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Preface

My desire to master this particular topic stems from an obsession with water combined with a passion to make a difference. As stereotypical as it may sound, I believe in change, yet I am not trying to save the world. I believe in contributing anything and everything I can when I can, cleaning water one drop at a time.

There are many ways to “clean water” either physically through treatment, or through policies of sustainable management conservation and prevention. In my earlier study, I focused mainly on the physical methods of water treatment through environmental engineering. However, as I worked in water resources I realized that the challenges of pollution and degraded aquatic ecosystems couldn’t be solved with physical treatment alone. There is a need for management strategies, education, and political support for protection, restoration, and conservation of water ecosystems.

Since this discovery I have been very curious about the role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and the various approaches they take in the field of global water management. It appears that they have a very unique position sitting between local people, governments, and industry. This research experience provided me with a looking glass into the working world of NGOs, by working at Both ENDS and talking to their project partners and external organizations.

When first confronted with the Negotiated Approach and Both ENDS I was very excited and idealistic about my view on the contribution that this thesis work could make. I thought maybe I could immediately contribute to solving global water problems! After spending a couple weeks with the Negotiated Approach and still not understanding it or really knowing what it was I began to get quite discouraged. At first I took that discouragement out on the Approach itself and threw it under the bus, classifying it as another set of empty statements and promises. Yet, hope was not lost. I kept researching and seeking rational perspectives in the midst of my emotional turmoil and slowly but surely I started to understand why the Negotiated Approach seemed like empty words and it started to become clear why others and I might interpret it that way. First off, Both ENDS knew that there is more work to be done on the approach and that is why I am researching it, secondly the world is very
complex and everyone does the best they can do with the resources they have. As my idealistic bubble popped it became clear to me that nothing is perfect and no one approach can be the savior of the world, but each approach has its place. In this report I hope to explain the place for the Negotiated Approach. I also hope to explain how to communicate the approach so that others will not have the same experience as I did.

Because of this work, I am now very interested in implementing first hand projects in participatory water management, working with people and feeling, seeing and touching the issues I discuss in this paper. This might not be easy and Confucius warns that it might not be pleasant.

"By three methods we may learn wisdom:
First, by reflection, which is noblest;
Second, by imitation, which is easiest;
and third by experience, which is the bitterest."

Throughout the course of my research I witnessed bitterness from time to time in others who are fighting on the frontlines of global water work. How many times have you sat down and heard someone with sincere emotion tell you of the children dying and the environment crumbling due to pollution or water shortage? Over and over I hear speeches like this and feel guilty and a bit overwhelmed. Because of the heavy and slightly negative environment I am inspired even more to carry on and find a way to fight in this challenging, uphill battle while keeping the joy in my day-to-day work.

This project was my first step down that path. I found joy in this research, which proved to be challenging, confusing, and interesting. I hope you will also be interested but not challenged or confused while reading.

Sincerely,

Christin T. Reynolds
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The fast pace of development worldwide has brought natural resource management (NRM) to the forefront of ecological, social, political and economic discussions. At this forefront, NRM practices have undergone an evolution from one-dimensional technocratic management practices designed by engineers to multi-dimensional management practices designed in multi-disciplinary environments. For example, everyone is aware of the rapid development in India. In India, engineering solutions of canal networks and dams, “are being challenged by what are proposed as more bottom-up, participatory, and locally appropriate alternatives. The debate has been exemplified in India by a number of protest movements against big dams, the most well known of which is the controversy over the Sardar Sarovar project in the Narmada Valley (Baviskar 1995).” (Tim Dyson 2004)

This evolution from technocratic to participatory management practices has brought new players to the table. Governments are not as equipped to work in participatory bottom-up management practices. To fill this gap, non-governmental organizations are stepping up and playing a more central leadership role. “The 1993 Human Development Report judged that some 250 million people were being touched by NGOs, and that the numbers would rise considerably in the years ahead.” (Roger C. Riddell 1995). Local non-governmental organizations have a unique position to work on the local level with the people. There is still a gap between the local bottom-up efforts and the central top-down approaches. Both ENDS aims to be a bridge across this gap by providing support to “non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs) and issue-related coalitions or networks. They support inspiring, people-oriented examples of sustainable development.” (Both ENDS’ website) They have a very broad scope of work in the field of international development, but this research is aiming specifically at strengthening their Negotiated Approach to River Basin management.

The Negotiated Approach to RBM focuses on the local participation of river basin dwellers. The approach works from the bottom up, connecting local residents with
the policy makers, essentially bringing all actors involved to a level playing field to determine the best use of their river basin.

Presently, the Negotiated Approach has been applied in seven river case studies (Both ENDS and Gomukh 2005). In addition, the general concepts of the approach have been outlined. However, how is the Negotiated Approach different from the management techniques that precede it? Where does the Negotiated Approach fit in the sea of similar participatory, bottom up approaches? Are there other recommendations that could help improve the Negotiated Approach?

I researched, by examining case studies, reviewing literature and interviewing with experts, the Negotiated Approach. Once the Negotiated Approach was clearly outlined, I then examined other well-established approaches to River Basin Management including Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems (RAAKS)(Manintveld 2002), the 3xM (Micro, Meso, Macro) approach by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF)(Reed 2006) and Rotary 3H (Health, Hunger and Humanity) Grants (The Rotary Foundation 2008). Through this evaluation I addressed the questions: How is the Negotiated approach different from the management techniques that precede it? Where does the Negotiated Approach fit amongst other participatory bottom up approaches? Once these questions were answered I moved on to complete a final analysis to answer the question: Are there other recommendations that could help improve the Negotiated Approach?

1.2. Research Framework

The research was structured by the following four questions. Underneath each question is the method that was employed to answer the question.

(1) What is the Negotiated Approach?
   Literature review
   Interviews with experts

(2) How is the Negotiated Approach grounded in theory?
   Literature review
   Case Study evaluation
   External Interviews
(3) How does the Negotiated Approach Compare to other Approaches?

- External Interviews
- Literature review of other approaches

(4) How can the Negotiated Approach best be applied in the future?

Figure 1 illustrates the methods and path that were followed to answer these research questions. The first research question needed to be answered before any other elements of the research could commence; the first blocks on the left in yellow address this question (1). Once the NA (Negotiated Approach) was identified, the next question to tackle was research question (2), theoretical support for the NA; the bottom blocks in green address this question. Following this was the comparison, research question (3); the upper blocks in purple address this question. The middle blue box, expert interviews, contributed to answering research questions (2) and (3) as well as influencing heavily the last research question (4), which are recommendations for the future of the Negotiated Approach.

![Figure 1: Research Framework](image)

1.3. **Structure of Report**

Although the Negotiated Approach is already outlined and applied in the field, its broadness and variation make the approach difficult to understand. Therefore the
first step is to identify the Negotiated Approach based on documentation, case studies and interviews. This is outlined in section 3.

With the Negotiated Approach generally outlined and understood the second research question, How is the Negotiated Approach grounded in theory, can be addressed. To answer this question, a literature review was performed. The literature review scanned the field of policy analysis, process management, and developmental studies in water management. There was a need for broad theories that could support the flexibility of the approach. Theories that seemed to have similar themes to the Negotiated Approach were selected. These included: common pool resources, policy streams models, decision making space and the hexagon model. An additional practical theory was discovered through an external interview post-literature review (Anderson April 28, 2008). The theory is The Collaborative for Development Action’s matrix, which will be referred to as The Matrix.

Identifying theories with similar themes is compelling, but how practically can these theories be used to support the application of the Negotiated Approach? The theories were applied to the general description of the Negotiated Approach as well as the individual case studies. Through empirical review of the case studies with these theories in mind, each theory highlighted different pieces of the approach.

The case studies help to explain empirically how these theories support, help understand or could be used for monitoring. A brief introduction to the case studies is found in section 4. These theories can help Both ENDS to share with others, particularly policy makers, about the approach, examine what happened in existing cases, and also help in the application of new approaches. The specifics of each of these theories can be found throughout chapter 4.

The third research question, “Why is the Negotiated Approach important?” considers existing natural resource management techniques and challenges. The sub-questions that help explain the importance of the negotiated approach are: Within the field of natural resource management, why is there a need for the Negotiated Approach? And furthermore, what is different about the Negotiated Approach when compared to existing frameworks, approaches and tools? In order to address this question the approach is compared with other well-established approaches to River
Basin Management. Both ENDS selected two of the three comparable approaches. The third was selected in order to fill a gap in comparison, this is discussed in detail in section 5.1 Selection of Comparable Approaches. The three approaches compared to the Negotiated Approach are:

- Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems (RAAKS) (Manintveld 2002)
- 3xM approach by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) (Reed 2006)
- Rotary 3H Grants (The Rotary Foundation 2008)

To conclude this research, it is important to look to the future of the Negotiated Approach. The third research question addresses how the negotiated approach can best be applied in the future. The sub-questions here attend to strengthening the Negotiated approach, section 6, and the needs for future research, section 7.
2. Why Another Approach?

Before examining in detail what the Negotiated Approach is (section 3), first let’s examine the scope and the reasons behind defining the approach. The scope of this project encompasses the global field of participatory water management. Although the case studies thus far have been located geographically in regions of the world considered developing or “the south” I do not wish to divide the world and limit the approach in such a manner. Instead, I hope to identify the conditions in which this approach works and its limits based on the application and core values of the approach. The term participatory water management field doesn’t characterize all that I mean. To really describe the field of water management that I am addressing I would have to say the field of: participatory, decentralized, integrated, bottom-up, holistic, soft, and water management approaches. Why all these names and approaches?

Two reasons that explain the reason for so many varying approaches and names are as follows.

(1) Working in the global scope of water, there are numerous and widely diverse water issues to deal with, therefore there is a demand for many types of solutions.

(2) The second reason for the numerous approaches is best described by a lack of communication, knowledge, and resource sharing in the field of water management.

This gap is closing. The United Nations Development Program suggests building a global partnership and global water action plan. (Watkins 2006) Also, the World Water Council and the Global Water Partnership are working to close this gap through conferences and knowledge sharing. However, the situation still needs more attention until there is a free accessible list of all water projects from all regions of the world, their approaches and methods used and their outcomes reported. If this were established, then re-inventions of the wheel could be prevented by accurately keeping track of experiences and evolutions in best practices. In an ideal world we could share our knowledge resources and monetary resources in order to work together efficiently and wisely to maintain a clean and well-balanced global water resource.
This utopia is something to work towards, however it would be foolish to disregard the real world of complexities, politics, inequalities, competition and conflicts. Within this complex world many organizations create their own approach based on their own knowledge and experience to achieve their mission. It can be frustrating to see multiple organizations making the same mistakes, learning the same lessons and then competing against each other for support of their approach’s uniqueness. This is explainable and reasonable for many reasons, but those reasons will be left for elaboration in other studies on dynamics of water organizations and markets.

This study instead will focus on furthering the development of the existing Negotiated Approach to RBM.

In order to avoid re-inventing the wheel during this study, I intend to perform a literature review on existing theories and approaches that are similar to the Negotiated Approach. When complimentary approaches or tools were found they are listed in the Appendix 10.3.
3. Identification of the Negotiated Approach

The Negotiated Approach to RBM shares similar ideals of IWRM and other participatory, soft, bottom up approaches. In fact, the Negotiated Approach evolved out of these other river management practices. The ideals of local stakeholders’ participation, integration of water uses, sustainability, appropriate technologies and working at the lowest level possible carry through many management approaches.

The difference lies in the fact that the Negotiated Approach does not attempt to “straightjacket the planning process” (Hirsch March 7, 2008) by defining methodologies or formulas for successful river basin management. Instead its main goal is to allow the local actors the flexibility and adaptability they need to work within the widely diverse field of river basin management.

The Negotiated Approach has been developed from experience in the field, a series of seven case studies. The evolution of the approach was through action research. Local cases of river basin management were initiated on their own from local Community Service Organizations (CSO) before the term Negotiated Approach was defined. Both ENDS with their helicopter view of global water management saw a successful trend of local initiatives influencing policy and desired to send a message to both policy makers and local organizations that local initiatives can and do have a positive impact. This message has been documented and sent thus far under the name the, “Negotiated Approach to River Basin Management”. In the first encounter with the name, one might think this approach is a set of tools for negotiation. The focus on local initiation is not known from reading the name alone. Best practices for local initiation, negotiation and up-scaling in river basin management might be a better title to send this message or more simply, “local initiatives influence policy, here is how” or, “managing river basins from both ends”. This name debate is something worth spending some time on later in recommendations, because the name is the first introduction to the concepts behind it. For the purpose of clarity and uniformity, and also out of respect for the creators of the name, I will not change the name within this paper.
It is generally hard at first encounter to understand what the Negotiated Approach is. Through interviews with people who know about the Negotiated Approach, I found that I was not the only one left confused. This is partly due to the deliberate broad flexible nature of the approach. Changing the way the approach is communicated could prevent some confusion. This will be discussed again in Chapter 6.
The future of the Negotiated Approach. This uncertainty and questioning is healthy for the Negotiated Approach because it is a learning process and,

“We learn more by looking for the answer to a question and not finding it than we do from learning the answer itself.”

Lloyd Alexander

With learning and understanding by revealing questions and uncertainties in the approach, it can be redesigned from a more educated and mature perspective.

Many of the uncertainties stem from the broad flexible nature of the approach. Describing the Negotiated Approach is a balancing act because, on one hand, in order to have an approach you need key concepts and processes. On the other hand, the key factor of this approach is to leave the approach flexible. It is essential to leave the local initiators the freedom and power to identify their needs and their process towards river basin management. However, in order to communicate the success of local initiatives and to give policy makers and local actors confidence in these initiatives, some conclusions about the negotiated approach processes and key concepts must be defined.

**Key point** - Through interviews with Both ENDS and Gomukh as well as reading the documents on the seven case studies the key phases of the approach emerged as the following five phases;

1) External support capacity Building
2) Local CSO or other Champion for leadership and facilitation
3) Engaging local actors, assessing power, including powerless (families below poverty lines and women)
4) Negotiation Process
5) Up-scaling: Invite new members into the negotiation process
   a. Horizontally: Geographically over to next village
   b. Vertically: Up to next level

The initial phases of the Negotiated Approach are intended to first create a level playing field for negotiation; this encompasses points 1 through 3. Some river basins need more focus on these first three phases, where as other localities are already organized and empowered to negotiate. The negotiation process occurs in each case between different actors, but generally involves local water users, CSO’s and
local governments. The negotiations start at the lowest level and as a consensus is made, they grow to include more stakeholders. For example, in the Bhima Basin in India the “negotiated approach was applied initially to a watershed of 8000 hectares through formation of watershed committees and water users groups that met periodically to discuss water allocation issues for catchments. Gradually, government officials, engineers, experts were involved in the process. Over time an initiative that began in a small watershed is being upscaled to cover the entire Bhima basin (Area: 4863 square kilometers).” (Gomukh 2002)

To understand the context of the approach, the resources and roles of the Negotiated Approach will be outlined (see figure 1). The circles represent the three main resources involved in the negotiation process. These include (1) implementation power on the policy level and economic resources, (2) local knowledge of problems and traditional solutions, and (3) expert knowledge on ecological and sustainable solutions. Also the whole river basin helicopter view needs to be represented. It is also important to be able to have external support both for capacity building for local actors and for financing; this is shown by the blue rectangle at the bottom of Figure 2. Knowledge and economic resources can be provided by various organizations which are listed at the bottom of Figure 2. The Negotiated Process occurs where the circles overlap. The one missing factor in this diagram is the champion of the approach. This role can be played by any of the organizations involved but it is an essential resource needed in the Negotiated Approach.
Figure 2: The Key Resources and Roles of the Negotiated Approach

Without these resources and roles represented, one should re-consider whether it is the right time and place to apply the Negotiated Approach to River Basin Management.
4. Theoretical support for the Negotiated Approach

As the Negotiated Approach was developed through action research, the emphasis within the approach is on practical application based on a limited amount of empirical research. Major pieces of the approach have stemmed from expert intuition in the field. Intuition, and evidence from seven case studies, however strong it may be, may not be solid enough to convince policy makers and international institutions of the need for the Negotiated Approach. In addition, there is some uncertainty internally within Both ENDS on how applicable their intuitive conclusions are outside their own networks and projects.

In order to address this uncertainty, a literature review was performed in the fields of developmental studies, water management, policy analysis, and process management. Through this review, multiple theories were identified which support the ideals and themes of the Negotiated Approach. These included common pool resources, policy streams model, decision making space and the hexagon model. Through an external interview post- literature review, (Anderson April 28, 2008) another theory generated from practice was discovered which supports the ideals of the Negotiated Approach. This is not a theory from books with a name, but a practical tool that stems from years of working experience. For the purposes of discussion, this theory will be referred to as *the matrix*.

How do these theories support the Negotiated Approach? How can Both ENDS use them in practical application? Through empirical review of the case studies and Negotiated Approach documents, it was found that each theory supported the approach in one of three different ways. The theory either (1) supported the key concepts of the approach, (2) helped to understand the complex situation in which the Negotiated Approach is applied, or (3) helped to monitor and evaluate the approach.

Five theories support the NA in one of these three ways;

1) Supporting the key concepts of the approach
   - Common pool resources
• The Collaborative for Development Action Matrix (The Matrix)
2) Understanding the complex situation in which the Negotiated Approach is applied
   • Policy streams model
   • Decision making space
3) Monitoring and Evaluating the approach
   • Hexagon model

4.1. Supporting key concepts of the NA;

The sustainability of local resource management; Common Pool Resources

A fundamental assumption of the Negotiated Approach is, if locals residing in the river basin have more management control, the river will be taken care of in a more sustainable manner. Intuitively, if people living near the river depend on the river and have control to manage it, they will take care of it so they can continue to use it. Conversely, a central government in the city away from the banks of the river may not see or be directly impacted by the results of their river management strategies.

This intuition is directly supported by the set of literature falling under the classification of common pool resources. “The literature on common property-based resource management comprises many important studies that seek to specify the conditions under which groups of users will self-organize and sustainably govern resources upon which they depend.” (Agrawal 2001) Simply the fact that the resource is locally managed does not necessary guarantee anything, but local management combined with the following conditions enable sustainable management. Figures 2 through 5 list the summary of critically enabling conditions for sustainability on the commons(Agrawal 2001). Agrawal gathered conditions from Wade (RW), Ostrom (EO), and Baland and Platteau (B&P) as well as his own research. The conditions are classified into resource system characteristics, group characteristics, institutional arrangements and external environment.

The resource system characteristics for sustainability, Text Box 1, are not easily met within the resource system of a river basin. A river basin is not small, it does not have
a low level of mobility and there is not a great possibility for storage. If it were a small lake, pond or agriculture land the resource system characteristics would be met.

Text Box 1: Common pool resources critical enabling resource system characteristic conditions for sustainability

Many of the group characteristics, as specified by common-pool resources (Text Box 2), support the group characteristics of the Negotiated Approach. Specifically, the group characteristics which most clearly match between common pool resources and the Negotiated Approach are small size, clearly defined boundaries, appropriate leadership, shared norms and interdependence among group members. Small size and clearly defined boundaries support the concept within the Negotiated Approach of starting at the lowest possible level. However, as the approach is scaled up, this advantage is lost. The characteristics of shared norms and interdependence among group members are essential pre-conditions for facilitating the negotiation process. Appropriate leadership is something worth mentioning. An essential piece of the Negotiated Approach is having a champion of the approach who has the connections to local tradition, understanding of changing external environments and passion to see the process through.

Text Box 2: Common pool resources critical enabling group characteristic conditions for sustainability

The institutional arrangements that promote more sustainable management of local resources are listed in Text Box 3. All of these institutional arrangements specified by common pool resources are inline with the philosophy of the Negotiated Approach.
### 3. Institutional arrangements

(i) Rules are simple and easy to understand (B&P)
(ii) Locally devised access and management rules (RW, EO, B&P)
(iii) Ease in enforcement of rules (RW, EO, B&P)
(iv) Graduated sanctions (RW, EO)
(v) Availability of low cost adjudication (EO)
(vi) Accountability of monitors and other officials to users (EO, B&P)

---

**Text Box 3: Common pool resources critical enabling institutional arrangement conditions for sustainability**

The external environment conditions as specified by common pool resources, including low cost technology, central governments not undermining local authority and supportive external sanctioning institutions, are also in line with the Negotiated Approach.

---

### 4. External environment

(i) Technology:
- (a) Low cost exclusion technology (RW)
- (b) Time for adaptation to new technologies related to the commons
(ii) Low levels of articulation with external markets
(iii) Gradual change in articulation with external markets
(iv) State:
- (a) Central governments should not undermine local authority (RW, EO)
- (b) Supportive external sanctioning institutions (B&P)
- (c) Appropriate levels of external aid to compensate local users for conservation activities (B&P)
- (d) Nested levels of appropriation, provision, enforcement, governance (EO)

---

**Text Box 4: Common pool resources critical enabling external environment conditions for sustainability**

If the common pool resources enabling conditions are in line with the Negotiated Approach, what does that mean? Many studies within common pool resources have shown that, if these enabling conditions are followed, then there is local sustainable resource management (Ostrom 1990). So, it means that if these conditions are followed within the Negotiated Approach, then the approach will result in sustainable resource management.

However, for the case of the Negotiated Approach to river basin management, the resource system characteristics in Text Box 1 are not met. Therefore in this case, because of the flowing unpredictable resource system of a river, common pool resources theory does not support sustainable local management. Local input might
still be useful in management, but the idea of up-scaling to basin level is essential to consider in the case of a river. This will be addressed in section 4.2.

**Key Point** - If working in a resource system that is small with well-defined boundaries, the following six enabling conditions highlight the matching elements between the NA and common pool resources theory. These conditions should be considered during implementation. They were selected because they were the most relevant from each of the four groups of sustainable resource management enabling conditions.

1) Overlap between user group residential location and resource location
2) High levels of dependence by group members on resource system
3) Locally devised access and management rules
4) Central governments should not undermine local authority
5) Supportive external sanctioning institutions
6) Appropriate levels of external aid to compensate local users for conservation activities

In conclusion common pool resources supports the ideals of the Negotiated Approach by confirming the fact that local resource management is sustainable, but for the case of the river, more than local resource management is needed because this resource flows. The mobile nature of the river creates a need for upstream-downstream coordination in addition to local management.

**The importance of up scaling: the matrix**

Both ENDS stresses the importance of successful local initiatives to spread both geographically over and politically upward. This is referred to as up scaling. The Collaborative for Development Action (CDA), an NGO with staff who hold more than forty years in international development assistance, agree with the importance of up scaling. Although they focus on peace issues rather than environment, the shared field is international development assistance, where there is interaction between local people and external organizations and uncertainty is high when working within the complex field of poverty, politics, and culture. Their work is highly relevant and complimentary to the lessons learned by Both ENDS through the Negotiated Approach.
In observing the various types of projects and programs organizations embark on, CDA noticed a structure to which all organizations fit. Organizations in peace work tend to have different focuses relating to gaining support for peace. Organizations tend to focus on either gathering support from more people, key people or both. Also, there is a general focus on individual/personal level and/or emphasis on the socio-political level. A more detailed explanation of this matrix can be found in appendix 10.3.

The main purpose of including this matrix is to display that in other fields of development work, like peace work, up scaling is also an issue of importance. If an organization works in both local and higher policy levels, they would be plotted on the matrix on the dotted line boundary between the individual/personal level and the socio-political level. These are the organizations that “up scale” because they are reaching outside of their local level capacity. It is also possible to “down scale” from higher policy levels to local levels. The individual level is that of the local people or local CSO’s/ NGO’s and the socio-political level is on the level of policies, governments, and international agencies. Some organizations work on the individual level and some work on the socio-political level, where some, as mentioned by those plotted on or near the dotted line, work in both.

The issue of whether to focus on more people or key people is one that is not addressed explicitly within the Negotiated Approach thus far, but in the matrix it is addressed. Here, from patterns observed in organization’s strategies, it was observed that some organizations work with the strategy of gaining support from more people, getting to a certain critical mass. Others try to aim for strategic connections instead with key people. Again some organizations work in both. These organizational strategies can be plotted on the matrix in Figure 3.
Figure 3: The Matrix (Anderson and Olson 2003)

What lessons can be drawn from this matrix in terms of up scaling? One of the key questions CDA is aiming to answer is; how can peace work be made more effective? They find that up scaling contributes to a programs’ efficiency and overall impact. “Evidence shows that when programs focus only on change at the Individual/Personal level without regard to how these may be translated to Socio/Political level, actions inevitably fall short of having an impact on the larger goals." (Anderson and Olson 2003)

Key point - Up scaling therefore is indeed very important when the end goal is not just to impact the local communities’ ecosystem, but when the desired outcome is to impact the whole river basin or natural ecosystem. How to implement up scaling will be touched upon in the next section within the theory of Kingdon’s policy streams.

4.2. Understanding the complex environment of the NA and how to up scale the approach

The environment within which the Negotiated Approach is applied varies as widely as the local cultures in which it is implemented. The political and social status of the issues that are being negotiated influences the outcomes heavily. This is particularly relevant when the end goal is to up scale the issues. A local village can be mobilized and organized by various approaches and methodologies, but the potential for up scaling depends on the wider political environment.

Examining the political, social and economic diversity of the varying local cultures from the case studies may give some insight into the outcomes, but that is not within
the scope of this research. Instead, there are some broad general characteristics of the environment that can be examined in each of the cases that can help in understanding the complexities in which Both ENDS and partner organizations will be working with. These characteristics include the political timing of the initiation of the approach and the decision making space within which the negotiation takes place. The case studies will help display how these characteristics affect the outcomes of the Negotiated Approach applications. First a brief description of the case studies will be provided.

Introduction to Case studies

There are seven case studies that represent the Negotiated Approach. They will be used to give evidence for the application of the policy streams model and decision-making space theory. The cases were initiated in the following way; “Through a project funded by DGIS, civil society organizations Both ENDS (The Netherlands) and Gomukh Environmental Trust for Sustainable Development (India) documented and analyzed the results of implementing a negotiated approach to river basin management through local CSOs in the following basins:

- Bhima Basin: India,
- Khulna-Jessore Districts: Bangladesh,
- Se San Basin: Cambodia,
- Nan Basin: Thailand,
- Sand Basin: South Africa,
- Onconga Basin: Peru and
- Tiquipaya- Cochabamba Basins: Boliva” (Deshpande-Dandekar)

The case studies are very socially and politically diverse and deal with a wide variety of river basin issues. Sometimes the main focus of the cases are related more to land management than water management. In brief, the cases are described below.

The **Bhima** case deals with negotiations for conserving sacred groves and establishing a perennial source of water in Bhima Basin, India.

**Khulna-Jessore** deals with the problems of salinity intrusion and peoples’ participation in planning and decision-making about the salinity.

**Se San** negotiates on trans-boundary issues between Vietnam and Cambodia and attempts to mediate the competing uses of the river for electricity
versus the need to release the flow for the health of the downstream aquatic ecosystems.

The *Nan Basin* will be left out of the discussion for the purposes of this research based on limited data. Not much will be left out by its exclusion because, “unlike all other case studies, negotiations did not take place in this case. Local communities were not informed about the project, nor were they made a part of planning or decision-making.” (Deshpande-Dandekar) Because of this, it was hard to tell from the documentation what went wrong and therefore due to time constraints and data constraints, the remaining six case studies were focused on.

The *Sand* case deals with balancing the use of the river, particularly tackling the issues of poverty, lack of access to water, dense population and arable land area.

The *Ocona* case integrates livelihoods and ecosystem conservation through organic farming and eco businesses.

Lastly, the *Cochabamba- Tiquipaya* case is somewhat similar to the Nan Basin in that negotiations did not commence. In this case it was due to water wars and the heavy politics involved in ownership of water and natural resources. This case remains in the study as it represents one of the most extreme environments that could be faced when attempting to negotiate.
Examining the initiation of the Negotiated Approach Process through Kingdon’s policy streams model

Kingdon’s policy streams model lends insight into why the timing of the NA is important. It states that if certain elements, policy stream, political stream and problem stream, cross at the same point in time, there is a window of opportunity for change. Kingdon’s streams model is described in Text Box 5 and Figure 4.

The stream of problems: The rationale behind this stream is that a given situation has to be identified and explicitly formulated as a problem or issue for it to bear the slightest chance of being transformed into a policy. A situation that is not defined as a problem/issue, and for which alternatives are never envisaged or proposed, will never be converted into a policy. The feeling that a current or foreseen situation is wrong and that something should, and can, be done to modify and/or improve it is thus a prerequisite for turning an issue into a policy. Moreover, it is necessary to be able to demonstrate that the problems mentioned can actually be attributed to causes within human control and thus that action can be taken to change the situation.

The stream of policies: The second stream used to explain how an issue rises or falls on an agenda has to do with the stream of policies. This stream is concerned with the formulation of policy alternatives and proposals. New policies will never be shaped if there are no ideas or policy proposals on which they can be based and developed. An important aspect of the streams model developed by Kingdon is linked to the idea that such proposals and solutions, which must be technically feasible, are not initially built to resolve given problems; rather they float in search of problems to which they can be tied. A variety of actors can participate in the elaboration of such solutions and alternatives, and in the drafting of proposals for policy reform.

The stream of politics: Although they take place independently of the other two streams, political events, such as an impending election or a change in government, can lead a given topic and policy to be included or excluded from the agenda. Indeed, the dynamic and special needs created by a political event may change the agenda. In the political stream, consensus is usually obtained as a result of bargaining rather than persuasion. Thus, more attention is paid to assessing the costs and benefits of a policy proposal than to underlining its analytical importance and relevance.

Text Box 5: Streams model description (Boussaguet, Jacquot et al. 2004)
Figure 4: Kingdon's streams model

The most effective policy change can occur during windows of opportunity displayed in Figure 4; policy window being the most opportunistic window. The Negotiated Approach, when working within these windows, can quickly generate appropriate solutions that have the political backing to be implemented. For example, in the Khulna-Jessore case, the region was facing severe salinity intrusion. In response to this problem polders were set up by the Water Resources Department. However, over time, these polders lead to water logging. This describes the problem stream. The policy stream met the problem stream when the government suggested solving this issue by setting up investment intensive regulators at the mouth of tidal rivers. The problem stream, made up of stakeholders representing academics, farmers and fisherman, responded to this policy with skepticism towards the high maintenance interventions and therefore generated their own policy option of a Tidal Basin Management (TBM) technique. By exposing the policy directly to the problem, more appropriate policy and technology options were generated. However, without the political stream there was not much power to implement these plans. Fortunately, the Community Service Organization (CSO) representing the Tidal Basin Management technique was backed by an Asian Development Bank (ADB) mandate to complete a social and environmental impact assessment. This mandate brought the political power. With the political stream meeting the other two policy and problem streams, a policy window was opened where real policy change could occur and it did. In Bangladesh, the low maintenance Tidal Basin Management technique was implemented and it has improved the salinity intrusion problems.
Who brings the policy streams together and who recognizes that there is a window of opportunity? Kingdon addresses these questions by suggesting, “couplings of streams do not come about automatically. They are created by a ‘policy entrepreneurs’, actors hunting for solutions to their problems, or for problems for their solutions, or for support for their problem solving combinations.” Within the negotiated approach, the champion of the approach, usually the local CSO, would play the policy entrepreneur role. A good example of policy entrepreneur is Gomukh Trust in the Bhima Basin.

“The local CSO (Gomukh Trust) suggested the idea of rejuvenating sacred groves and natural springs to the community through the platform of watershed meetings. The grove belonged to Forest Department and initially the Department was not open to the idea of diverting forestlands for “non-forest-purposes”. To overcome this impasse, Gomukh arranged several dialogue meetings between the Forest officials and the village elders for resolving the conflict. Gomukh advocated the view that protection, augmentation and regeneration of the Sacred Groves and natural springs, achieved through soil and water conservation and plantation measures, would improve the ecological status of the forest by retaining soil moisture, increasing species diversity, providing much needed “water holes” for the faunal species, increasing ground water level flora and improving sub-soil water percolation for recharging ground water aquifers (Paranjpye, Dialogue Experiences in the Bhima River Basin, Central India, Dialogue on Food, Water and Environment, 2002). After a negotiating process of two months, the Department sanctioned and supported the process.” (Deshpande-Dandekar)

Initially in this situation, the problem stream of poor land management was represented by Gomukh and the politics stream of a recent severe drought was felt by the government, but the policies stream was missing. Gomukh was able to generate the policies stream by negotiating with the forest department and proposing to them the idea of sacred groves. With the pressure of the severe droughts, they were open to listening and in the end the sacred groves were built. This displays that, although sometimes not all three streams are present, it is possible to generate some of them, particularly the policies stream. The political stream however, is much more external to the control of the policy entrepreneur. For example, generating a fake natural disaster could push the political stream to meet up with the problem stream, but this is quite irrational and immoral to do. The political stream is like the wind and “I can’t change the direction of the wind, but I can adjust my sails to always reach my destination.” ~ Jimmy Dean
For each case study, the presence of each stream was questioned and the policy entrepreneur or champion of approach was identified through case study documentations and interviews. Results can be found in **Table 1**. It is important to note that the analysis of the presence of the streams was based on the issues as outlined from the perspective of the local people or local CSO's. For example, in the Se San basin, water is politically important and of course a political issue, but water for downstream aquatic ecosystems is politically unimportant. That is why the politics stream is marked no for Se San.

**Table 1: Policy Streams Analysis of Case Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bhima</th>
<th>Se San</th>
<th>Tiquipaya</th>
<th>Oconca</th>
<th>Khulna-Jessore</th>
<th>Sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the problem stream involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policies stream involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Stream of politics involved</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy entrepreneur / Champion of approach</td>
<td>Gomukh</td>
<td>SSPN</td>
<td>Centro A.G.U.A</td>
<td>AEDS</td>
<td>GEGS</td>
<td>AWARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To say one case had a better outcome than another is not a statement that can be proved within this research, but the cases that did contain all three streams, Bhima and Khulna-Jessore, did show policy change within the life of the case study documentation. The existence of all three streams can make a project move along without resistance, where-as the lack of streams, may end up in an endless negotiation process.

**Examining the decision making space of the Negotiated Approach**

The decision-making space of the negotiated approach varies from case to case. The decision-making space examines the type of decision situation existing and this dictates the type of decision-making process that will naturally follow. The type of decision situation is based on the preferences. Do all the actors involved in the negotiation have similar preferences, incompatible preferences, unclarified but compatible preferences or unclarified preferences? This matters because the Negotiated Approach aims for a negotiation decision-making process. In order to attain this, the preferences of actors involved should be either similar or compatible and at the very least, not incompatible. If preferences are incompatible then the negotiation process wouldn’t lead anywhere and it could create open conflict or war. Table 2 outlines the different decision making spaces that are relevant to the Negotiated Approach based on Rommetvedt.
Table 2: Decision making space (Rommetvedt 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision situation</th>
<th>Incompatible preferences, lack of fellowship</th>
<th>Similar preferences, divisible goods</th>
<th>Unclarified and/or different but compatible preferences</th>
<th>Unclarified preferences, assumed public good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Strategic bargaining</td>
<td>Deliberative negotiation</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the case studies, there is variation in the decision situation and decision-making process. This variation can be seen when comparing the Bangladesh case to the Vietnam-Cambodia case. In the Bangladesh case, both the government and the local water users were looking for solutions to eliminate the water logging, despite each having their own set of preferred solutions. This decision situation would be classified as different but compatible preferences. In this decision situation, the decision making process that follows naturally is deliberative negotiation. However, in the Vietnam-Cambodia case, the government of Vietnam, who built the dam, wants to use the river flow for hydro-power and the downstream river users want the flow to be released for other uses. This is classified as incompatible preferences and naturally follows a decision making process of war. The word war is very strong, and in this case it is not that there will be a physical war, but it is much harder to have a negotiation with incompatible preferences.

Based on the case study documents, each case was classified in a decision situation and decision making process (Table 3). The main point here is to consider the spread of preferences in order to be prepared for how far apart the negotiations will start. In addition, it is important to know, trying to negotiate could lead to more conflict. For example, in Tiquipaya, there were water wars. Se San, like Tiquipaya, also has incompatible preferences, lack of fellowship, but war is not yet a threat. The decision situation doesn’t always dictate fully the decision-making processes but usually it is a good indication.
Table 3: Decision Making Space Analysis Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Situation</th>
<th>Bhima</th>
<th>Se San</th>
<th>Tiquipaya</th>
<th>Ocona</th>
<th>Khulna-Jessore</th>
<th>Sand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclarified and different but compatible preferences</td>
<td>Incompatible preferences, lack of fellowship</td>
<td>Incompatible preferences, lack of fellowship</td>
<td>Unclarified preferences, assumed public good</td>
<td>Unclarified and different but compatible preferences</td>
<td>Unclarified preferences assumed public good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td>Deliberative negotiation</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Deliberative negotiation</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering how far apart preferences are before beginning negotiations can help prepare the CSOs or local organizations for their fight ahead. Also, if there is a choice on where to start negotiations, it might be more worthwhile to start where preferences are more compatible, especially when dealing with limited time and budget constraints.

4.3. **Classifying the target of the approach and monitoring with hexagon model**

The hexagon model can be used to define the target of the Negotiated Approach as well as define the target of each individual application. The purpose of the Negotiated Approach to River Basin management is to improve the way river basins are managed by integrating local knowledge and sustainable ecological solutions into mainstream policy. The approach is highly flexible and adaptable because each village, region and basin has different obstacles standing in the way of a healthy, vigorous river. Therefore, the aim of each application of the approach may vary. In order to both design the process of the Negotiated Approach and in order to monitor and evaluate its status, the hexagon model can be used to specify the target of each approach.

“You got to be careful if you don’t know where you’re going, because you might not get there.”

~ Yogi Berra
The hexagon model was designed to represent the full range of motivations for completing a policy analysis project. These motivations can be applied to specifying the target for the Negotiated Approach both in general and on a case-to-case basis. The hexagon model is displayed in Figure 7, with each corner represents a cluster of activities and each side represents the style that is created by the two activities. The six activities are: research and analyze, design and recommend, advise strategically, mediate, democratize and clarify values and arguments. “In real-life cases and projects, a policy analyst (CSO in NA) will combine one or more activities, albeit not all at the same time. When more activities are combined, a policy analysis project (NA application) will become richer and more comprehensive, but also more complex.” (Mayer, Daalen et al. 2004)

![Hexagon Model](image)

**Figure 5: Hexagon Model (Mayer, Daalen et al. 2004)**

This model can be used to specify the focus of the Negotiated Approach and then monitor the progress and evaluate the outcomes based on that focus. In general, from reading the documents on the Negotiated Approach, its target seems to rest between the participatory style and interactive style, as displayed in Figure 6. The main activities in the Negotiated Approach are initiated in order to clarify values and arguments, and democratize and mediate. With this target outlined, evaluation can be considered after the approach application. Did it democratize, did it mediate well, and were values and arguments clarified?
Figure 6: General target of Negotiated Approach

Although this seems to be the general target of the approach overall, each application of the approach had different targets and emphasis. In the case studies already completed, the Negotiated Approach was applied for various reasons and in various styles. In order to understand the range of variation within the approach, the case studies were examined utilizing this hexagon model framework.

Experts who participated in the cases themselves or employees of Both ENDS may be able to specify these targets more accurately, but based on the case study descriptions and interviews with two experts from the Bhima River case and the Khulna-Jessore case study, the targets of each case have been identified in Figure 7. The area that is shaded represents the focus of the Negotiated Approach. As you can see there is a wide variety of targets within the Negotiated Approach. For example, the Khulna-Jessore not only focused on democratizing and mediating but also on design and recommendation and research and analysis. This application of the Negotiated Approach involved technical expertise, “engineering consultants were engaged by the Bangladesh Water Development Board (BWDB) under the Ministry of Water Resources (MoWR) for developing options that could solve the problem of drainage congestion in the area” (CEGIS 2004). In many cases, the technical research and analyze aspects are not the main target. The most common target included amongst almost all the cases is to democratize. This makes sense, as the idea of participation is a very democratic ideal. In contrast to the Khulna-Jessore
case, if we look at the Ocona case we see that the main focus stayed more traditionally in the participatory style part of the hexagon. This case focused on establishing a round table within the Ocona basin at a provincial level that has the purpose of

“1. Harmonize the activities of the public and private institutions related to the management of the local agendas 21 of the province La Union and the districts;
2. Institutionalize the organized participation of civilian population in the management of the development using their civil rights;
3. Achieve a transparent management of the local authorities and the institutions working in the province/districts;” (Meijer 2002)

The purpose of pointing this section of the case study out is to display the emphasis on democratizing and clarifying values and arguments.

**Figure 7: Hexagon model applied to case studies**

What does this variation in the case studies mean? It shows that the Negotiated Approach in its current application is widely diverse and flexible. This diversity and flexibility can cause some confusion on how to move forward with the approach. In addition, some of the cases teeter on the border of the definition of the Negotiated Approach as outlined thus far in the report. In the cases of Khulna-Jessore and Bhima, additional elements beyond the five steps listed in bold in section 3 would
need to be added to accurately describe the process of these applications of NA. An analytical step of designing and recommending would need to be added to accurately capture the key phases in these cases.

There is a difference then between what the Negotiated Approach aims to be and how it has been applied. This difference will be further discussed in the comparison section 5. In addition to comparing the Negotiated Approach to other approaches, I will also compare the Negotiated Approach as it aims to be versus how it currently has been applied.

Applying the hexagon model to the Negotiated Approach shows us the purpose of the approach as well as the purpose of each case. Once the purpose of the cases is understood, the next phase of evaluating the outcomes could be performed. What were the outcomes? Did they match up with the target? Depending on the purpose, there are different ways to evaluate if the outcomes met the target. For future research, the outcomes of the approach and each case study should be verified based on their purpose. Text Box 6 describes each method of evaluation based on the purpose of the approach. I will provide one example of how these specifications can be used to evaluate by examining the outcomes of the Khulna-Jessore case.
Research and analyse
Policy analysis will be judged by substantive (scientific) quality criteria such as validity and reliability, the use and integration of state-of-the-art knowledge, the quality of data gathering and the formal argumentation and validation of conclusions.

Design and recommend
Policy analysis will be judged by instrumental criteria of policy relevance, such as usability and accessibility for policymakers, action orientation and utilisation, presentation and communication of advice, weighing up of alternatives, clear choices and so on.

Clarify values and arguments
Policy analysis will be judged by quality of argumentation and debate criteria such as formal logic (consistency), informal logic (rhetoric and sophism) and quality of the debate in terms such as richness, layering, and openness of arguments.

Advise strategically
Policy analysis will be judged by pragmatic and political effectiveness criteria such as the ‘workability’ of advice, political cleverness and proactive thinking, greater insight (for the client) in the complex environments (political and strategic dynamics, forces and powers), targeting and achievement of goals.

Democratise
Policy analysis will be judged by democratic legitimacy criteria such as openness and transparency of the policymaking process, representation and equality of participants and interests, absence of manipulation and so on.

Mediate
Policy analysis will be judged by external acceptance and learning criteria such as the agreement that mutually independent actors reach on the process and/or content, support for and commitment to the negotiating process and solutions, learning about other problem perceptions and solutions.

Text Box 6: Evaluation procedure based on purpose (Mayer, Daalen et al. 2004)

For example, in the Khulna-Jessore case the purpose was widespread. The target was to (1) research & analyze, (2) design and recommend, (3) democratize and (4) mediate. To evaluate this project each target must be examined. Was the target met?

1. (1) To research & analyze, good data and rationale must be used. For Khulna-Jessore, the relevant questions here would be: Was there a research and analysis process that examined the problems of salinity intrusion? Did this process include a scan of state-of-the-art-knowledge? Was the data and rationale used of scientific quality? From the limited documents I have read on Khulna-Jessore, the research & analysis process was not rigorous in its search for solutions. However, it is possible that it was performed but not described in the case document.
(2) To design and recommend the relevance and usability should be considered. Was the advice presented and communicated clearly? In the Khulna-Jessore case, the Tidal Basin Management technique was designed for usability and relevance. There was a large negotiation process in order to present and communicate the technique to first the Asian Development Bank and then on to the Water Resources Department. The Khulna-Jessore case therefore did a good job of designing and recommending.

(3) To democratize the openness of the process and the equality of participants should be considered. Within this case there was no documentation of going to extra effort to include women and families below poverty line in the process. The community service organization was able to influence the water resources department and in this is an indicator of equality. However, the process wasn’t 100% democratic and open. Therefore, the Khulna-Jessore did an okay job at democratizing.

(4) To mediate the negotiation process and the end agreements should be examined. Within Khulna-Jessore, the negotiation process went well in that the water resources department listened to the local CSO and it led to an end agreement to implement the Tidal Basin Management technique. Therefore, from my quick overarching perspective, the Khulna-Jessore case study did a good job with mediation.

Overall the Khulna-Jessore case had good mediation and design & recommendations. The democratization was okay and the research & analysis was weak. Now this case did seem to solve the initial problem of salinity intrusion. The evaluation process might show weakness and yet the water problem in Bangladesh was still solved. Wouldn’t the evaluation results reflect the end result of the project? If the evaluation results score badly but organizations are satisfied with the end product of the project, then there are misaligned targets and goals. And next time when identifying the targets and goals of the project, they might be better aligned. Evaluation is not just to get a good grade, but it is useful for learning, and consequently better design of future projects.
It is important to note that the target of the project here could be misaligned because I identified the target after the project was complete and as an outsider. In the future, the purpose should be determined in the project design and then afterwards the evaluation performed. I wanted to include this simulated evaluation process anyway in order to display how the hexagon model can be used as a tool for evaluation.

*Key point* - In summary, the hexagon model can be used to identify the target of each approach or the approach in general. Once this target is identified it is then easier to monitor or evaluated progress based on this target.
5. **Comparison of Negotiated Approach with Other Approaches**

What is different about the Negotiated Approach when compared to existing approaches? In order to address this question the NA is compared with other well-established approaches to River Basin Management or to the broader fields of poverty alleviation and environmental improvement. Three approaches were compared to the NA; Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems (RAAKS)(Manintveld 2002), 3xM approach by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF)(Reed 2006) and Rotary 3H grants(The Rotary Foundation 2008). In addition to this comparison, I will also examine the Negotiated Approach as it has been applied versus the ideal application.

5.1. **Selection of Comparable Approaches**

Both ENDS selected RAAKS and 3xM as approaches to compared with the Negotiated Approach. RAAKS and 3xM line up with many of the central elements of the Negotiated Approach including global application, environmental improvement, poverty alleviation, bottom-up participatory processes and up scaling of initiatives. However neither RAAKS nor 3xM put as much emphasis on the ownership and initiation of the local people as the NA does. Both approaches stress the importance of local participation, but not necessarily initiation. In addition they are more structured than the Negotiated Approach. To round out the comparison, Rotary 3H Grants was added to bring a more flexibility and to stress local initiation into the comparison. In summary, RAAKS, 3xM and Rotary 3H Grants line up with various central elements of the Negotiated Approach as follows;

- Global application - all approaches
- Environmental improvement – all approaches, but only side emphasis of Rotary 3H
- Poverty Alleviation - all approaches
- Bottom-up participatory process - all approaches
- Local Initiative - strictly followed with Rotary 3H Grants, less strict in RAAKS and 3xM locals can play various roles
- Up scaling – central theme to 3xM, sometimes found with Rotary 3H, rarely found in RAAKS
In addition to the selection being based on the central elements of the Negotiated Approach, RAAKS, 3xM and Rotary 3H grants also represents a group of similar approaches. What is a group of approaches? As defined by the Oxford American Dictionary an approach is a way of dealing with something. There are unlimited numbers of approaches dealing with global environmental improvement and poverty alleviation. They range from specific tools to wider broad mission statements. The classification of approaches for this research was conceptualized as follows (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Classification of Approaches

The general definitions of each of these terms are described in Text Box 7.

| Tool: a device or implement used to carry out a particular function |
| Methodology: a system of methods used in a particular are of study or activity |
| Framework: a basic structure underlying a system, concept, or text |
| Prerequisite: a thing that is required as a prior condition for something else to happen or exist |

Text Box 7: Definitions of Terms(Oxford 2008)

Most of these terms are self explanatory and are commonly used. However the terms prerequisite and mission statement are not as commonly used in this context.. The prerequisite approach is where sets of pre-conditions must be met before the project is considered. Once these prerequisites are met the project can commence. This approach is usually used for grants or donor organizations to control the allocation of their funds. Mission statements are very flexible where the main goals and values of the work, program or project are defined and the specifics of how they will be met are left unspecified. Presently the NA is classified as a Mission Statement.. RAAKS, 3xM and Rotary 3H Grants each represent a different group
• RAAKS is classified within this context as a methodology because it is a system of tools and methods. There are many other toolkits and methodologies with this level of articulation. They are used for rural agricultural water management one example is Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA).
• 3xM is representative of an overarching framework for the institution (in this case WWF) that is used as a planning tool for programs and projects.
• Rotary 3H grants are given out if prerequisites are met; this type of approach represents volunteer project based work that is typically philanthropically funded, similar to work done by Water for People and Engineers Without Borders.

All of the above approaches cover a wider field around the Negotiated Approach, however it is important to note that this set is not representative and comprehensive for the whole field of global environmental improvement and poverty alleviation. RAAKS, 3xM and Rotary 3H grants will be discussed in more detail in the following sections respectively, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

5.2. RAAKS

RAAKS, rapid appraisal of agricultural knowledge systems, is a well-known methodology particularly in international organizations that are based in the Netherlands. Paul Engel and M.L. Salomon from Wageningen University in accordance with the Royal Tropical Institute developed it in 1997. It was developed in response to the multi-stakeholder component of major agricultural issues today. The old way of transferring information through a broker from one party to another was no longer efficient. RAAKS was designed as a new way of working together which “facilitates simultaneous multiple-interface interactions”(Engel 1997). In agriculture there has been an increased focus on innovation of technology yet there is also a need to focus on innovation of social interactions. This is the premise under which RAAKS was developed.

Its strengths lie in a set of designed communication procedures to coordinate co-operation within agriculture systems. It is a clear methodology with a list of tools to
choose from as well as exercises that can be followed. Specifically “The RAAKS process helps to make these appreciations (perceptions, preoccupations, judgments, understanding of stakeholders) explicit by encouraging stakeholders to assess and re-assess their understanding of the problem situation and their own role in it. It also offers ways to address specific issues in a transparent manner, using methods that have been validated and can be agreed upon in advance by those who are taking part. This method thus makes it easier for people with diverse interests to begin to work together. It also helps identify possible constraints and opportunities, and allows the participants to design strategies to define measures to improve their current interaction.” (Engel 1997)

Critique has been that it indeed does facilitate communication between stakeholders and generates a visible increase of communication schemes and interactions, however in the end did it improve irrigation? Was institutional change achieved? The general impression is no. The approach stayed at one level, the local level, and is very focused on process. (Havigna March 26, 2008) RAAKS does get people talking like it intended it to do however there is still a lack of confidence in its ability to generate change within the agricultural systems and institutions. A summary of RAAKS is described in text box 8.

| RAAKS (rapid appraisal of agricultural knowledge systems) is a diagnostic framework and participatory methodology for analyzing complex multi-stakeholder situations and for designing effective co-operation and communication strategies. It is an important methodology for facilitating innovative performance in agriculture, natural resource management and rural development. |

**Text Box 8: RAAKS (Royal Tropical Institute 2008)**

### 5.3. The 3xM Approach

World Wildlife Fund (WWF) published the 3xM approach (bringing change across micro, meso and macro levels) in 2006 in order to promote poverty reduction and environmental sustainability. The approach was developed as the result of a four-year project where participation of project partners in China, Indonesia, El Salvador, South Africa and Zambia were “guided by the common purpose of raising the living
standards of the rural poor and improving management of natural resources on which the rural communities depend" (Reed 2006).

*Key point* - The approaches strength lies in its structured framework which has the capacity to generate change across all levels from local to governmental as seen in **Text Box 9**. The approach is inclusive and comprehensive. Whether you are a civil society organization, national government, bilateral development agency, or development bank there is a place for you in this approach. It also acknowledges other existing approaches and strategies and suggests not to replace, but to add the concepts from the 3xM framework on to existing approaches.

Challenges are faced when aligning the 3 Ms’. During the four year project study it was hard to align all levels especially the Macro level. “Establishing this policy and institutional coherence across the three levels proved to be the most challenging dimension of the interventions of our national partners. Foremost of those challenges was trying to change policies and institutional arrangements at the macro level, particularly when governments were committed to policies that disregarded economic growth in the rural sector or adopted policies built on rent seeking from natural resource sectors.” (Reed 2006)

The 3xM approach is used within World Wildlife Fund as guiding principles for project and program planning; it is not used as a set of fixed tools and processes. It is a nice conceptual framework that links environment and poverty together with international funding. (Temm May 7, 2008) The approach is also used to communicate the principles that WWF believes in. The following **Text Box 9** outlines the approaches basic principles.
The three M’s in the 3xM Approach stands for micro (local), meso (subnational), and macro (national/international). It is called the 3xM Approach because it links changes across the micro, meso, and macro levels of a given country. Its overarching purpose is to remove political, economic, and institutional obstacles so that the rural poor can compete more effectively in the emerging economic order and strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystems. 3xM Approach has four basic principles:

1. Building an effective intervention strategy for changing poverty-environment dynamics requires carrying out rigorous economic, ecological, and institutional analysis that cuts across micro, meso, and macro levels.
2. Changing the dynamics mentioned above begins with removing obstacles at the local level that prevent the poor from competing economically, improving natural resource management, and participating in the political processes.
3. Establishing a coherent policy and institutional context in which local initiatives can thrive requires aligning policies and institutional arrangements at subnational and national levels.
4. Building alliances between rural communities and a wide range of advocates, experts, and supporting institutions in urban areas is needed to effect policy and institutional changes.

Text Box 9: The 3xM Approach (Reed 2006)

5.4. Rotary 3H Grants

Rotary 3H Grants (Health, Hunger and Humanity) were established by Rotary “in 1979 with the approval of a US $760,000 grant to support polio immunizations activities in the Philippines. Since then, The Rotary Foundation (TRF has awarded 305 3-H grants totaling $74 million to support projects in 77 countries and continues to award more grants every year.”(The Rotary Foundation 2008) The main purpose is to encourage self-help and sustainability through projects that promote health, alleviating hunger and enhancing human and social development. Rotary’s overarching goal is to help advance international understanding, goodwill, and peace.

The strength of Rotary 3H grants can be partially attributed to its local to international club involvement. To apply for the grant there must be a partnership of at least two Rotary clubs, one inside the project country and the other outside. In addition Rotary’s 3H grants strength lies is its ability to evaluate and control its projects. The project duration is typically 2-4 years and throughout this time the project is monitored. In addition, before awarding the money there is an approval
process in which experts review and visit the project site to verify the plan. The evaluation process throughout the project timeline is well structured and executed which is possible because the money, work, and benefits of the project are all centered around Rotary. The grant projects must be balanced with technical expertise and some form of training, community participation or capacity building. Lastly, Rotary encourages applicants to have multiple disciplines within the project scope, for example a project on water should include health and sanitation. This promotes more sustainable uplifting of a community.

The limitations of this approach are that it works on the local level only, it does not intend to influence policy change. There have been some projects that have influenced policy change, but it is not the main goal. Local poverty alleviation is the target. A description of the 3-H grants is displayed in Text Box 10.

| Health, Hunger and Humanity (3-H) Grants are awarded to fund large long-term international self-help and grassroots development projects that use and integrative approach to address humanitarian needs. An integrative approach incorporates multiple program components, including a combination of sustainable factors such as training, community participation, capital assets, and technical expertise from Rotarians and other sources. Projects must be self-sustaining after the 3-H grant funds have been spent. All projects must involve Rotary clubs or districts in at least two countries, with a significant number of Rotarians actively participating in the project. To be eligible for a 3-H grant, the primary host and international sponsor clubs or districts must have successfully worked together as primary sponsors of a Matching Grant project within five years of submitting their 3-H application. The sponsors must contribute at least 10 percent of the 3-H grant award amount. Grants range from US $100,000 to $300,000. |

Text Box 10: Rotary 3-H Grants (The Rotary Foundation 2008)

### 5.5. Identification of Dimensions

Throughout the field of participatory, bottom-up approaches to water management there are several dimensions that are mentioned repetitively in a wide variety of case studies and approaches. Because of this, it is often hard to tell the difference between one approach and the next. In order to compare the Negotiated Approach with RAAKS, 3xM and Rotary 3H Grants these commonly discussed dimensions will be identified and evaluated for each approach.
Brainstorming Dimensions

There were many inputs to the brainstorming of dimensions, first was the documents of the various approaches (RAAKS, 3M, Negotiated Approach and Rotary 3H Grants) and the theories discussed in section 4. In addition during my initial literature review I came across numerous individual project reports, theoretical articles and books that discussed applying participatory approaches in the developing world. My intention was to generate dimensions that reflected the central issues of all the approaches as well as the general field of participatory water management.

The approaches have clear differences that could be identified before the formal comparative analysis was performed. These differences helped identify important dimensions for the comparison.

- RAAKS varies with the other approaches as it is applicable to one field specifically where as 3M, NA and Rotary 3H grants can be applied to a wide range of fields, therefore the dimension **applicability to multiple sectors** was important to include.
- Rotary 3H Grants are unique from the other approaches in that they are project based with a set specified budget and time duration, whereas RAAKS, 3M and NA have a longer term commitment. In order to examine these differences the dimensions of **working style** and **time commitment** were included.
- The Negotiated Approach stresses the importance of **flexibility** so this was included in the comparison; however when something is flexible it may be hard to specify or replicate therefore the dimension **ease of replication** was also included.

The theories from section 4 were helpful in brainstorming relevant dimensions for the comparison. Common pool resource discusses **local involvement**, the matrix stresses the **importance of up scaling** and the hexagon model touches on **evaluation**. These are all dimensions included in the comparative analysis.

The literature review provided a background and reconfirmation of important dimensions in the field around the Negotiated Approach. For example; a book entitled **Water Rights and Empowerment** (Boelens and Hoogendam 2002) described
a variety of case studies that stress local involvement in water policy and rights. This re-stated the importance of including the dimension of local involvement. A journal article entitled Bottom up and top down: Analysis of participatory processes for sustainability indicator identification as a pathway to community empowerment and sustainable environmental management (Fraser, Dougill et al. 2006) reinforced the ideas of flexibility and evaluation. An article on Stakeholder Methodologies in Natural Resource Management: a Review of Principles, Contexts, Experiences and Opportunities (Grimble and Wellard 1997) mentioned the need for “developing improved systems, frameworks and methodologies for analyzing situations and incorporating stakeholder and institutional concerns”. This article reconfirms the importance of discussing the classification of an approach as well as the evolution and working style.

The identification of dimensions came from the perspective of the Negotiated Approach, with the background of supporting theories, literature review and considering the other three approaches. Specifically four questions were asked to help structure the specification of central elements.

1) What are central themes to the Negotiated Approach?
2) How are the approaches unique?
3) What elements from the theories are applicable for the comparison?
4) Are there any central themes still missing?

This process is conceptualized in Figure 9. The dimension’s which were identified as answers to each question are lined up to the right of the relevant question, however some dimensions were identified from multiple questions, therefore there is not a direct linear path from the input to the output.
Figure 9: Identification of Dimensions

Substantiating Dimensions

The dimensions brainstormed in the previous section are relevant for comparing the various approaches. However, there are other pre-existing comparisons that use similar dimensions? How can we verify that these are indeed central elements for this comparison? Also this is a long list, is there a way to cluster or simplify the dimensions? This section gives additional support for the identification of the dimensions before they are used in the comparison.

There is one comparison in particular, which has been performed already, that can be used to substantiate the dimensions of this study. UNICEF performed a comparison between rapid rural appraisal and participatory rural appraisal, two methods very similar to RAAKS. Their comparison is quite similar to the comparison that will be performed in the sections to come; as they were trying to identify the differences between various participatory approaches. In their comparison they describe the differences between approaches using the dimensions of time, degree of participation and scope see Figure 10. These dimensions directly relate to the dimensions brainstormed for this study.
Seven of the ten dimensions can be classified under the three dimensions UNICEF identifies, Figure 11. Under the category of time, working style and time commitment can be grouped as they both deal with the time a project is implemented. Degree of participation is correlated to local initiation because the stronger the importance of local initiation the higher the degree of participation. The phrasing is different, but the idea being captured is the same by both of these labels. The dimensions of applicability to multiple sectors, up scaling, flexibility and rigidity all can be categorized under scope.

- The applicability to multiple sectors is an issue of scope in that it deals with the question; does the approach cover only the contexts of water or would it be applicable for land as well?
- The dimension of upscaling relate to scope as it deals with the reach of the approach is it local, regional or international or all of the above.
- Then is the scope of the project applicable to a wide range of environments or only a certain situation? (this question reflects the dimensions of flexibility and ease of replication)
Figure 11: Dimensions clustered and revised

Are the remaining dimensions of classification, evolution and evaluation still relevant? Classification as defined previously ranges from tools to mission statements. The web portal of PP&M Wageningen University, 10.4, structures their list of resources under; (1) theories & background, (2) methodologies & approaches and (3) tools and methods. Although the word approach in this research is used as an overarching term for all types of “approaches” the general outline of classifying from broad (1) theories & background to specific (3) tools and methods is similar to the classification dimension in this research from broad, (i.e. mission statement) to specific (i.e. tools). As such this general classification is important to keep in as a dimension.

Evolution deals with how the approach was developed. Was it from a theory formed by experience and then tested in practice or was it from an observation of the field and pattern recognition? Evolution is an interesting dimension, yet the evolution might not be all that influential on the application of the approach. Does it really matter how the approach evolved or rather is it matter more what the approach is? This dimension is interesting however support to use this dimension in the analysis
was not found and it is not as strong as the other dimensions, therefore it was eliminated from the comparison.

Evaluation is an important aspect the comparison; the Hexagon model supports the process of evaluation. Since the Negotiated Approach in the future would like to incorporate more evaluation into its application it would be useful to see if there are any lessons that could be obtained from the variety of ways other approaches work with evaluation.

The substantiated dimensions that will be used for comparison are summarized in Figure 12.

Figure 12: Final Dimensions
5.6. **Comparison**

In order to understand where the Negotiated Approach fits in the general field of participatory water management, a comparative analysis was performed. This deepened the explanation of the Negotiated Approach. In addition, not only was a comparison between other approaches performed but a comparison was also performed on the ideal way the negotiated approach is described versus how it has been applied thus far. Lastly this comparison provided the uniqueness of the approach and examples of various directions the NA could head towards in the future.

Section 5.5 discussed the identification of dimensions that will be used for this comparison. Some of the dimensions of approaches can be rated in a quantifiable way, from low to high or short term to long term. Others were not quantifiable in a ranking order. This is noted because the end product of the dimensional comparison is a visual plot of each approach where the axes are the dimensions Figure 13. However, they all hold relevance for the comparison and therefore the unquantifiable dimensions will be left in table form. The discussion of the comparison is structured by examining one dimension at a time for each of the four approaches. Then each approach will be summarized at the end of this chapter. Table 4 and Table 4 outline the dimensional comparisons. The visual axes are explained in Figure 13 and the visual comparison is displayed in Figure 14.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

**Classification** was described previously in section 5.1 Selection of Comparable Approaches and displayed in Figure 8. It deals with the type of approach; is it a Methodology, Framework, Pre-requisite or Mission Statement? This dimension is linked to flexibility and ease of replication in the sense that as you move from Methodology to Mission Statement you gain more flexibility and lose the ease of replication.

RAAKS is a Methodology which is comprised of various toolkits and includes a step-by-step procedure to follow.

3M is a Framework which is a less rigid and specific than RAAKS.
Methodology. It is used as a way to structure project and programs, but is not comprised of a stepwise procedure, nor does it contain series of tools that must be used. It does however give key concepts and suggests analytical procedures that can be used so it is still more structured than the Rotary 3H Grants and The Negotiated Approach.

Rotary 3H Grants are allotted based on pre-requisites. Each grant must meet certain criteria before it is given out. If these criteria are met then the project will commence. These criteria are strict; however there is generally freedom and flexibility as long as the simple criteria are met. Therefore this is more flexible than that of RAAKS and 3M but still more structured than the Negotiated Approach.

The Negotiated Approach ideally is a framework, however it has been applied as a mission statement thus far with guiding principles. Having a methodology, framework or pre-requisites assumes a certain level of uniformity and rigidity that I think is against the real message of the Negotiated Approach. It may be better to reside with guiding principles and a mission statement that stem from case studies. The message that is being conveyed is that standardized approaches are not flexible enough and do not give enough autonomy to the local people. The case studies give evidence of the value of the Negotiated Approach. However forcing a methodology or framework out of the case studies creates confusion and skepticism. When first presented with the NA I was quite confused and unclear about what “the approach” was. In addition when interviewing about the NA to experts and external interviewees who had been in contact with the approach I also found confusion and skepticism about what the approach really is and what it can do. This skepticism takes away from the power of Both ENDS successful cases and valuable lessons learned. Would it be better to market the NA as a message that local initiatives have influence, lets support more of them and focus on up scaling them?

*Easy to evaluate* is related to how easy it is to define the goals of the approach and determine if they were met. This dimension was added, because of potential future research on the evaluation of the Negotiated Approach. For the most part many of these approaches have difficulty evaluating, because of the broad application and flexibility.

RAAKS is evaluated and measure on a project basis. The “success of a
RAAKS exercise was measured by the quality of action plans, satisfaction of the contracting organization and the commitment of stakeholders to implement the action plans" (Salomon 2006) However there is additional need for follow up because the stakeholders do not always keep to their action plans.

3M is a very broad framework, how would you evaluate if the micro, meso and macro levels were reached? It is very broad and hard to evaluate, not impossible but challenging.

Rotary 3H Grants are easy to evaluate as they set goals up front and specify what the money will be used for exactly. Rotary sends experts out to check and confirm that what is said will be done can be done and after the project they again check that it was done.

The Negotiated Approach ideally can be evaluated by using the hexagon model to define the purpose of each application and follow up to see if that purpose was met. However as it stands right now the approach is too broad and vague to be able to evaluate.

**TIME**

*Working Style* refers to how the approach is used. Is it used for individual projects or is it used for an overall program design? This dimension is linked to time commitment. If the approach is focused on project, there is a short-term commitment; where-as programs are longer-term commitments.

RAAKS is completed on a project-to-project basis.

3M is generally used for program planning.

Rotary 3H grants are based on individual projects.

The Negotiated Approach as it has been applied so far has seven independent case studies that have been project oriented.

however the NA is intended to facilitate sustainable change which requires longer term programs. Therefore here it was classified as both project and program working style.

*Time commitment* is directly related to working style. If it is a program working style it has long-term time commitment and if it is a project it has short-term time commitment. If the approach is used for both project and program working styles it is ranked in the middle.

RAAKS is short term.
3M is long term.
Rotary 3H Grants are short term.
The Negotiated Approach ideally is both, so in Figure 14: Visual Comparisons it is ranked on the middle of the time commitment axis. However presently how it has been applied in case studies it is a short term time commitment.

**DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION**

**Stress on local initiation** refers to how much emphasis the approach puts on the local community initiating the approach. All of these approaches emphasize local involvement, but some do not specify that locals should initiate the process, they can simply be participants or partners.
RAAKS has medium stress on local initiation.
3M has medium stress on local initiation.
Rotary 3H Grants have high stress on local initiation as it is one of their pre requisites that the local community raises money and the local Rotary club is involved in the project planning.
The Negotiated approach also has high stress on local initiation in its ideal form. However looking at the existing applications, in some instances there is not an extra emphasis to include women and families below the poverty line, therefore the stress on local initiation for the existing NA is ranked medium.

**SCOPE**

**Applicability to multiple sectors** indicates if the approach can be used not just for river management or agricultural management, but if it can also be used for land management, ecosystems management or even social development projects.
RAAKS has low applicability to multiple sectors as it is specifically for agricultural appraisal in rural communities.
3M, Rotary 3H Grants and the Negotiated Approach (both ideal and existing) all have high applicability to multiple sectors as they can be used in many different types of programs and projects from ecosystems to societal systems.
**Importance of up scaling** refers to how much emphasis the approach puts on up scaling, low being little to no emphasis and high being almost an essential element of the approach.

RAAKS has low importance of up scaling.

3M has high importance of up scaling.

Rotary 3H Grants has medium importance, because some projects focus on linking up to higher policies and in some they don’t.

The Negotiated Approach ideally has high importance of up scaling, however so far only some of the case studies have up scaled the approach. Therefore for the existing NA approach, up scaling is rated at medium.

**Flexibility** is fairly straightforward. What is meant with flexibility is how many different situations and environments can it be applied in? If there is high flexibility it can be applied in a wide variety of environments and can be designed specifically for those conditions. Low flexibility is high rigidity and can be applied in only certain ways or certain environments. It is important to note that these low, medium, high rankings are relative only to the comparative approaches, not based on some standardized level of flexibility.

RAAKS compared to the other approaches has low flexibility.

3M and Rotary 3H grants are more flexible than RAAKS but not as flexible as the Negotiated Approach, therefore they have medium rank for flexibility.

The Negotiated Approach, both ideal and existing have high flexibility.

**Ease of Replication** refers to how easy it is to copy a successful application of the approach. Also how easy is it to copy and paste the process of the approach?

RAAKS has an easy replication, because it is a procedure that can be followed and repeated.

3M has a medium ease of replication because there are standard pieces, however they are broad and the specifics have to be adapted each application.

Rotary 3H Grants are hard to replicate, they are based on an individual grant to grant basis.

The Negotiated Approach, both ideal and existing, are hard to replicate, each
application has to be designed and adapted specifically to the existing environmental conditions.

Table 4: Comparison non-quantifiable dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Working Style</th>
<th>Easy to evaluate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAAKS</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>reasonably easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>hard very broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary 3H Grants</td>
<td>Pre-requisites</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>clear procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal NA</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Projects/Programs</td>
<td>can use hexagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing NA</td>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>hard very broad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison quantifiable dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Time commitment</th>
<th>Importance of up scaling</th>
<th>Stress on local initiation</th>
<th>Applicability to multiple sectors</th>
<th>Ease of Replication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAAKS</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary 3H Grants</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal NA</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing NA</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison of quantifiable dimensions was translated into a star axis in order to visually see the differences between the approaches. Figure 13 shows the empty axes where the approaches will be plotted. For Flexibility, Applicability to multiple sectors, Importance of local initiation and Importance of up scaling the range is low on the inside of the axis and high on the outside. For ease of replication the scale is from easy on the inside to hard on the outside. For time commitment, short is on the inside and long is on the outside. The general trend is as you move inward on the axes you gain focus and rigidity and as you move outward breadth and flexibility. This pattern holds true, as in Figure 14 you can see that the Negotiated Approach has many points on the outside and covers a large area of the plot where as RAAKS has most of its points on the inside and is more focused with a smaller plot area.
Figure 13: Quantifiable dimensions on star axis
Figure 14: Visual Comparisons

The smaller the area the more focused the approach, the benefit of these types of approaches, like RAAKS, is that they are easier to apply, replicated and evaluated.
After RAAKS, based on the visual comparison, Rotary 3H Grants seem to be more focused. The 3M Approach and The Negotiated Approach, both the ideal and existing, are the most broad and general out of these five. So how then is the Negotiated Approach unique? The Negotiated Approach is unique from the other approaches in that it is the most broad and flexible. This allows the local stakeholders the autonomy to design their own solutions for their problems and it also enables the approach to be applied in many situations. However, the trade off from gaining flexibility is losing focus and clarity, this is an important discussion. Rotary 3H grants seem to balance flexibility and focus quite well. In the next section I will discuss the above ideas as well as strengths of the other approaches that might aid in the future application of the Negotiated Approach.

There are some strong points worth discussing in other approaches that could be useful for the Negotiated Approach.

The 3M framework is “bringing change across micro, meso and macro levels” (Reed 2006). There has already been collaboration between WWF and Both ENDS about integrating the two approaches. The Negotiated Approach can be improved from the structured way the 3M approach connects the local communities (micro) to the upper policy makers (macro) through middle players (meso). It provides suggestions and even tools that can be used to perform institutional analysis and to identify key actors. The 3M framework unlike RAAKS and Rotary 3H grants stress the need for a long-term horizon. This is the trade off for focusing on broader strategies of policy influence; it will take a longer-term commitment in order to establish sustainable strategies for policy change.

The RAAKS approach as a methodology has the benefit of clear detailed step by step process, which is easy to transfer and replicate. The Negotiated Approach could use more ease of replication like RAAKS, however not at the expense of hindering flexibility and autonomy for the local people. It is important not to “straightjacket the planning process”.

The Rotary 3H grants projects have been very successful in clearly outlining their goals and meeting them with each project, yet they still maintain a certain level of flexibility for local influence. In fact the projects require local initiation and usually provide an educational component with their projects that aids in lasting effects of work in the local community. The benefit Rotary has is through the access of its clubs to both a global network of local communities and also a global network of
donor clubs, which team up to perform the projects. The downside might be that their work is done on a focused one-project basis. These nicely wrapped projects might not commit to meet the broad goals of policy change that the Negotiated Approach seeks, however, their impact seems to make sustainable improvement to communities on a local level. Since the communities own their projects they usually are satisfied with the results.
6. **The future of the Negotiated Approach**

The purpose of my research is to examine the Negotiated Approach with the perspective of an outsider and master's student researcher. The results of my examination are summarized here. Answering the research questions outlines the recommendations for the future of the Negotiated Approach.

### 6.1. *What is the Negotiated Approach?*

The first research question, “What is the Negotiated Approach,” is answered by the following key phases outlined in points 1 through 5 as well as the key roles and resources visually displayed in Figure 15

Through interviews with Both ENDS and Gomukh, as well as the documents on the seven case studies, the key phases of the approach that emerged are the following five phases;

1. External support capacity Building
2. Local CSO or other Champion for leadership and facilitation
3. Engaging local actors, assessing power, including powerless (families below poverty lines and women)
4. Negotiation Process
5. Up-scaling: Invite new members into the negotiation process
   a. Horizontally: Geographically over to next village
   b. Vertically: Up to next level
Figure 15: Key Resources and Roles of the Negotiated Approach

It was challenging at first to be able to outline these key phases, roles and resources of the Negotiated Approach. When initially confronted with the Negotiated Approach, I was left somewhat confused. It seemed like the approach was trying to “wear too many hats.” Its name implied negotiation as the central theme, however, I found negotiation to be more of the central tool but not necessarily the main purpose or function of the approach. Therefore, my first recommendation for the future of the Negotiated Approach is to define the main purpose, and get that main purpose into the name. For example, the 3M approach focuses on three M’s: Micro, Meso, and Macro levels. If the end goal is negotiation, then the Negotiated Approach is properly named, however, negotiated nonsense would not be a desired situation. There are many more layers to the approach than just negotiation.

My interpretation of the main purpose of the Negotiated approach is, as quoted from Both ENDS directly, “to create an alternative method to policy makers and international organizations that does not ‘straight jacket’ the planning process.” I would add to this that the purpose is to give autonomy and flexibility to the local people as initiators and owners of their ecosystems concerns and to assist them in getting their concerns heard at higher policy levels. If I had to pick a name right here
on the spot, I would say that the Negotiated Approach could be translated into The Negotiated Approach to Ecosystems Management; aligning peoples, policy and ecosystems needs.

6.2. How is the Negotiated Approach Grounded in Theory?

The Negotiated Approach can be supported by the following theories in the following ways:

1) Supporting the key concepts of the approach
   a. Common pool resources
      If the resource is small and has clear boundaries (i.e. not a flowing river) the following six enabling conditions highlight the matching elements between the NA and common pool resources theory. These conditions should be considered during implementation:

      1) Overlap between user-group residential location and resource location
      2) High levels of dependence by group members on resource system
      3) Locally devised access and management rules
      4) Central governments should not undermine local authority
      5) Supportive external sanctioning institutions
      6) Appropriate levels of external aid to compensate local users for conservation activities

   b. The Collaborative for Development Action Matrix (The Matrix)
      This matrix confirms that up-scaling is indeed very important when the end goal is not just to impact the local communities’ ecosystem but when the desired outcome is to impact the whole river basin or natural ecosystem.

2) Understanding the complex situation in which the Negotiated Approach is applied
   a. Policy streams model
   b. Decision making space
When looking into applying the Negotiated Approach, potential for up-scaling must exist. The success of up-scaling is not something that can necessarily be designed into the approach as a process, however, gathering insights from Kingdon’s policy streams and decision-making space, up-scaling possibilities will be present when the political will, policy ideas and problem awareness meet at one time. Also up-scaling is more probable when the decision making space is compatible, meaning that the higher-level governments are trying to solve the same problem that the local people are trying to solve. Scanning the environments for these pre-conditions could increase the success of up-scaling.

3) Monitoring and Evaluating the approach
   a. Hexagon model
   The Hexagon model can be used to help identify the target of each application of the approach. This model gives evaluation questions relating to each target that can be used post-project to evaluate if the targets were met. The process of evaluation, in addition to keeping the projects on track, also provides an opportunity to learn from each application in order to improve future work. More research could be done on the targets and evaluation of the outcomes of the Negotiated Approach (see future research Chapter 7.)

6.3. How does the Negotiated Approach Compare to other Approaches?

One of the research questions is, “how does the Negotiated Approach compare to other approaches?” Both ENDS believed that it was unique, but wanted more confirmation of this. Indeed through the comparison, it was found that the Negotiated Approach is unique in its high flexibility and broadness of application. This uniqueness is what offers an alternative to more structured approaches, however, it also keeps the NA teetering on the edge of an approach. If a true mores structured approach is desired not just as a mission statement, some of this flexibility will have
to be given up. The lessons learned from the case studies can generate a good program or project framework for Both ENDS development and ecosystems work.

Lessons are also learned from other approaches- mostly from the 3M approach and Rotary 3H grants.

The Negotiated Approach can adopt the 3M framework of connecting the local communities (micro) to the upper policy makers (macro) through middle players (meso) for its up-scaling agenda. The framework provides suggestions and even tools that can be used to connect the levels including institutional analysis and identifying key actors.

We can learn from the Rotary 3H grants that it is possible to balance flexibility and local initiation while still maintaining clearly outlined goals and evaluation procedures.

### 6.4. How can the Negotiated Approach Best be applied in the Future?

The lessons learned in developing the Negotiated Approach are valid. My external interviews and literature reviews support the validity of the Negotiated Approach lessons. The main lessons are as follows;

- Initiation must be local
- Potential for up-scaling must exist
  - Look into the timing of the approach
  - Look into the decision-making space
- Emphasis must be on sustainability, ecosystem friendly and technically appropriate solutions
- Negotiation as a tool for communication

However, the strength of the lessons learned is being weakened by confusion. In my opinion, there needs to be a shift of focus with the Negotiated Approach. The present situation of moving forward applying the Negotiated Approach as it is defined now, may be causing confusion to organizations on the same level as Both ENDS and has potential to confuse higher funding organizations. If the Negotiated
Approach was redefined as a mission statement or lessons learned through case studies, Both ENDS could then transform them for practical use in one of these two ways:

- Option 1: The lessons could lead into working principles for all of Both ENDS ecosystems work. Using these lessons for program design in a manner more like how the 3M framework is used within WWF.
- Option 2: The lessons learned could be used on a project basis as essentially pre-requisites like the Rotary 3H grants. If the above outlined four bullets are not met, then the project is not supported or taken further by Both ENDS. These projects could then all be defined as following the “Negotiated Approach”. As mentioned previously in conclusions, it would help for communication purposes to consider adding something to the name of the approach, particularly when presenting to peer organizations, funding organizations, government institutions and Universities. One suggestion could be adding a tagline such as, *The Negotiated Approach to Ecosystems: Management; Aligning Peoples, Policy and Ecosystems Needs.* Also for communication, it would be good to acknowledge the challenges and trade-offs as well as the benefits of the approach. In the reflection section there will be a greater discussion of these tradeoffs.
7. Future Research

As with every research project, due to the limited time and scope some sidetracks were not researched in the level of detail that they could be. There are many opportunities for future research. Firstly, the case studies were not understood in full detail (1). In addition, outcomes and evaluation of the Negotiated Approach should be further examined (2). Furthermore, it would also be interesting to do a full study on the complex environment that the Negotiated Approach is applied in considering power structures, corruption and examining if all regions of the world are really ready and able to negotiate for their resources (3).

(1) There is potential for future research in confirming the interpretation of the case studies. Due to limited time and access to the current status of the case studies, detailed outcomes of the cases were not discussed within this paper, but should be examined in future research.

(2) There is also potential for future research in identifying how to evaluate progress with the Negotiated Approach. It was found in this report that the hexagon model can be used to identify the target of each approach or the approach in general. Once this target is identified, it is then easier to monitor or evaluate progress based on this target. It would be valuable to be able to evaluate each application of the Negotiated Approach.

(3) There is potential for future research in studying the complex environment of corruption, power structures and the cultural acceptability of negotiation. The power structures and external environment were touched on slightly in this research when examining the potential for up scaling the approach, however, generally the study was limited to focusing internally on the Negotiated Approach. The external environment might have an even more powerful influence on the success or failure of the approach than the specifics of the approach design. Therefore, future research should be taken up to examine this. Conclusions from a study like this could be used to optimize the identification of the moment in time and geographic location of an application of the NA.
8. Reflections

At the beginning of this research, I wanted to understand what the Negotiated Approach was and the biggest question that kept rising to the surface throughout the research is: why create another approach? There are so many participatory management practices out there that when I started reading case study after case study it was very hard to tell the difference between approaches. From my eagle eye view it seemed that everyone was doing the same thing. This created some frustration and skepticism about the necessity of so many approaches that are targeting the same problems. The skeptical part of me thought all these approaches might be a reflection of mans (or woman’s) need to do things their own way and make their mark on the world, which I am guilty of myself. I still believe this could be a part, however, through this research I started to understand all of the trade-offs and different ways to design approaches for various purposes. Each approach makes different trade-offs based on what it considers important.

There are many trade-offs to consider when trying to apply an approach. Which qualities are you willing to sacrifice for others? If the approach should be flexible, the trade-off might be clarity, focus and ease of replication. Should your approach work in short-term projects that are easier to observe change and evaluate, or should it be long term programs that are more appropriate for policy change, yet are hard to reach measure and predict? Each approach makes different trade-offs to reach its goals.

Other issues that created skepticism in my mind were the issues of control and power. Many documents that I read seemed to dodge the challenges of power and implied the ability to control the working environment in a wide variety of complex cultural political situations. I know that the organizations owning the approaches know very well the importance of culture and politics and these issues have been dodged in the reporting for the need to be clear and understandable. There is one simple way to address this gap without getting into a complex discussion of power and culture: adding a discussion of timing. As supported by theories within this report, particularly the policy streams model we see that timing is essential. If the time is right, and political powers are aligned making policy options available, then the application of the Negotiated Approach or other approaches will have a greater impact. I am not
saying to sit back and wait for the opportunities to arise; I am suggesting to be prepared, to take consistent action, to read the environment and to move in big steps when the right political timing is at hand. In some situations, it might be possible to influence the political timing through media, lobbying and pressure from the international community.

Assessing and understanding the political timing, environment and power structures are a whole new research project that was recommend in future research. This could give insight as to how effective the Negotiated Approach might be. Power is what is needed to transform words, ideas, and negotiations into actions. The people negotiating should have the power and desire to apply the decisions that are reached. However, the identification and distribution of power is something that is muddled by self-interests, thus creating corruption and complexities.

Answering questions then creates more questions and it is important to acknowledge not only the questions and skepticism I have left, but also to address the questions that were answered. From the beginning, I was unsure of how to identify the Negotiated Approach, how will dimensions be brainstormed and what recommendations will help to improve the approach. Periods of active research with periods of passive reflection allowed me time to deal with each one of these questions. I am very satisfied with the answers I was able to find and the analysis that was completed. My results as discussed in my conclusions I stand behind, and hope that they are interesting to the field of policy analysis and provide useful insight for the future of the Negotiated Approach.
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10. Appendix

10.1. Description of External Interviews

The list of interviews both internal (Both ENDS and partner agencies) and external is as follows; (Anderson April 28, 2008; Moomaw April 28, 2008; Kempers March 5, 2008; Hirsch March 7, 2008; Douma March 17, 2008; Paranjpye March 19, 2008; Havigna March 26, 2008; Alum March 28, 2008; Hall May 2, 2008; Martin-Wilde May 5, 2008; Temm May 7, 2008; Asiago May 9, 2008)

The full references to the interviews are included within the reference list. However for Both ENDS in particular I wanted to provide a brief description of each of the external interviews I performed. Below are the descriptions of each external interview.

Mary B. Anderson

*Interviewed in Boston, MA, USA in person on April 28, 2008*

Executive Director of DCA Collaborative Learning Projects and President of CDA, Inc. has worked in international development assistance for over forty years. Named as “the most influential theorist in the world of humanitarianism” (NY Times Magazine, Feb. 11, 2001), she is more typically known for CDA’s pragmatism and grounded approach to solving problems faced by the staff on international agencies.

Before starting CDA, Inc., Dr. Anderson was Program Officer with the Harvard Institute for International Development, Director of the Bunting Institute at Radcliffe College, and Director of the International Relief/Development Project at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She received her PhD in Economics from the University of Colorado, Boulder, and held a post-doctoral fellowship at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, a non-profit entity, established by Mary Anderson in 2003, broadens the scope of collaborative training, learning, and new project development with many international governments and NGOs.
Joel Asiago
*Interviewed by phone from Boston to Nairobi, Kenya on May 9, 2008*
Social Scientist, Kenya

Ed Hall
*Interviewed in person in Worcester, MA, USA on May 2, 2008*
Volunteer director of Rotary water projects in Haiti.

Collette Martin-Wilde
*Interviewed by phone from Massachusetts to Illinois on May 5, 2008*
Senior coordinator of Rotary 3H Grants.

William Moomaw
*Interviewed in person in Boston, Ma on April 28, 2008*
Senior Director, Tufts Institute of the Environment; Co-Director, Global Development and Environment Institute; Co-Director, Public Disputes Program, Program on Negotiations; Convening Lead Author, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2001; Board of Directors, Consensus Building Institute; Science Advisory Committee, Earthwatch; Lead author, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2003. Research Interests include; Quantitative indicators of environment and development; sustainable development; trade and environment; technology and policy implications for climate change; water and climate change; biodiversity; negotiation strategies for environmental agreements.

Gabriella Richardson Temm
*Interviewed in person in Washington D.C. on May 7, 2008*
Gabriella Richardson-Temm is MPO’s Senior Program Officer for the Poverty and Environmental Program. She has over 10 years experience working on the intersection of poverty and environment. Prior to joining WWF/MPO, she was an independent consultant in the field of conservation and development. She has also worked for six years with IUCN initially in their Social Policy Programme and later as head of IUCN’s Country Office in Zambia. Gabriella holds a Master of Social Science in Applied Sociology and a Bachelor’s degree in Development Economic from the University of Lund in Sweden.
10.2. Research Side-tracks

Not all pieces of research that were performed ended up being relevant to the report. For the purposes of Professors to understand more clearly my research process and my selection of relevant material, I will include briefly the pieces of my research which were left out of the main body of my report.

Process Management

Initially I thought process management principles could help outline and design the Negotiated Approach, however the more my research matured, they seemed to drift away from the conclusions I was reaching. However it is possible that they still back up the Negotiated Approach. It just did not directly answer my research questions in the structure and focus of this research.

Process management outlines the basic fundamentals of a good process design. Since the process within the Negotiated Approach is very important, these process management fundamentals help to outline the approach in a way that adequately emphasizes the importance and success of negotiation.

Process management

![Process Design Diagram]

Figure 16: Process Design

These four process design parameters can be translated to design the negotiated approach process. Table 1 displays the detailed categories from the process design
literature that are appropriate for the negotiated approach. This table also examines to see if each case study follows these design parameters.

### Table 6: Process Design Evaluation of Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Management</th>
<th>Bhima</th>
<th>Sesam</th>
<th>Tiquipaya</th>
<th>Ocona</th>
<th>Khulna-Jassore</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>NaN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate leadership</td>
<td>yes (AEDES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All relevant parties should be involved in the decision-making process</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional efforts to get women &amp; families below the poverty line</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both the process and its management should be transparent</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of core values</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate levels of external aid to compensate local users for conservation activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated sanctions for appropriators who do not respect community rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules are simple and easy to understand</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap between user group residential location and resource location</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in allocation of benefits from common resources</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of user group adhering to resource management rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting adaptation to changing external environment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic or government controls of decision and controls</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process should create prospects of gain as well as incentives for cooperative behavior: time pressure</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate levels of external aid to compensate local users for conservation activities</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Common pool resources applied to case studies

I examined each case study to find if the critical enabling conditions from common pool resources were present. This was challenging and in the end proved not to add anything to my research. The main use of common pool resources is that it backs up the idea that local resource management is sustainable. The lessons I learned from this process was that it is hard to decipher what was present from documents alone on the case studies. In addition it is not reasonable to try to rate on so many criteria.

Provided below is the summary table, as you can see there are blanks and question marks.

### Table 7: Common pool resources applied to case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource System Characteristics</th>
<th>Bhima</th>
<th>Sesam</th>
<th>Tiquipaya</th>
<th>Ocona</th>
<th>Khulna-Jassore</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>NaN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation boundaries</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low levels of mobility</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of benefits from the resource</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proliferation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental involvement</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource size</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of users</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-defined boundaries</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of dependence by group members on resource system</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap between user group residential location and resource location</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of group members adhering to resource management rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness in allocation of benefits from common resources</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of user group adhering to resource management rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements (applied to the NA case study, not the past management of resources)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules are simple and easy to understand</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of group members adhering to resource management rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base in enforcement of rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate sanctions for appropriators who do not respect community rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of the case adaptation (changing evidence and determining rights and obligations fair)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of resources and other effects in process</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting adaptation to changing external environment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather restrictions on transport: level of registration of resources</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of resolution to adaptation to registration of resources</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External environment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study adaptation to external factors related to the commons</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of user group adhering to resource management rules</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather restrictions on transport: level of registration of resources</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather restrictions on transport: level of registration of resources</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10.3. The Matrix in detail

The description of the matrix in the body text is quite brief. In order to compliment it here is the full description from (Anderson and Olson 2003).

“As RPP looked at the many peace programs in operation, it became clear that in spite of the great variety of activities, all of them can be mapped in a simple matrix, illustrated in Diagram 1, below.

DIAGRAM 1

The horizontal axis indicates that peace practice takes essentially two approaches to engaging people for peace:

More People
Believing that peace can only be achieved when many people are involved, this approach sets out to engage more people in peace activism, in talking to the other side, in protesting violence, in gaining new understanding, etc. The theory behind this approach is that the achievement of peace depends on involvement of “the people.” “More people” strategies are context-specific. In some situations, getting more people involved may mean getting only a few individuals to take a first step because, in that setting, no one has yet taken such a risk. In other circumstances, getting more people involved may mean organizing massive demonstrations or public campaigns involving literally thousands of people. In addition, the issues around which more people should become involved will vary from place to place and time to time. But, the essential strategy is focused on increasing the numbers of people who support the processes for stopping violence or building justice.

Key People
Believing that peace cannot be achieved without the direct involvement of certain people deemed important to the peace process, this approach sets out to engage these “key” individuals in dialogue, in programs designed to increase understanding, in changing laws, in negotiating a cease-fire, etc. People are deemed “key” for a variety of reasons that, as above, depend on the given context. They may represent important entry points for work (as, for example, when a program targets children because all sides of a conflict can agree on benefits for children when they agree on nothing else). They may have leverage beyond themselves and, thus, be key in terms of affecting people on a broader scale (as when a program targets media, or religious leaders, or school teachers because they can influence people by their own access or prestige). Or, they may be key because
they are in some sense necessary to a peace agreement (as when programs target warlords or particular political actors without whom peace accords cannot be made or sustained).

Sometimes, a person or group may be key for more than one reason. For example, the media can be an entry point (because they are open to new information) and a leverage point (because of their ability to influence public opinion). Politicians may be key both because they have leverage on public opinion and because they are necessary to any peace agreement.

Some peace practice agencies have programs that take both the more people and the key people approaches; many concentrate on one or the other.

The Diagram’s vertical axis shows that peace practice also works at two basic levels.

**The Individual/Personal Level**
Believing that a central aspect of peace-building is changing the thinking of individuals, some agencies concentrate on activities that are intended to bring changes in the attitudes, values, or perceptions of individuals.

**The Socio/Political Level**
Believing that systemic, institutional, societal level change is necessary for peace, some agencies focus their programs in the public realm. These agencies believe that sustainable peace cannot be achieved until political and societal institutions support it. Such programs focus on supporting changes in politics, economics, justice systems, and other institutions.

One can work on “more people” at either the Individual/Personal or at the Socio/Political levels, and one can work with “key people” at either or both levels. A number of different types of activities fit within each quadrant.

To illustrate, a program that brings children to an inter-ethnic camp every summer and a program that revises the grade-school curriculum in the government schools both work to engage more children in peace-building. The former, however, focuses at the level of individual attitude-change (Individual/Personal) while the latter addresses the institutions of education (Socio/Political) of a national government.

Similarly, a program that focuses on training youth for employment who otherwise would likely join fighting groups as well as a program that engages political leaders in negotiations both work with “key” individuals. While the first focuses at the Individual/Personal level, the second focuses on the Socio/Political level by pursuing a political outcome.
10.4. Resources, Portals and websites

Throughout my research I ran into some websites with lists of information, methods and toolboxes. Provided here are some that are relevant for the topics surrounding the Negotiated Approach.

(1) [http://portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme](http://portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme)

A website which lists theories, methodologies, approaches and tools for participatory planning monitoring & evaluation.

(2) [http://www.qwptoolbox.org/](http://www.qwptoolbox.org/)


(3) [http://www.fao.org/Participation/ft_find.jsp](http://www.fao.org/Participation/ft_find.jsp)

A place to search for tools and methods based on keywords. For example this search window is in response to a search for Negotiation tools.
Found 11 methods, approaches and tools

You selected:
Containing "NEGOTIATION"

[T] Agreements: This tool examines how to assist stakeholders in drafting a final agreement.

[T] Consultations to formulate common action: How to carry out a consultation process following a 4 step approach.

[T] Exit strategy: After an agreement has been signed, mediators need to develop ways of handing over the responsibility for monitoring the agreement to the stakeholders or a trusted local monitor.

[T] Handling mandates in meetings: Dealing with meeting facilitation in which different parties hold mandates for decision-making from their home organisation “constituencies”.

[M] Learning alliance (LA): The learning alliance (LA) approach is relatively new in the development sector but is recognised as having great potential for helping people and organisations to break through barriers to learning about innovations and to help innovations to spread more widely.

[T] Maps and Mapping: This tool uses purchased maps, maps produced by the group and/or aerial photographs to assist with community land use planning and monitoring changes in land use.

[T] Negotiation: Negotiator is a newly developed simulation which is used as a tool to strengthen capacities of high level policy makers in negotiation.

(4) http://www.unesco.org/water/water_events/
This is a portal for water events worldwide.

This is a development resource management portal from USAID under water resources technical area.