation Strategy* on the basis of earlier work done at the London-based International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and elsewhere—has become the mantra of governments around the globe. The concept of 'ecological accounting' now being developed with pioneering inputs from citizen organizations such as the World Resources Institute (WRI) is another concept that is fast gaining currency on policy agendas.

Very often, what gives a citizen organization the ability and the credibility to place innovative ideas on policy agendas is that they have already demonstrated the efficacy of these innovations through small scale implementation. An example of an idea that began as a citizen sector project and now enjoys currency all over the world is the provision of credit to the very poor by the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh. The idea that giving credit to the very poor is indeed a very bankable proposition would not, until recently, have been considered a serious suggestion. However,

today it is considered a model for micro-credit schemes throughout the world, even including USA, and enjoys a place of prominence on policy agendas of international development agencies and national governments in many countries (Clark, 1991: 59). Another examples of citizen innovations influencing policy agendas is the role that Ralph Nader and his groups have played in the in the field of consumer rights or which the Rocky Mountain Institute has similarly played in influencing the U.S. energy agenda.

We have defined innovation at the agenda setting stage as instances where citizen organizations are able to place novel or previously unaccepted notions on the policy agenda. Innovation at the **policy development** stage is defined here as instances where novel approaches championed by citizen groups are accepted as the policies of choice. One example of such policy innovation is that of the so-called 'debt-for-nature swaps' in which developing country debts are 'bought' off at discounted rates and, in return, the debtor country agrees to take mutually agreed environmental measures. This innovative idea has been championed by a number of environmental groups in North as well as South including Conservation International, the Nature Conservancy, Rainforest International, the Brazilian Institute for Economic and Social Analysis (IBASE) and the Ecuadorian Fundación Natura; these citizen groups have been active partners in a number of such deals which have now been completed in many countries including Bolivia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Philippines, Zambia, and Madagascar (Porter and Brown, 1991).

Citizen organizations have also spurred policy innovations nationally. For example, the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP) in Northern Pakistan has been so successful in facilitating village level community development that the model is now being used as the government's preferred approach to rural development (de Silva, 1994: 13). Similarly, in Peru, PROTERRA's land tilting activities in Lurin valley influenced the shape of agrarian reform laws; and in India, the Amul Dairy cooperative provided the model for the government's National Dairy Development Program (Livernash, 1992: 226).

That citizen organizations as innovators have been able to contribute as much as they have to the agenda setting and policy development stages is, in fact, a testimony to the level of innovation that they invest at the project, or the **policy implementation**, stage. It is here, more than anywhere else, that they are able to both nurture and apply what Tom Dichter calls 'strategic knowledge.'[20] A particularly relevant example in this area is that of the Pakistan Institute of Environmental-Development Action Research (PIEDAR) whose action research in rural Punjab is geared specifically towards demonstrating the benefits of community based irrigation management over bureaucratized irrigation management as a potentially more efficient implementation alternative.

Citizen organizations innovate as much by choice as out of necessity. Not all groups innovate nor are all innovations worthy of emulation. Yet, some very spectacular examples of innovations can be listed which have made significant contributions towards operationalizing the otherwise nebulous concept of sustainable development. The Sukhomajri Watershed Restoration project, in the foothills of the Himalayas in India, for example, demonstrates how an innovative community approach to water management can succeed where more elaborate technical approaches would not. Similarly, the Cassava Integrated Pest Management initiative of the Nigeria-based International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA) demonstrates how innovative biological solutions can be worthwhile alternatives to environmentally costly chemical pesticides. In yet another example, the spread of the Jiko Charcoal Stove in Kenya by KENGO demonstrated how a simple but innovative technology that is better both for the environment and human health can be popularized on at a mass scale (Reid et al., 1988).

Technical innovation—especially innovations that seek to meet the needs of the grassroots while learning from the latest advances but not forgetting traditional practices—is an area that citizen organizations working on sustainable development are particularly active in. Fisher (1993: 126) lists some examples: the Appropriate Technology Development Association in Lucknow, India; the Technology Consulting Center in Ghana; the

CAMERTIC (Center for Agricultural Mechanization and Rural Technology) in Tanzania; Dian Desa in Indonesia; and CEMAT in Guatemala. The list could go on indefinitely and could also include the many citizen groups in industrialized countries such as the Boston Solar Energy Society, Appropriate Technology International, etc.

Citizen Organizations as Service Providers

Service delivery is what more citizen organizations do more of than anything else. Whether it is providing food to the hungry, shelter to the homeless, employment opportunities to the unemployed, or dispensing the benefits of education and health, the common impression of a citizen organization is one of providing services to the impoverished and needy. Although traditional 'relief' services still remain a very large part of what citizen organizations do, recent research suggests that if one is to consider their activity at a global scale then a large bulk of what they do would be better classified as dealing with human and economic development—and increasingly with sustainable development (Drabek, 1987; Clark, 1991; Fisher, 1993). Moreover, as Smith and Lipsky (1993: 3) remind us, the movement from charity to public service contracting translates into an enhanced political role for the sector:

> *Voluntary associations [have long enabled] citizens to express their collective interests and solve community problems. Today, in addition, they play a new political role in representing the welfare state to its citizens, providing a buffer between state policy and service delivery.*

A simultaneous trend is towards the glamorization of more 'political' citizen activities such policy advocacy which, some fear, will come at the cost of the service delivery role. However, Charlton and May (1995: 241) remind us that a "service delivery role should not be marginalized as an adjunct to activities—from advocacy through citizenship education to lobbying—arbitrarily defined as 'more' political; nor should it be dismissed as a distraction from these more important 'political' missions." This

paper's definition of service delivery builds on Charlton and May's notion that service delivery, even in its narrowest meaning and even in the most isolated 'project' sense, is an essentially 'political'—and, in fact, 'policy'—mission. Moreover, we expand on this definition to include the delivery of 'policy services' not only to the communities that citizen organizations serve, but to governments who are increasingly using citizen organizations not only as official or unofficial advisors inducted to represent various community interests, but also as contracted policy consultants.

Citizen involvement at the **agenda setting** phase of the policy enterprise (in the form of actually providing the 'service' of defining a policy agenda) comes overwhelmingly in their role as monitors, advocates, and innovators. There are, however, occasional instances where citizen organizations are called in formally as service providers (often as public service contractors) in this capacity. A flurry of such examples came during the preparatory process for UNCED. [21] However, these should not be considered the norm.

One such example is that of the Business Council for Sustainable Development (BCSD), the creation of which was essentially facilitated by the UNCED secretariat and which was then formally invited by the secretariat to write a report outlining the business community's vision of sustainable development. This report, although not an official document, was nonetheless an exceptionally influential one. Another, more interesting, example was of an initiative led by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and other international environmental groups in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). This consortium provided assistance to selected developing countries in preparing their national reports for UNCED. In fact, a large number of countries in industrialized as well as developing countries directly involved citizen organizations in the preparation of these reports which, in many cases, have since influenced their policy agendas.

Another, somewhat unique, example of involvement as a service provider at the agenda setting stage was when the government of

Pakistan invited IUCN-Pakistan to hold a series of search conferences with various government agencies and citizen organizations to discuss if a National Conservation Strategy should be developed for Pakistan. This turned out to be amongst the most significant agenda setting events for much of Pakistan's subsequent environmental policy initiatives; it exposed a set of individuals and institutions to environmental concerns which have since played important roles in shaping the country's environmental policy.

Citizen organizations as direct service providers have been far more active at the **policy development** stage. Although the presence of the citizen sector in an observer capacity at most international environmental treaty (i.e. policy) negotiations is considered to be an advocacy role within our framework, some international groups have, in fact, played a direct service delivery role. The most prominent amongst such organizations is IUCN. Not only does IUCN actually host the secretariats of particular international environmental treaties at its headquarters in Gland, Switzerland but it has also been instrumental in shaping the language of a number of such treaties. These include the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, signed in 1972, which was based on a draft produced by IUCN in 1971; and the Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), signed in 1973, which was based on an IUCN initiative that went through three drafts over nearly a decade (Porter and Brown, 1991: 62; McCormick, 1993: 134).

Regional and country offices of IUCN have also played a significant role at the national level as a policy development service provider. Since having co-initiated the concept of National Conservation Strategies (NCSs) in the 1982 *World Conservation Strategy* IUCN has taken it upon itself to propagate these cross-sectoral policy reviews; since then, over 60 countries, most of them in the South, have produced such strategies, many with the active collaboration of IUCN. In most of these cases other, more local, citizen organizations have also been involved in the policy development process. More recently, other international groups, such as IIED, have also become involved in similar initiatives;

prominently including the preparation of National Environmental Action Plans (Carew-Reid et al., 1994).

At the national level, citizen organizations are often invited to governmental commissions and similar initiatives which are directly or indirectly involved in policy development. This has been a common practice in Northern countries for quite some time and is now a growing trend in the South. This trend has been especially prevalent in environmental policy development because a) citizen organizations, in their advocacy capacity, often have a major role in bringing environmental issues to the policy table, and b) they bring a level of technical and practical knowledge of environmental issues as well as a sense of community interests that government agencies may not possess. Such interaction during policy development is one of the stated goals of the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) in Pakistan which has played an influential role in a number of government policy development exercises on both national and international issues. Similarly, like many other such groups all over the world, Canada's National Roundtable on the Environment and the Economy (NRTEE) has representation from a number of citizen organizations including the Island Nature Trust, the Ecology Action Center, and Canadian Ecology Advocates (*see* Roseland, 1992).

Examples of the citizen sector playing a service provider role at the **policy implementation** stage are the most numerous. As suggested earlier, governments and donor agencies are rapidly realizing the strategic value of using citizen organizations for policy implementation tasks. According to Charlton and May (1995: 246-7) this may be because the sector's reputation for "probity (*qua* honesty)" is "the most significant of the NGO sector's 'qualitative advantage' over state functionaries and government agencies are realizing that "if rehabilitation of the policy implementation process is to occur under contemporary conditions, it will almost certainly require the direct assistance and support of the non-governmental sector to achieve what the governmental sector can no longer be expected to aspire to unaided." This is not without strategic advantages for the citizen sector:[22]

> *The insertion of [citizen organizations] into the policy and programme cycles of governments and their donors principally as project implementers places the sector in a strategic position, pursuing roles as policy mediators and service providers that may appear mainly economic in form but are as clearly perceived by their beneficiaries as political in their content. (Charlton and May, 1995: 240).*

We are most concerned here, however, with citizen initiatives which serve to fill a major void in what might otherwise be considered an area of state responsibility. These, then, are the areas where citizen organizations are 'filling in' for the state either because they are able to provide services which the state is unable to, or are able to provide them more efficiently and effectively than state agencies. Examples that immediately come to mind include the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) which works in 2,225 villages and, as only one of its many diverse development projects, has provided oral rehydration training for 11 million households; and the Organization of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP) in Zimbabwe whose employment generation projects reach over 60,000 people (Fisher, 1993: 95). The Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP) runs a similarly broad development program in Northern Pakistan. All three are large enough in size and comprehensive enough in scope to rival some government agencies and, in fact, are looked upon both by their beneficiaries and by governmental agencies in the areas they serve as pseudo-government agencies, or what Salamon (1987) might call 'third-party government.' Similar programs also abound in Northern countries with one obvious example being Planned Parenthood clinics all over the US which have been at the forefront of providing contraceptive education and services. Given the volatile politics that surrounds issues of contraception, and by extension abortion, such clinics are able to provide a service that the US government is unwilling to provide.

Another way in which citizen activity is harnessed in the policy implementation phase is through what Durning (1989: 78) calls

'broad community-government mobilizations'. He points out that extraordinary gains have followed in the (admittedly rare) cases where local-national alliances have been forged:

> *During World War II millions of American, Asian, European, and Soviet civilians recycled materials, conserved energy, and planted victory gardens to boost food production. Later, South Korea used village-level organizations to plant enormous expanses of trees, implement national population policies, and boost agricultural production. Zimbabwe has trained more than 500 community-selected family planners to improve maternal and child health and control population growth. And after the 1979 Nicaraguan revolution a massive government literacy campaign sent 80,000 volunteers into the countryside… in one year they raised literacy from 50 to 87 per cent.*

Populating the Policy Map

The principal conclusion that emerges from the evidence and examples presented above is that in the various roles that citizen organizations play as policy entrepreneurs, they have been active in all stages of the policy stream. Populating the policy space we had defined in Matrix I with some of the examples discussed above gives us Matrix II. Significantly--but not surprisingly--it demonstrates the sheer breadth of citizen occupancy of the policy map. It is presented here to highlight the conclusion that in the area of sustainable development the global community of citizen organizations has been very active at all policy stages and in all policy roles. Moreover, this trend encompasses organizations of various sizes and structural features, working in various geographic locations, and operating under a variety of different contextual constraints.

The purpose of Matrix II is not to suggest that all citizen organizations are necessarily--or equally--adept and effective in the various roles discussed. It is only to point out that these are roles that citizen organizations are demonstrably capable of playing and are likely to continue playing as their involvement in the policy process increases. One must also reiterate that the matrix should not be seen as being composed of rigid pigeonholes. Nor should it be seen as a classification schema. For example, any contribution made at the policy development stage will necessarily be informed by, and impact upon, policy implementation and agenda setting. Similarly, particular organizations which invest effort, resources and expertise in a particular policy issue are often likely to follow it through the various policy stages or in various roles.[23]

In short, the policy map defined by the matrix should not be seen as a rigid edifice of twelve neatly defined boxes, but rather as a flexibly structured constellation of categories with permeable boundaries. Constructed as such, we should allow for cross-influences along both axes.

Putting the Policy Map to Use

Two important points emerge from the preceding discussion. First, the policy influence of citizen organizations--in both North and South--extends beyond narrowly defined notions of conventional advocacy and we need to look at the full range of roles in which these organizations can, and do, influence the substance and process of public policy. Second, the broad roles that citizen organizations play at the various stages of the policy process are, in fact, similar enough in North and South for a general framework to be constructed that can be applicable to studies from either domain and, therefore, also to comparative research within or between them.

The policy map matrix, as defined above, has the virtue of being independent of the geographic or economic location (e.g., North or South, Asian, European or North American, etc.), the substantive sector (e.g., environment, health, disaster relief, etc.), or the political system (democratic or dictatorial, unitary or

federal, etc.) in which an organization operates. Although it is necessarily broad in scope, the applicability of the framework to data on citizen organizations from either North or South can provide a basis for the type of systematic comparative research that is required for meaningfully bridging the chasm that exists between the sectors in these two worlds.[24] Such research can make use of the policy map matrix either as a tool for organizing data or as a device for analyzing it.

A Tool for Organizing Data

A practical utility of the policy map matrix is in providing scholars and practitioners with a handy device for organizing data on the policy influence of citizen organizations. Applied to any given policy episode, country, region, or organization, the matrix can help organize our understanding of 'who' (i.e., which organizations or sub-components thereof) is influencing public policy 'how' (i.e., in which role) and 'when' (i.e., at what stage). This is how the preceding section used the matrix. There are, however, a number of other ways in which the matrix could be used as a tool for organizing data on citizen organizations.

For instance, instead of populating the policy space with examples from around the globe as we have done in Matrix II, we could focus on a single policy episode and see which organizations have been active in which role and at which stage of the process. One example that has already been mentioned above is of the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy (PNCS) process.[25] This was a major cross-sectoral policy review which aimed to align national development priorities with the need for sustainable development planning. The agenda setting stage began in the early 1980s, gathered momentum towards the middle of the decade and by 1988 actual policy development had begun in earnest. In 1992 the government of Pakistan adopted the PNCS as the *de facto* environmental policy of the country. Its implementation is now in its second phase. Matrix III highlights the influence that selected citizen organizations had on this policy process in Pakistan.

Citizen organizations have been actively involved in all stages of the PNCS process and in Pakistan and abroad it is often quoted as a model of collaboration between government agencies and the citizen sector. In fact, the growth of environmental organizations in Pakistan has been directly influenced by the PNCS process. IUCN-Pakistan was the key impetus behind the entire process and was actually responsible for bringing it onto the policy agenda. It did so, first through a arranging visit by international experts and finally by hosting a conference in 1986 where government agencies were brought together with international and national experts and some citizen organizations to study the need for, and the possible shape of, such a strategy for Pakistan. IUCN was later appointed as the lead organization in the preparation of the actual policy document. As such, IUCN-Pakistan played the critical service provision role at both the agenda setting and policy development stage. It continues to play this role at the implementation stage but is now joined by a vast array of other citizen organizations, such as Sungi Development Foundation.

Partly due to the dearth of citizen organizations working in the environmental area at the time, there was no particular organization which played a major monitoring role at the agenda setting stage. However, during policy development a number of organizations, such as Shehri (Citizens for a Better Environment) and Shirkat Gah Women's Resource Center began playing this role by being involved in the discussions both for the purposes of 'keeping the process honest' and for advocating their particular interests. An even larger number of citizen groups are now indirectly playing a monitoring role at the implementation stage while the Journalist's Resource Center is playing it directly through its magazine *The Way Ahead*.

Apart from IUCN-Pakistan itself, the key advocacy role at the agenda setting stage was played by WWF-Pakistan. During the policy development stage this role was played by a number of organizations including, as already mentioned, Shehri and Shirkat Gah Women's Resource Center. Now, during the implementation stage, the key advocate for implementation is the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) which was established as a

result of the PNCS process with such advocacy being one of its principal mandates.

Organizations which influenced the agenda setting stage as policy innovators included IUCN-International which had pioneered the idea of National Conservation Strategies and the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP) whose projects in Northern Pakistan highlighted both the need and potential direction for such a strategy. At the policy development stage, the innovation principally came from the PNCS Unit which had been set up to foster a collaborative effort between key government agencies and IUCN-Pakistan's strategy team. Importantly, the PNCS Unit tapped into a vast reservoir of innovative ideas through a series of experts meetings and public hearings in which a number citizen organizations actively participated. At the implementation stage, a number of citizen organizations are playing the role of innovator. A key example is the Pakistan Institute of Environment-Development Action Research (PIEDAR) which was also created as a direct result of the PNCS process and one of whose principal project is seeking innovative policy responses to the issue of water use efficiency in the agricultural sector.

Amongst the many other alternative uses for the matrix would be to populate the policy space it defines with examples of how a single citizen group has tried to impact public policy at its various stages in different roles. A citizen organization may undertake such a study as part of its own strategic planning to better grasp the efficacy of its policy efforts. For example, such an enquiry may suggest that the organization in question is much more effective and efficient in a particular role, at a particular stage, on a particular type of issue. It would be advisable, then, for it to shift the focus of its policy efforts in that direction to get 'the biggest bang for its buck'. Yet another use may be to populate the matrix at a country, regional, or substantive issue level to highlight examples of different citizen organizations influencing public policy. Such a study would allow scholars to get a better profile of the policy influence of the citizen sector in that geographic or substantive area.

A Tool for Analyzing Data

The much more important task that necessarily follows the organization of data within any framework is to make analytic sense of the cases being reviewed. The policy map defined in Matrix I can also assist in organizing this analysis. More than that, it can be a useful device for generating and studying questions about citizen organizations in the policy stream. For example, a few of the questions that emerge from the preceding discussion include: Are particular forms of relationships between citizen organizations and governments likely to be more dominant at particular points on the policy map? Are there particular areas of citizen competencies within the larger policy stream? What type of citizen organizations are more or less likely to be successful at which particular area on the policy map? A much larger list of such questions could potentially be generated from the framework.

Answering any of the above would require much more systematic research and detailed analysis of particular cases than has been available for this study. However, even with the broad information that was used here, some tentative ideas begin to emerge which can be considered hypothesis for more detailed future research. Consider, for example, the question of whether there are particular roles or stages in the policy process where citizen organizations are more (or less) likely to have a significant impact on public policy? As a way of hypothesizing about the possible answer one might reflect upon the array of examples discussed earlier and attempt an informed--albeit necessarily subjective and qualitative--assessment about organizations working in the general area of sustainable development.

Based on the examples discussed, Matrix VI presents the tentative results of such hypothesizing about which roles have provided the citizen sector with the opportunity to make either 'strong', 'moderate' or 'weak' impacts at the various policy stages.[26] This should be seen as a descriptive rather than a normative assessment. That the citizen impact in a particular role at a particular policy stage has tended to be 'weak' should not be interpreted as a call to 'strengthen' that role but to ponder upon the institutional reasons behind why it has been so. For example, given how jealously governments in all polities guard their

prerogatives as the societal fonts of policy articulation, it should not be surprising that the impact of citizen organizations during the policy development stage tends to be strong only in their roles as advocates.

MATRIX IV: Towards Hypotheses--The Potential Policy Impact of Citizen Organizations Working on Issues Related to Sustainable Development

	Monitors	Advocates	Innovators	Service Providers
Agenda Setting	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	*Weak*
Policy Development	*Weak*	Strong	*Weak*	Moderate
Policy Implementation	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong

By similar token, it should not be a surprise that citizen organizations working towards sustainable development goals tend to have the strongest impact in their role as advocates or at the policy implementation stage. As advocates—which for them is a fundamental defining function—they best invoke their organizational motivation of actualizing particular visions shared by their workers and constituencies. By the implementation stage policy has often lost its 'fuzziness' and become concrete—often taking the shape of specific projects—and it is therefore easier for citizen groups to mobilize their constituents for the purpose of "actually getting things done!"

In the absence of detailed case-based studies, the value of something like Matrix IV is obviously limited. However, such an exercise can be a useful first step towards developing a well-defined and systematic research regime on the policy impact of citizen organizations. For example, in light of Matrix IV one might devise a research program to systematically look at a set of organizations (or a set of policy episodes) either within a country or between countries to see whether any general patterns of efficacy exist. In controlling for similarities or differences between the type of organizations being studied one could shed light on the question of what type of organizations are more suited for what type of policy activities, in what role, and at what stage

of the policy enterprise. Similarly, one might run parallel studies in Northern and Southern contexts to see what may or may not be common. The possibilities are many, but in each instance detailed case-based research would be required. However, in starting from a general framework, that research could then be plugged back into the framework to see what, if any, generalizations can be defended and what lessons might be drawn from experiences in different contexts. Such research would have much to contribute to our understanding of the global citizen sector.

Lessons Learned

Focussing on the substantive area of sustainable development this paper has attempted to construct a general framework for understanding how citizen organizations influence the process and substance of public policy. It has done so using examples of citizen organizations from both North and South. A conscious effort has been made to use examples of organizations of varying structural features, working at all levels (grassroots to international) in a variety of political, economic, and social settings. Any conclusions that emerge from this discussion must be accompanied with the disclaimer that in trying to understand the 'big picture' of policy influence by the citizen sector we have, by necessity, used a very broad brush. That many finer details may have been lost in adopting such an approach does not imply that such details are not considered to be important, but only that they have been beyond the scope of this exercise. Having said that, some general lessons begin to emerge about the activities of the citizen sector within the policy stream:

- There is a case to be made for actually defining citizen organizations in both North and South as policy entrepreneurs or para-policy organizations. We can do so on the basis of their normative characteristic being a) the bringing together—in associations—of actors with shared normative values, b) for the purpose of actualizing particular social visions. Much of the action and aspiration of the citizen sector (even where it calls itself the *non*-governmental sector) can be boiled down to either doing itself, or wanting governments to do, things

that governments either a) refuse to do, b) do not do enough of, c) are incapable of doing, or d) are unable to do.

- Whether they define themselves explicitly as 'advocacy' organizations or not, most citizen organizations are in the business of influencing policy. We need to broaden our understanding of such influence by looking beyond narrow and restrictive notions of policy advocacy as the only, or even principal, role that citizen organizations play in the policy stream. Citizen organizations also influence public policy through their activity as policy monitors; as innovators of new approaches; and as service providers.
- Expanding our conception of how citizen organizations influence the policy enterprise shows that, in fact, they influence policy at all its stages: agenda setting, policy development and policy implementation. Moreover, the broad roles that such organizations play--monitors, advocates, innovators and service providers--in the policy stream are, in fact, the same in Northern and Southern contexts. Placing the three policy stages on one axis and the roles in which citizen organizations influence policy on the other defines a map of the policy space within which citizen organizations operate in trying to influence policy. This policy map can be used as a tool for organizing as well as analyzing data. It can also help in generating and studying key questions about the impact of citizen organizations on the policy enterprise. Most importantly, such a framework can be useful for comparative research within and between countries which can facilitate better North-South learning and possibly lead to broader theory-building studies on the policy influence of the citizen sector.

References

ALI, SAHAR. 1993. "Gunyar: Leading by Example." *NCS Bulletin*, 5(2): 25-27.

ANNIS, SHELDON. 1987. "Can Small-scale Development be a Large-scale Policy? The Case of Latin America." *World Development*, 15 (Supplement): 129-34.

ANNIS, SHELDON. 1988. "What is Not the Same About the Urban Poor: The Case of Mexico City." In *Strengthening the Poor: What have we Learnt* edited by J.P. Lewis et al. Pages 138-43. Washington DC: Overseas Development Council.

BRATTON, MICHAEL. 1990. "Non-governmental Organizations in Africa: Can They Influence Public Policy?" *Development and Change* 21(1): 87-118.

BROWN, L. DAVID AND DAVID C. KORTEN. 1991. "Working More Effectively with Nongovernmental Organizations." In *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank* edited by Samuel Paul and Arturo Israel. Pages 44-93. Washington DC: The World Bank.

CAMILLERI, JOSEPH A. AND JIM FALK. 1992. *The End of Sovereignty? The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmenting World.* Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

CAREW-REID, JEREMY, ROBERT PRESCOTT-ALLEN, STEPHEN BASS, BARRY DALAL-CLAYTON. 1994. *Strategies for National Sustainable Development: A Handbook for their Planning and Implementation.* London: Earthscan Publications.

CERNEA, MICHAEL M. 1988. *Nongovernmental Organizations and Local Development*. World Bank Discussion Paper #40. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

CHARLTON, ROGER AND ROY MAY. 1995. "NGOs, Politics, Projects and Probity: A Policy Implementation Perspective." *Third World Quarterly*, 16(2): 237-55.

CHAYES, ABRAM AND ANTONIA HANDLER CHAYES. 1993. "*On Compliance." International Organization* 47(2): 175-205.

CHEN, MARTHA ALTER. 1996. "Engendering World Conferences: The International Women's Movement and the UN." In *NGOs, the UN and Global Governance* edited by Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker. Pages 139-55. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

CLARK, JOHN. 1991. *Democratizing Development: The Role of Volunteer Organizations*. London: Earthscan.

COHEN, MICHAEL D., JAMES G. MARCH, AND JOHAN P. OLSEN. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17(1): 1-25.

CSE. 1982. *The People's Report on the State of India's Environment (1981-82)*. New Delhi: Center for Science and the Environment.

DAWKINS, KRISTIN. 1991. *Sharing Rights and Responsibilities for the Environment: Assessing Potential Roles for Non-governmental Organizations in International Decisionmaking.* Masters Thesis, Department of Urban Studies and Planning. M.I.T.

DE SILVA, DULCAN. 1994. "Government versus the NGOs." *The Way Ahead–Pakistan's Environment and Development Quarterly*. 1(2): 12-13.

DIAZ-ALBERTINI, JAVIER. 1993. "Nonprofit Advocacy in Weakly Institutionalized Political Systems: The Case of NGDOs in Lima, Peru." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 22(4): 317-37.

DICHTER, THOMAS W. 1988. "The Changing World of Northern NGOs—Problems, Paradoxes and Possibilities." *Development–Journal of SID* 1988(4): 36-40.

DOUGLAS, JAMES. 1987. "Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. Pages 43-54. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DRABEK, ANNE GORDON (editor). 1987. *Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs.* Supplement issue of *World Development* Vol 15.

DURNING, ALAN B. 1989. "People Power and Development." *Foreign Policy*, Fall(76): 66-82.

ENGE, ELIN AND RUNAR I. MALKENES. 1993. "Non-governmental Organizations at UNCED: Another Successful Failure?" In *Green Globe Yearbook of International Co-operation on Environment and Development 1993* edited by Helge Ole Bergesen and Georg Parmann (Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway). Pages 25-33. New York: Oxford University Press.

ESMAN, MILTON J. AND NORMAN T. UPHOFF. 1984. *Local Organizations: Intermediaries in Rural Development*. Ithaca: Cornell University.

FERBER, BETTY, JANINE FERRETTI, AND LYNN M. FISCHER. 1995. "Building an Environmental Protection Framework for North America: The Role of the Non-Governmental Community." In *Green Globe Yearbook of International Co-operation on Environment and Development 1995* edited by Helge Ole Bergesen and Georg Parmann (Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Norway). Pages 83-92. New York: Oxford University Press.

FINGER, MATTHIAS. 1994. "Environmental NGOs in the UNCED Process." In *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the Local and the Global* edited by Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger. Pages 186-213. London: Routledge.

FISHER, JULIE. 1993. *The Road from Rio: Sustainable Development and the Nongovernmental Movement in the Third World*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

FISHER, JULIE. 1998. *Nongovernments: NGOs and the Political Development of the Third World*. Hartford, CT: Kumairan Press.

GORDENKER, LEON AND THOMAS G. WEISS. 1996. "Pluralizing Global Governance: Analytical Approaches and Dimesions." In *NGOs, the UN and Global Governance* edited by Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker. Pages 17-47. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

HALL, PETER DOBKIN. 1987. "A Historical Overview of the Provate Nonprofit Sector." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. Pages 3-26. New Haven: Yale University Press.

HANSMANN, HENRY. 1987. "Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. Pages 27-42. New Haven: Yale University Press.

HULME, DAVID AND MICHAEL EDWARDS (Editors). 1997. *NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* New York: St. Martins's Press.

JAMES, ESTELLE. 1987. "The Nonprofit Sector in Comparative Perspective." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. Pages 397-415. New Haven: Yale University Press.

KINGDON, JOHN. 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies.* New York: Harper Collins.

KORTEN, DAVID C. 1990. *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

KORTEN, DAVID C. 1991. "The Role of Nongovernmental Organizations in Development: Changing Patterns and Perspectives." In *Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank* edited by Samuel Paul and Arturo Israel. Pages 20-43. Washington DC: The World Bank.

KRAMER, RALPH M. 1981. *Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LAWS, DAVID. 1990. "The Antarctic Minerals Regime Negotiations." In *Nine Case Studies in International Environmental Negotiation,* edited by Lawrence E. Susskind, Ester Siskind, and J. William Breslin. Cambridge, MA: MIT-Harvard Public Disputes Program.

LÉLÉ, SHARACHCHANDRA M. 1991. "Sustainable Development: A Critical Review." *World Development* 19(6): 607-21.

LINDBORG, NANCY. 1992. "Nongovernmental Organizations: Their Past, Present, and Future Role in International Environmental Negotiations." In *International Environmental Treaty Making* edited by Lawrence E. Susskind, Eric Jay Dolin and J. William Breslin. pages 1-25. Cambridge, MA: Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School.

LIVERNASH, ROBERT. 1992. "Policies and Institutions: Nongovernmental Organizations: A Growing Force in the Developing World." *World Resources 1992-93* a report by the World Resources Institute in collaboration with UNEP and UNDP. pages 215-234. New York: Oxford University Press.

LYSTER, SIMON. 1985. *International Wildlife Law.* Cambridge: Grotius Publications.

MAJONE, GIANDOMENICO. 1989. *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

MATHEWS, JESSICA. 1997. "Power Shift". *Foreign Policy*, 76(1): 50-66.

MCCORMICK, JOHN. 1993. "International Nongovernmental Organizations: Prospects for a Global Environmental Movement." In *Environmental Politics in the International Arena: Movements, Parties, Organizations, and Policy,* edited by Sheldon Kamieniecki. Pages 131-43. Stony Brook: State University of New York Press.

MCMAHON, VANESSA M. 1993. "Environmental Nongovernmental Organizations at Intergovernmental Negotiations." In *Papers on International Environmental Negotiations* (Vol. 3) edited by Lawrence E. Susskind, William R. Moomaw, and Adil Najam. Pages 1-21. Cambridge, MA: Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School.

NAJAM, ADIL. 1993. "International Environmental Negotiation: A Strategy for the South." In *Papers on International Environmental Negotiation, Vol. III*, edited by Lawrence E. Susskind, William R. Moomaw, and Adil Najam. Pages 187-230. Cambridge, Mass.: Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School.

NAJAM, ADIL. 1995. *Learning from the Literature on Implementation: A Synthesis Perspective.* IIASA Working Paper WP-95-61. Laxenburg, Austria: International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis.

NAJAM, ADIL. 1996a. "Understanding the Third Sector: Revisiting the Prince, the Merchant, and the Citizen." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 7(2): 203-19.

NAJAM, ADIL. 1996b. "NGO Accountability: A Conceptual Framework." *Development Policy Review*, 14(4): 339-53.

NAJAM, ADIL. 1996c. *The 3C's of NGO-Government Relations: Confrontation, Complimentarity and Collaboration.* Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference ofn the International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR), July 18-21, 1996, Mexico City: Mexico.

NERFIN, MARC. 1986. "Neither Prince nor Merchant: Citizen—An Introduction to the Third System." In *World Economy in Transition* edited by Krishna Ahooja-Patel, Anne Gordon Drabek and Marc Nerfin. Pages 47-59. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

NUNEZ, AIDA M. 1994. *NAFTA AND its Environmental Parallel Agreement.* Masters Thesis, Department of Urban Studies and Planning. M.I.T.

OPOKU-MENSAH, PAUL. 1997. "Allies or Adversaries? NGOs and the Africa State: The Case of Ghana. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), Indianapolis, December 4-6, 1997.

PORTER, GARETH AND JANET WELSH BROWN. 1991. *Global Environmental Politics*. Boulder: Westview Press.

PRINCEN, THOMAS, MATTHIAS FINGER AND JACK MANNO. 1995. "Nongovernmental Organizations in World Environmental Politics." *International Environmental Affairs* 7(1): 42-58.

REID, WALTER V., JAMES N. BARNES AND BRENT BLACKWELDER. 1988. *Bankrolling Successes: A Portfolio of Sustainable Development Projects*. Washington DC: Environmental Policy Institute and National Wildlife Federation.

ROSELAND, MARK. 1992. *Toward Sustainable Cities: A Resource Book for Municipal and Local Governments*. Ottawa: National Roundtable on the Environment and the Economy.

RUNNALLS, DAVID. 1995. The Story of Pakistan's NCS: An Anlysis of its Evolution. Karachi: IUCN-Pakistan.

SALAMON, LESTER M. 1987. "Partners in Public Service: The Scope and Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by Walter W. Powell. Pages 99-117. New Haven: Yale University Press.

SALAMON, LESTER M. 1992. *America's Nonprofit Sector: A Primer*. New York: The Foundation Center.

SALAMON, LESTER M. 1994. "The Rise of the Nonprofit Sector." *Foreign Affairs* 73(4): 109-22.

SALAMON, LESTER M. AND HELMUT K. ANHEIER (Editors). 1997. *Defining the Nonprofit Sector: A Cross-National Analysis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

SAMEE, MEHREEN. 1995. "A First for Environmental Advocacy." *The Way Ahead–Pakistan's Environment and Development Quarterly*. 2(1): 23-26.

SANDS, PHILLIPPE. 1992. "The Role of Environmental NGOs in International Environmental Law." *Development–Journal of SID* 1992(2): 28-31.

SMITH, STEVEN R. AND MICHAEL LIPSKY. 1993. *Nonprofits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

SPIRO, PETER J. 1995. "New Global Communities: Nongovernmental Organizations in International Decision-Making Institutions." *The Washington Quarterly* 18(1): 45-56.

STAIRS, KEVIN AND PETER TAYLOR. 1992. "Non-governmental Organizations and the Legal Protection of the Oceans: A Case Study." In *The International Politics of the Environment* edited by Andrew Hurrell and Benedict Kingsbury. Pages 313-353. New York: Oxford University Press.

STARKE, LINDA. 1990. *Signs of Hope: Working Towards Our Common Future*. New York: Oxford University.

STONE, DEBORAH A. 1988. *Policy Paradox and Political Reason.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, & Co.

TANDON, RAJESH. 1987. "The Relationship between NGOs and Government." Paper presented to the Conference on the Promotion of Autonomous Development (New Delhi: PRIA). Mimeo.

TANDON, RAJESH. 1989. "The State and Voluntary Agencies in Asia." In *Doing Development: Government, NGOs and the Rural Poor in Asia* edited by Richard Holloway. London: Earthscan Publications.

TENDLER, JUDITH. 1982. *Turning Provate Voluntary Organizations Into Development Agencies: Questions for Evaluation*. USAID Program on Evaluation Discussion Paper no. 12. Washington DC: USAID.

TRIEDMAN, JULIE. 1993. "Narmada Dam Suicide Averted: Indian Government Accepts Demands for Dam Review." *Third World Resurgence*, September (37): 39-40.

UVIN, PETER. 1996. "Scaling Up the Grassroots and Scaling Down the Summit: The Relations Between Third World NGOs and the UN." In *NGOs, the UN and Global Governance* edited by Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker. Pages 159-76. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

WCED. 1987. *Our Common Future. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development.* New York: Oxford University Press.

WEISBROD, BURTON A. 1988. *The Nonprofit Economy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

WOLCH, JENNIFER R. 1990. *The Shadow State: Government and Voluntary Sector in Transition*. New York: The Foundation Center.

YUSUF, ZOHRA. 1992. "Legal Notice: The Environment as a Human Rights Issue." *NCS Bulletin*, 4(2): 10-11.

Endnotes

1 Although different in both focus and form, this monograph has grown out of, *Nongovernmental Organizations as Policy Entrepreneurs: In Pursuit of Sustainable Development* (Adil Najam, 1996; PONPO Working Paper No. 231, Program on Non-Profit Organizations, Yale University, New Haven).

2 Indeed, there have been some brave, even seminal, attempts at expanding our conceptual understanding of this genre of organizations (e.g., Kramer, 1981; Esman and Uphoff, 1984; Weisbrod, 1988; Wolch, 1990; Brown and Korten, 1991; Clark, 1991; Fisher, 1998). However, even most of these have focussed either solely on nongovernmental organizations in the South or on nonprofit organizations in the North.

3 This monograph will use the term 'citizen sector' to refer to what is variously called civil society or the nonprofit, the voluntary, the independent, the charitable, the people's, the philanthropic, the associational, or the third sector. A more detailed treatment of this choice of terminology is provided in the section on definitions.

4 Salamon (1992) points out that each of these various terms highlights one aspect of the sector while overlooking others. Each, therefore, shows only part of the picture. In fact, if the purest interpretation of these terms were to be applied, *nongovernmental* would include the market sector just as *nonprofit* would encompass the government.

5 This conception is designed to be expansive. It makes no distinction between organizations by size, geographic locale, financial base, or substantive interest and would include industrialized as well as developing country groups. Moreover, no moral claim is implied in the usage and the Ku Klux Klan would be accepted as no less of a citizen organization by definition than, say, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Bigotry, after all, can be as much of a citizen trait as altruism.

6 The concept of citizen organizations as 'para-policy organizations' is not unsimilar to notions of nonprofits as

'semipublic institutions' or 'third-party government' as used by Salamon (1994) in advancing his theory of "voluntary failure."

7 With some exceptions (e.g. Kramer, 1981; Esman and Uphoff, 1984; Tandon, 1987; Smith and Lipsky, 1993; Fisher, 1998) citizen organizatio-government relations have received less scholarly attention than relations between these organizations and philanthropist or international assistance agencies, or between citizen organizations of various types such as grassroots and grassroots support organizations.

8 This, however, should not be a surprise. The 'non' in nongovernmental is as much a statement about what these organizations *are not* like in form, structure, vision and values as it is a statement about what institutional sector they *are* most like in the issues and activities that concern them the most.

9 Such reasoning can be linked back to theories about 'government failure' being the rationale for nongovernmental or nonprofit organizations (see Douglas, 1987; Weisbrod, 1988; Wolch, 1990).

10 Using extensive examples from Asia, Africa and Latin America Julie Fisher (1998) provides an insightful discussion on the growing depth and breadth of the global trend towards more Citizen-Prince relations.

11 Camilleri and Falk (1992: 3) have argued that the concept of state sovereignty is being challenged by 'the emergence of new social movements with both local and transnational consciousness." For more discussions on the threat to citizen autonomy from increasing interaction with government agencies see Tandon (1989) and Fisher (1998).

12 In Najam (1996c) a "3C's" model of understanding Citizen-Prince relations is proposed. This interests-based model is based not on the 'nature' of the host regime (e.g. democratic, autocratic, bureaucratic, dictatorial, etc.) but on the degree of convergence or divergence of the goals and interests of particular citizen organizations and particular governmental agencies on particular issues. The '3C model' argues that

three types of relationships are likely: **C**onfrontation, **C**omplimentarity, or **C**ollaboration. In the first, governmental and citizen organizations are likely to have opposing objectives and act to thwart each other's efforts; in the second, they are likely to act separately but towards converging objectives; in the third, they would tend to work jointly towards joint objectives. It suggests that a robust approach to studying citizen sector-government relations is through the complex lens of inter-institutional interests, rather than simpler notions of comparative advantage, or the even simpler perceptions of antipathy for all governmental motivations. It is suggested that even where government is the dominant and dominating institutional player, the ultimate relationship is a strategic institutional decision made by *both* the government and the citizen organizations in question.

13 The descriptions of the three policy 'stages' or 'phases' are necessarily simplistic. They do ***not***, however, imply a linear, top-down view of the policy enterprise. Moreover, none of the three phases are static or finite. Each is an ongoing and overlapping process. Much like music that has to be 'rewritten in the act of playing it', agendas, policies and implementation are ever evolving and ever responding to changing balances of institutional interests, alliances, and negotiation. For a literature review on the complex nature of the policy process, and especially the policy implementation process, see Najam (1995).

14 At one level, the four roles defined here are in a natural progression: As *monitors* citizen groups keep an eye on what may be wrong, as *advocates* they actively seek steps towards what they believe to be the 'right' direction, as *innovators* they suggest what these steps may be, and as *implementers* they carry out such steps. Having said that, it is acknowledged that this progression while seemingly (and simplistically) natural is not necessarily realistic and is nearly never this neat.

15 In *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda*, David Korten (1990: 185-97) suggests four critical roles for voluntary action: a) catalyzing the transformation of institutions, policies and values; b) monitoring and protesting abuses of power; c) facilitating reconciliation; and d) providing essential community services. The first of these corresponds roughly with what we are calling innovation and advocacy, the second with monitoring and the fourth with service provision. The third—facilitating reconciliation—is, in fact, less of a policy function; and the parts that are so, may be covered under innovation.

16 Unlike other issues where citizen interest was triggered by existing political concern (e.g. human rights) one can generally say that interest in the environment was propelled onto the political agenda significantly because of the activism and advocacy by citizen organizations. Arguably, although citizen advocacy in the human rights area has certainly made it a bigger political issue than it otherwise might have been, yet it was the issue's already latent political importance that fertilized the growth of citizen organizations in that area. The distinction to be made is that between *expanding an existing space* in the policy agenda on the one hand and the identification of a crack, the elbowing in, and then the pushing at its sides *to create a new space* on the other. Citizen organizations seems to have played the later role in the case of environment and development.

17 The advocacy efforts of the Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) with island states vulnerable to climate change and sea-level rise was so successful that it resulted in the creation of the Association of Small Island States (AOSIS) and CIEL became an official advisor to these governments (McMahon, 1993).

18 The distinction between monitoring and advocacy at this phase can often get blurred and needs to be reiterated. Monitoring is a reporting task--to track what is happening and how it is different from what was supposed to happen.

Advocacy is different in that it entails a judgement call on what *ought* to happen.

19 Citizen organizations played an important advocacy role at all stages of the Narmada Dam process. What is highlighted here is the role they played at the implementation stage; i.e., after the Indian government had already decided to build the dam. What is important in this example is that even at this late stage advocacy by citizen organizations was able to impact the details of how the project was ultimately carried out.

20 Dichter's notion of 'strategic knowledge' comes to me via Julie Fisher (personal communication).

21 This flurry may be partly attributed to the sense of euphoria that the Earth Summit generated about the prospect of global cooperation for sustainable development and about the role that the citizen sector may play in such cooperation. Moreover, the scale and visibility of the conference caught a lot of governments, especially in the South, by surprise and forced them to do their environmental policy thinking on fast forward; any help they could get from citizen organizations in this regards was, therefore, very welcome.

22 As Clark (1991: 45) points out, there are also disadvantages and dangers attached to such collaboration: "Public Service Contractors will often tailor their projects and indeed their organizations to suit the official aid agencies who fund them. They are happy for the project initiative to come from governments and for their role to be that of a subcontractor implementing a component of another's project. And they are equally content to act on strong hints they receive from official donors that the latter would 'welcome' funding applications for a particular type of project…." (See also, Smith and Lipsky, 1993)

23 Consider as an example, the role of service provider that IUCN-Pakistan played in the development of the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy. As discussed later, IUCN played this role at the agenda setting stage as well as at the policy development stage and is now playing it equally at the

policy implementation stage (de Silva, 1994). In another example, also from Pakistan, the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) was involved in all stages of policy implementation regarding the transfer of a mercury-based chloro-alkali plant from Denmark: as a monitor it tracked the import of this dirty technology, as an advocate it protested this import, as an innovator it worked with technical experts to devise innovations to the technology that would reduce its environmental impact, and as a service provider it worked with industry and government to implement and institutionalize these innovations (Samee, 1995).

24 This is not to suggest that this is a unique framework for such comparative research. It is only to stress that applying some common framework to cases in North and South will be necessary if we want to nurture learning between the two worlds.

25 All of the following discussion on the Pakistan National Conservation Strategy is based on the author's direct involvement in that process. For a detailed analysis of the process see Runnalls (1995).

26 A related question that this matrix does not focus on concerns the 'type' of organization (e.g., large international organization, grassroots organization, coalition of citizen groups, etc.) that may be more, or less, influential in a particular role or stage.

Matrix II: Examples of Citizen Organizations Inhabiting All Nooks of the Policy Space

	Monitors	Advocates	Innovators	Service Providers
Agenda Setting	• World Watch Institute • Center for Science and the Environment • Third World Network • Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF)	• Green Forum • Union of Concerned Scientists • International Waterfowl Research Bureau (IWRB)	• Grameen Bank • World Resources Institute (WRI) • Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI)	• International Institute for Env & Dev (IIED) • Business Council on Sustainable Development (BCSD)
Policy Development	• International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) • US Citizens Network for Sustainable Development	• Women Env. & Dev. Org. (WEDO) • Groupo de los Cien • Urban Popular Movement (MUP) • Sierra Club	• Fundación Natura • Nature Conservancy • Brazilian Institute for Economic & Social Analysis (IBASE) • PROTERRA	• International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) • Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
Policy Implementation	• Friends of the Earth (FOE) • Consumers Association of Penang (CAP) • Shehri	• Greenpeace International • Narmada Bachao Andholan (NBA) • Greenbelt Movement	• Pakistan Institute for Env.-Dev. Action Research (PIEDAR) • Sukhomajri Water- shed Restoration • Dian Desa	• Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) • Organization of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP)

Matrix III: Examples of Citizen Organizations Which Influenced the PNCS Process in Pakistan

	Monitors	Advocates	Innovators	Service Providers
Agenda Setting	---	• WWF-Pakistan	• Aga Khan Rural Support Programme	• IUCN-Pakistan
Policy Development	• SHEHRI—Citizens for a Better Environment	• Shirkat Gah Women's Resource Center	• PNCS-Unit	• IUCN-Pakistan
Policy Implemen- -	• Journalist's Resource Center (JRC)	• Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)	• Pakistan Institute for Environment-Development Action Research (PIEDAR)	• Sungi Development Foundation

SDPI is an independent non-profit research Institute
on Sustainable development

Mailing Address: PO Box 2342, Islamabad Pakistan

Street Address: 3rd Floor, Taimoor Chamber, 10-D West,
Fazal-ul-Haq Road, Blue Area, Islamabad.

Telephone: +(92-51) 2277146
2278134 2278136 2270674-6

Fax: +(92-51) 2278135

URL: www.sdpi.org e-mail: main@sdpi.org