

Workshop Report:

Collaboration for Research on Democracy (CORD)

University of Toronto Scarborough

May 21st – 23rd, 2012

Funded by the IDRC

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
CORD Background	4
Workshop Objectives	5
Participants	6
Agenda & Highlights	7
Workshop Outputs	7
CORD's Research Program:.....	7
Group 1: Extra-Institutionality and the Dynamics of Citizenship	8
Group 2: Marginality, Citizenship and Public Policies	9
Group 3: Mapping Knowledge and Democracy in the Global South	10
CORD's Action Matrix.....	14
Detailed Summary of Activities	14
Day 1: Monday May 21st, 2012	14
Day 2: Tuesday May 22nd, 2012	25
Day 3: Wednesday May 23rd, 2012	32
Public Symposium	38
Conclusions and Final Comments	38
APPENDIX.....	39
A: Workshop Agenda	39
B: Preliminary Mind Mapping of Research Concepts	Error! Bookmark not defined.
C: Workshop Evaluation	42

Executive Summary

A planning workshop was held in Toronto, Canada, at the University of Toronto Scarborough, to launch a new southern-led research and knowledge network, the Collaboration for Research on Democracy (CORD), a partnership of over thirty researchers and practitioners working in universities, think tanks, research institutes and NGOs predominantly in the Global South. CORD aims to provide a unique platform for researchers, practitioners and policy-makers to build a policy-relevant research agenda on the new challenges of building pro-poor development. Many of CORD's affiliates were part of a ten-year, DFID-funded research partnership, the Centre for Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (www.citizenship-drc.org), and have deep experience in policy, research, advocacy, and rich methodological knowledge on policy-relevant comparative research.

CORD focuses on the intersections between research and policy-making. It aims to achieve (1) the generation of new knowledge across contexts, (2) the dissemination of new knowledge widely to decision-makers and practitioners, (3) a deepened capacity of Southern partners to carry out high quality research, communication and policy engagement, and (4) the fostering of dynamic engagement between researchers, practitioners and policy-makers.

To pursue the goal of launching the network, **the first CORD workshop aimed to:**

- Explore the opportunities for and approaches to achieving a new south-south knowledge network and partnership on governance and citizen engagement
- Explore and define the research program of the proposed network
- Share current research
- Share network-building strategies using online platforms and offline tools
- Understand and develop strategies for long-term sustainable local funding mechanisms

The workshop was co-convened by partners from the Brazilian Centre for Analysis and Planning, the BRAC Development Institute at BRAC University and the International Development Studies Program at the University of Toronto Scarborough. It was hosted by the UTSC IDS program and funded by IDRC. Overall, the workshop was structured to be participatory and collaborative. The first day focused on lessons learnt from past global research partnerships and what partners identified as key areas and themes for collaboration. The second day focused on understanding the wider challenges of development research, deepening research themes, defining ways of working together and identifying funding strategies. The last day focused on clarifying next steps and timelines for our joint activities.

Highlights of the workshop included a seminar by invited guest, Peter Taylor from the IDRC, on current trends in the field of International Development; a visit from two representatives from Taking IT Global to commence an ongoing partnership to create an online collaborative research network; as well as the creation of a collective grant in order to secure funding for CORD's future activities and meetings.

Most importantly, after three days of debates and sharing of ideas, CORD members agreed on the following three areas upon which to ground their research:

1. Extra-Institutionality and the Dynamics of Citizenship
2. Marginality, Citizenship and Public Policies
3. Mapping Knowledge and Democracy in the Global South

The workshop concluded with the creation of a one-year Action Matrix to loosely guide CORD's activities for the next year, as well as the hosting of a Public Symposium during which CORD members had the opportunity to share their work with interested students, academics, community members, etc.

CORD Background

With the recent events in the Middle East, North Africa, and others, the idea that citizen engagement and action can contribute to improved governance and pro-poor development outcomes has become an accepted part of the policy discourse. Pro-poor social change as a result of citizens' struggles against durable inequalities and the exploration of new democracy-building strategies are increasingly evident in both transitional and already democratized countries. Yet there is still a great need to better understand how these citizen-centric strategies work and how we actually assess the wider democratic impact and developmental outcomes of citizen-initiated social mobilization.

The Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (CDRC) was a previous research collaboration that aspired to attain a deep understanding of the complexities associated with citizen engagement in civil society and political processes. This was done, predominantly, through an examination and comparison of 150 case studies collected by 60 researchers from all over the world. While evidence suggests that *most* examples of citizen engagement appear to bring about positive change, indeed the processes are deeply complex and, in some circumstances, may lead to disempowerment or other negative effects for citizens.

Nonetheless, to complement the research, the CDRC initiative focused on building relationships between Northern and Southern institutes, as well as linking South-south institutions in a way that would further facilitate comparative research and learning processes. Upon completion of the CDRC after ten years, researchers agreed that future

studies need to focus on the quality and direction of the differences that citizen participation can make, and how positive change can be attained. Often this type of research is best conducted in larger, multi-country research networks, which bring together researchers and practitioners from different contexts. These types of multi-context collaborations can go beyond merely sharing best practices to developing a deeper and more complex understanding of the conditions under which successful pro-poor democratic mobilizations and social arrangements work across different contexts.

Recently, despite the end of the CDRC, many of its affiliated researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers expressed an interest in continuing their collaboration through a new South-South network – the Collaboration for Research on Democracy (CORD) which aims to provide the framework for a new Southern-led network. Indeed, CORD aims to provide a unique platform for researchers, practitioners and policy-makers to build a policy-relevant research agenda on the new challenges associated with the development landscape of democratisation. Many of CORD's collaborators and participants have deep experience in working in different arenas - policy, research and advocacy – and have also accumulated deep methodological knowledge on policy-relevant comparative research.

With these things taken into account, some colleagues of the CDRC have been working since (MONTH) 2011 to bring the new Collaboration for Research on Democracy (CORD) into a reality. The first major CORD activity took place in February 2012 and consisted of a 4-day online conference on the topic of “Defining the Global South.”

The workshop held in May 2012 at UTSC, then, was the first opportunity for CORD members to meet face-to-face to discuss their research goals and objectives, and create an action plan moving forward.

Workshop Objectives

The primary objective of the first CORD workshop was to essentially establish the groundwork for the new collaboration. More directly, the workshop aimed to:

- Critically review existing empirical research literature on the relation between citizen action, pro-poor public policies and developmental outcomes
- Create a framework for the development of a new, timely and relevant research agenda on issues of citizen engagement and developmental outcomes
- Devise a funding proposal for the larger research network
- Discuss the development of a virtual platform to support the ongoing research collaboration, the dissemination of research outputs, and network building.

Participants

In order to achieve Southern-driven research collaboration, CORD members consist of a diverse array of global researchers and practitioners, coming from different locations and with different skills, research backgrounds and ways of working. At the Toronto workshop, a total of 23 participants were able to attend, representing countries including India, Bangladesh, South Africa, Brazil, Egypt, the UK, Australia and Canada. The full list of participants is below:

1. Leslie Chan (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
2. Vera Schattan Coelho (Brazilian Centre for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP), Brazil)
3. Michael Furdyck (Taking IT Global, Canada)
4. John Gaventa (Coady International Institute, St. Xavier Francis University, Canada)
5. Rebecca Hillyer (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
6. Ryan Isakson (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
7. Paul Kingston (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
8. Simeen Mahmud (BRAC Development Institute, BRAC University, Bangladesh)
9. Hani Morsi (Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK)
10. Gary Plum (OISE, University of Toronto, Canada) - tbc
11. Laurence Piper (University of the Western Cape, South Africa)
12. Roberta Rice (Political Science Department, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
13. Shylashri Shankar (Centre for Policy Research, India)
14. Alex Shankland (Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK)
15. Peter Taylor, Program Leader, Think Tank initiative, IDRC
16. Bettina von Lieres (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
17. Joanna Wheeler (Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK)
18. Laura Waisbich (Brazilian Centre for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP), Brazil)
19. Matt Leighninger (Deliberative Democracy Consortium)
20. Briana Lees (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
21. Kieran Way (International Development Studies Program, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada)
22. Claire Benit-Gbaffou (The University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa)
23. Ellen Field (James Cook University, Australia)

Agenda & Highlights

The workshop took place over a period of 3 days, from May 21st to 23rd 2012. The first two and a half days were spent discussing potential research clusters, methods for collaboration, and the formation of an Action Matrix and grant proposal. The final afternoon consisted of a Public Symposium held at UTSC in order to promote the work of CORD amongst interested students, academics, etc.¹

Highlights of the workshop included a guest-speaker presentation by Peter Taylor from the IDRC on the topic of “The Current Challenges for Development Research” and what should be expected in terms of available funding sources and priority funding areas. Another important highlight of the workshop was a collaborative discussion headed by Michael Furdyk from Taking IT Global. This discussion centred on creating a list of ideas for a collaborative, online platform that would aid CORD researchers to work together despite geographical distance, as well as creating a centralized location from which to disseminate research papers to the general public.

Workshop Outputs

The outputs from the workshop included a detailed draft of CORD’s Research Areas of Focus, the necessary framework for the creation of a grant to fund CORD’s ongoing activities, and a One-Year Action Matrix that summarizes the upcoming tasks and activities of the network. Included in this section are CORD’s Research Program and the Action Matrix:

CORD’s Research Program:

Over three days of participatory and collaborative discussion, CORD partners developed the following three priority research clusters under the wider theme of “**Creating Citizenship: the everyday struggles for access and quality**”. Starting off from an acknowledgement of the differential nature of citizenship and rights in the global south, the three clusters all aim to research different forms of exclusions, and the ways in which citizens mobilize to overcome marginality.

¹ For a full version of the workshop agenda, see Appendix A.

Group 1: Extra-Institutionality and the Dynamics of Citizenship

The last few years have seen an increasing recognition that the future of humankind is to be found in cities, and that the dramatic growth of mega-cities, especially in the south, is accompanied by the rise of large populations of the urban poor (Davis 2004). But political decision-making over these spaces and populations is increasingly framed in terms of 'informal governance', based on the recognition that informal institutions and practices play a critical role in poor people's everyday lives (Bayat 1997, Benjamin 2004, Chatterjee 2004). This 'informal turn' criticizes not only northern ideas of 'good governance' on the ground they are relying heavily on the depoliticized or romanticized notion of 'civil society' (Mamdani 1996, Williams 2004, Benit-Gbaffou 2011); but also deconstructs dominant conceptions of what precisely 'the state' is – especially where governance happens in complex partnerships between government, private sectors and non-governmental organisations.

CORD partners will collaborate to research the various kinds of mediation from democratic forms of advocacy and facilitation through to forms currently covered by terms like patronage, clientelism and local elite capture. Together they will seek to explore two apparently diverse phenomena that, while not new to the world of politics, appear to have taken on greater salience in recent times. These are what we provisionally term 'unruly politics' – understood as a public rebellion against the rule; and 'mediation' – understood as (often undemocratic) forms of representation of the poor and marginalised by unelected intermediaries. Our hypothesis is that these forms of politics emerge in contexts where formal democratic representation is weak or non-existent, and speak to an underlying lack of legitimacy for mainstream forms of governance, thus creating a space to be filled by alternative and informal forms of politics. CORD partners will develop a framing and language to understand more accurately the various kinds of informal brokering that occur between 'the poor' in pursuing urban public goods, and different parts of the state. In addition to enabling a better understanding of the way in which formal democratic institutions can be hollowed out by informal political practices, a more thorough-going mapping will allow for an appropriately variegated policy response that is more likely to produce democratic outcomes, including new forms of democratic institution like participatory budgeting (see Baiocchi, Heller & Sliva 2011).

Sub-questions and themes:

- 1) Mediation and unruly politics reshaping political authority
 - What makes the outcome from mediation binding?
 - How are the political, spatial, economic, and cultural boundaries redrawn and what is their impact on citizenship rights?
- 2) Types of mediators and practices of mediation that are emerging between formal (state/public authority) and informal spaces in urban/rural settings
 - What is the politics of visualization/recognition.
 - Is the recognition of extra-institutions for redistribution legitimate?

- What are the ambiguities in the role of the broker/mediator?
 - What questions does it raise in terms of legitimacy and representation?
- 3) Forms of unruly politics that exist or have emerged and how they impact regimes and the shaping of new forms of government and democratic politics
- Under what conditions do some sort of mediation coexist with unruly politics?
 - What is new about unruly politics and in what contexts does it emerge?
 - What is the impact on democratic practice and on democratic outcomes?
- 4) Agency, mobilization, activism in achieving substantive citizenship
- Are disruptive tactics more likely to bring about pro-poor policy change than more moderate tactics?
 - How can new spaces for agency be created, consolidated, and expanded in resiliently restricted environments?
 - How do you talk about agency in relation to political regimes that are path dependent?
 - What is the causal importance of digital social media in promoting and sustaining mobilization in fragmented social environments?
 - Can we channel this into something productive?

Group 2: Marginality, Citizenship and Public Policies

Achieving universal citizenship - capable of providing social inclusion and access to rights - has been an unfulfilled promise in many Southern countries. In those contexts, durable inequalities are still key drivers in producing different forms of exclusion and marginality, and thus, in redefining public policies, priorities and shaping contemporary forms of citizenship.

There has been a great deal of research conducted on understanding the social implications associated with being part of a marginalized group. However, less time has been spent understanding why it is important to comprehend the effects that marginalized groups may have on political processes.

This group is interested in looking at the gap in the access of universal rights by the marginalized, focusing on the effect of context and strategies used to narrow this gap. The main research questions CORD researchers in this group will ask are:

- a) When does marginality matter, politically?
- b) When and how does marginality shape public policies?
- c) What are the strategies marginal groups employ in order to achieve pro-poor social change?

In particular, some members of this research group are interested in exploring topics associated with marginality, citizenship and public policies in the health sector.

Some of the sub-questions and themes that this group hopes to explore are detailed below.

Sub-questions and themes:

- 1) What kind of political environments facilitate the emergence of marginalized communities?
- 2) What are the various strategies that marginal communities adopt to engage with and instrumentalize networks of power?
- 3) How do the interactions between the global discourse, state, and the marginalized reconfigure norms of universality? What are the implications for public policy?
- 4) How is marginality produced and transformed/overcome in particular contexts (cities, peripheries, rural areas, etc.) and what is the impact on democratic engagement and on citizenship rights?
- 5) Paired comparisons:
 - For instance, use two old cities/two marginal areas or a marginal area and old city or two mega cities and discuss the creation/evolution/tactics of transformation etc. of marginality in those contexts.
 - Do similar contexts produce different outcomes of democratic citizenship or do different contexts produce similar outcomes?

Group 3: Mapping Knowledge and Democracy in the Global South

The Knowledge and Democracy group will address two questions: (a) What forms of knowledge are necessary for and created through democratic activism? How do these knowledge-creation processes differ in varying local contexts?; (b) What are the pathways for how this knowledge is learned, shared and communicated? How do these pathways challenge conventional explanations on the flows of knowledge about democracy?

The group will follow an iterative process that encompasses the mapping of current practices of democracy, including how individuals (citizens and activists) gain awareness or consciousness about their rights; examine how digital social networks are changing the dynamics of citizen-state relations and driving activism and rights claiming; and use a democratic /participatory methodology to address both of the above, including a user-interactive digital platform and creative visual methods such as digital storytelling; and conduct a literature review. The objectives of this group are to:

- Map more fully the actors involved in knowledge production on democracy
- Use a democratic/participatory methodology to guide questions and responses (user-interactive platform, story mapping, etc.) and to allow activists to reflect on praxis and to network with each other regarding ethical considerations

Sub-questions and themes:

- 1) Whose knowledge is being used and shared and how can a process of democratizing knowledge be enabled?
 - democratizing knowledge is often prevented by lack of translation
 - issues of access to knowledge (walled gardens of traditional publishing business models vs. emerging discourses on open access to academic journals)
- 2) If part of CORD's mission is to be a southern-led platform, what does "southern-led" exactly mean?
- 3) How do southern researchers access their knowledge to build knowledge about democracy and how do they diffuse that knowledge?
 - Can we map this out?
 - explore how knowledge is being diffused in south-south and north-south channels
- 4) Is there a pattern about knowledge networks and digital networks?

Time-frame	Existing Work	CORD Network Activities	Collaborative Projects (small groups)
June - 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "political society" research with Claire in RSA land maybe India (Laurence) - FAPESP financed project on sub contracting for health services in the state of Sao Paulo (Laura) - French Research Network: INVERSES (informal politics) workshop in Paris (Claire) - "Agency and governance" in RSA with Joanna (Laurence) - "informal economy mapping of poor areas in RSA" with SLF (Laurence) - Bellagio conference on indigenous people in health systems (Alex) - finalize introduction and a chapter on co-edited book on spatial justice and urban governance "Discourses of Justice and Mobilization" (claiming favors/claiming rights) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary of Materials report (mid-June) - concept note by steering committee (mid-June) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mediation notes to Shylasheri by June 15th (Laurence) - develop wiki of mediation questions (Alex) - by June 15: Alex catalyze unruly politics sub-projects (Alex)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - formalize research proposal, "Political society, agency, and social change": South Africa-India (with Laurence Piper) (mid-June) (Claire) 		
July 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - matching funds workshop on unruly politics/knowledge (Shylashri) - unruly politics applications (Shylashri) - ISTR panel on mediation (Laurence, Bettina, Joanna) - youth, climate change projects, social network ethnography interviews (until December) (Ellen) - Politics of Constitution: Writing and Religion (Bellagio workshop and ZIF grant) (Shylashri) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - website and a logo for CORD (mid-July) - funding proposal preparations (SSHRCC) (until April) (Paul) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concept note from the mediation small group (mid-July) (Laurence) - concept note preparation by the marginality and access group
August 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secularization: Beyond the West (edited notes) (Shylashri) - ISA presentation on collaborative visual methods (Joanna) - Alex in Maputo to prepare food riots project (Alex) - networked ethnography paper presentation CORD at Association for Qualitative Research Darwin, Australia (August 25th-27th) (Ellen) - research trip to Lebanon for 2 weeks (on disability issues- relating to my CORD research contributions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - draft a purpose-focused concept note for the collaborative technology platform (Hani) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - get in touch with local organizations that we potentially want to involve in CORD
Sept. 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shared projects: IDS-CEBRAP (Vera, Laura, Alex) "Emerging Powers Initiative" preliminary results 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fieldwork on technology and activism in Egypt (Hani) - paper in conference on politics in divided societies with university (Joanna)- on local leadership (early September) (Claire) - developing participatory visual methods within Cape Town/Johannesburg? (Claire, Joanna, Laurence) - French Research Network inverses (informal politics) workshop in Italy (end of September) (Claire) - IDS food riots project concept notes (Alex) 		
Oct. 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - project in Bosnia using digital story telling/participatory video to understand citizenship (Joanna) - rippl: platform development for school to school cultural exchange focused around donations (global in scope) (Ellen) - IDS food riots inception workshop (Alex) 		
Nov – Dec. 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ethnography of old cities and encounters with globalization. Links to CORD themes: extra-institutionality, marginality, unruly politics, and activism and mobilization (Shylashri) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CORD face-to-face workshop in India 	
Mar. 2013		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - possibility of CORD meeting in Cape Town around BRIC Summit (Laurence) 	

- How do they form?
- How inclusive are they?
- Who participates in the networks?
- this could help us understand policy formation better

- 5) What are the tools for thought and practice that help promote consciousness of democracy and citizenship in a given context?
- What are democratic forms of knowledge?
 - What is the pedagogy for how knowledge for democracy is learned and shared?
 - What types of networks will promote a pedagogy of democratic knowledge?
 - What research methods are appropriate to understand these questions?
 - Which tools (technologies, approaches, methods) would CORD adopt?

CORD's Action Matrix

The matrix below details the existing and anticipated work of CORD members throughout the next ten months.

Detailed Summary of Activities

This section will provide a detailed overview of the entire workshop – including summaries of presentations by participants and guest-speakers, as well as documentation of discussions and debates that transpired throughout the workshop process.

Day 1: Monday May 21st, 2012

Welcome and Introduction

Bettina von Lieres, UTSC

Bettina introduced the objectives and intentions of CORD. The vision for CORD is a new knowledge network constructed of various research projects working within clusters. Researchers will be collaborating not only on research topics but on research practices as well.

Bettina von Lieres welcomes participants

Leslie Chan, UTSC

Leslie reviewed the history of the Scarborough Campus at University of Toronto (UTSC), noting its strong history of IT within the classroom. Seeing the digital path of today combined with the continuing funding cutbacks in the development field, which discourage face-to-face meetings, the UTSC setting seems appropriate for the first CORD workshop to take place.

Paul Kingston, UTSC

Paul provided a brief history of the twenty-five year old International Development Studies (IDS) program at UTSC. This program is in the process of being transformed into a centre. It is this program and future centre that this initial CORD workshop is attached to.

Bettina von Lieres, UTSC

To conclude the welcome and introduction, Bettina provided an overview of the workshop's agenda, providing participants with a comprehensive view of the presentations to be given and activities to be completed.

Background to CORD and aims of the Workshop

Vera, CEBRAP

Vera discussed the background of CORD to date. The idea for what is now CORD stems from a closing synthesis workshop for the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (Citizenship DRC) in Rio de Janeiro. To prepare for this initial CORD workshop, two e-conferences were held and a grant from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was secured.

CORD's work is based on fundamental agreements concerning democracy and citizenship. A democracy is considered to be a government holding majority rule, constitutional powers, and being respectful of citizenship; citizenship in regards to a government being respectful of citizen's rights and well-being.

The fundamental objective of CORD is to be "a Southern-led platform committed to producing knowledge on the processes and dynamics of pro-poor social change". Recognizing that participants have their preferences in focus areas, this knowledge platform will be focusing on contentious and collaborative politics as well as policy formation, implementation, and monitoring. In order to maintain focus on the big picture, pro-poor social change, CORD has the task of developing a common approach for all researchers to contribute to a united effort. This entails refining theoretical questions such as, what is the role of citizen representation, how do we advance our knowledge on participation, social movements, etc., and how do we deepen democracy. This unity combined with a participatory process, entails that these comparative studies on civil society will be better able to contribute to pro-poor social change.

Simeen, BRAC University

Background on the Citizenship DRC was provided by Simeen, highlighting its outputs such as written work and "ways of working" (WOW). Simeen notes the continued need to bridge the distance between the practitioner, policy, and research arena. She notes that improving the electoral process is insufficient and does not deliver meaningful pro-poor social change. The focus should rather be to use research to inform, mobilize, mediate, and bring together citizens from different backgrounds and from diverse contexts to be more effective in affecting change.

Lessons from the Development Centre for Citizenship, Participation, and Accountability: Building a Global Research Network

John Gaventa, Coady International Institute

While a proportion of CORD's participants also participated in the Citizenship DRC, John brought everyone up to date by providing a detailed description of the Citizenship DRC. The Citizenship DRC emerged in 2000 in response to a call from the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). DFID wanted to fund a new type of research – a consortium of people, from north and south, working together on one idea (rather than individuals working alone). Researchers came from different backgrounds with different approaches and had to construct the direction of the network. This meant that the research was conducted in many different venues, which really led to an understanding of diverse landscapes and different contexts.

While a major value of the network was the invisible change, the physical output was an eight-volume book series. This series consolidated four-hundred-and-fifty outputs created through ten years of research, which was conducted within twenty-five countries by sixty researchers who formulated one hundred and fifty case studies about how people claim citizenship.

The nine major research themes of the DRC included:

1. Meanings and Expressions (of citizenship)
2. Rights and Accountability
3. Global Citizen Engagement
4. Science and Citizenship
5. Winning Policy Change (national level advocacy)
6. Social Movements in the South (edited by southern researchers)
7. New Spaces for Change
8. Mobilizing for Democracy
9. Citizenship in Violent Settings

In a meta-synthesis of the one hundred case studies, the Citizenship DRC found that while most of the evidence indicates positive results from citizenship, there are risks of negative outcomes. Overall, citizenship made the most positive difference when there were multiple pathways for citizens to engage politically, especially when these pathways exist simultaneously. The success of these pathways involves linking institutional design, political will, and civil society mobilization. While the Citizenship DRC's first assumption was to look at citizenship, it found that the boundaries dividing states and citizens were blurred. These blurred boundaries also entailed that active citizens build responsive states and responsive states build active citizens.

Once completed, the Citizenship DRC identified some thematic research areas for future exploration. These included: Informal governance and unruly politics; citizenship agency in violent settings; linking engagement, transparency and accountability; and ways of

working, including how to build effective research networks. These thematic research areas should aim to explore how to extend the franchise of who can participate, the scope of issues affected by citizens, and the authenticity of participation. All these efforts are confronting the global challenge of deepening democracy which is magnified by: The closing and tightening of civil society space - often under the name of countering terrorism; the rise of inequality and power in the hands of a few – often in the name of economic recovery; democracy from above and with military might; and popular uprisings in the Middle East and elsewhere. All of these factors epitomize the arduous task of constructing and defining democracy.

Questions for John Gaventa (the presenter):

Becky: How were the Citizenship DRC case studies selected?

John's response: We chose cases that would be interesting to researchers, but also interesting because of the potential for engaging in citizen action. Thus, they were based on research design and creating substantive participation. Case studies were not randomly sampled, but were instead deliberately selected.

Shylashri: How did the findings of Citizenship DRC influence the direction of the research? What is the influence of funding agencies regarding their request for results?

John's response: Each stage of research informed questions for the next stage. Research direction emerged from dialogue and from researchers who were deeply engaged in their given context.

Donors have a propensity to have a narrow focus and judge quality of results from an entirely different perspective. Citizenship DRC cannot take credit for changing policy, but we can show that the discourse surrounding the issues researched has changed. To gauge research usefulness, research studies conducted by Citizenship DRC that were peer reviewed received 10 points by funders, those that were used locally received on average 2 points. We must be cognizant of this when navigating the new funding environment.

Ways of Working (WOW)

Joanna, Institute for Development Studies

Regarding how participants of Citizenship DRC were working together, there was an agreement that as a researcher, you have to make the manner in which research is conducted match what is being researched on the ground. The key question was how to include different voices and different epistemic perspectives. Answering this question in a workshop may be easy, but, when you go back to the field, it becomes more difficult. To answer this question, five points must be considered:

1. What is the network and what are its objectives?

2. What are the criteria for those we invite into the network?
3. What is collaboration?
4. What does it mean for the researchers in the network?
5. What are the links between knowledge and action?

The answers to these questions and the implications of these decisions must be strategically considered in order for this network to work effectively.

Questions for Joanna (the presenter)

Leslie: You raised a very interesting question with regard to the role of the researcher. There is a belief held by more traditional researchers that being an activist can delegitimize the researcher, how do you push back on these sorts of conceptions? Is it possible to be a researcher and a facilitator?

Bettina's response: Citizenship DRC was a cross-contextual network. Different challenges arose in different contexts for researchers. Sometimes there was more space for formal, more traditional research, while, at other times, local realities required more informal forms of research. There was a complex set of realities that needed to be considered and bridged. Local reality had an impact on the role the researcher was playing, whether it was more traditional or more activist.

Laurence's response: This question has only emerged out of past experience, so we can't answer these questions now.

Joanna's response: Researchers may occupy more than one role simultaneously at different points in the research process and all are important. It is more about having an awareness of yourself; if you are acting in a certain way, assuming a certain role, consider how it affects the research process. Be aware of how you approach your research. This relates to several peoples' questions on how these questions emerged; questions evolved over time, Citizenship DRC evolved, from a transnational knowledge and learning network, with new concerns and new questions. While we should keep these questions in mind, we do not need to answer them immediately or at this workshop. For example, iteration only became a priority after reflecting on the early years of the initiative.

Shylashri: Think about the insider or outsider idea with a range of people; not just people who are the traditional outsiders that research networks usually focus on, but also insiders such as people from political parties. That would make this slightly different from typical research networks. How do you become a practitioner and an academic? In one you are always in opposition, in the other you are in a space that is not in opposition. These are themes and questions we can deal with. What were your conclusions with respect to the opening of these spaces?

Leslie's response: You start out with a broad question, and end up with a set of new questions.

Vera: Researchers should act as catalysts of encounters. The researcher needs to bring knowledge to these encounters. What other kinds of things can researchers bring?

John's response: Initial tensions of the Citizenship DRC were that NGO members wanted to make sure the network was useful to them. There was a collaboration of traditional and activist researchers as well as people who weren't researchers. The ability to change roles was really important. The question is how broad can you make it to include all these voices, but still keep it focused. How can you include the stakeholders at the beginning of the process rather than at the end so that findings can be more relevant and useful? You have to ask the questions coming from the people facing the realities you are trying to change. From this, communication and utility questions arise.

Paul: Is there any insight into the tensions between the different approaches and which ones were the easiest to bridge and which were really useful for the network?

Matt's response: It seems like at this point we have all the same partners, audiences, activists; you might also add inside government personnel who might be trying to be champions of participation. We are facing similar questions that the beginning of Citizenship DRC faced. There are additional forms and opportunities to tap into the people as sources of data, adding accountability to things. I suspect that it's more of a question of how to incorporate these new methodologies and approaches.

Bettina's response: Concerning the north-south tension, it started as a north-south network and became a south-south network because of the approach of the northern hosts. It used to be that Northern hosts provided the comparative framework and the southern case studies were used to fill them in. They broke down that strict model. They developed a cross-contextual result. Regarding the theory-practice tension, I (Bettina) myself started off as a more of a traditional researcher and became more interested in the practice. There was a lot of space to have diverse research roles. When working with diverse disciplines, the challenge is finding crosscutting research themes, but this is incredibly productive when completed.

Vera's response: We didn't begin with a big theory but we need to make a conscious effort to see the big picture that comes from the different components.

Round Table: Participant Introductions

Bettina, UTSC, Canada

To introduce participants to each other and begin brainstorming for potential meta-clusters, participants were asked to introduce the institute or organization they come from,

an overview of their current research projects, ideas for cross-cutting themes, and their hopes for collaboration. These points were mapped on a wall using sticky notes.

Claire: South Africa

Her overall research interests are citizens encounters with the state, including formal and informal ways of citizens engaging the state and accessing resources. Specifically party politics and how they intertwine the state and civil society. She also looks at local leadership (formal or informal) and how these leaders build their power base and legitimacy, finding a working methodology. Claire would be interested in CORD mapping the representation of citizens. Local organizations and a university contributing to the Yeovil initiative provide examples of informal attempts to impact municipal politics.

Joanna, IDS Sussex, UK

Her background is in Brazil, Latin America, and South Africa. At the moment she is working in Bosnia and Mozambique. She has four main areas of interest for research. Firstly is political disengagement, the politics of dissent, and looking at what happens when people engage outside of accepted norms. These unruly politics are especially prominent in contexts of violence, where different types of participation do not always fit our standard conceptual frameworks. Second is looking at new technologies with participation and democracy. While these two approaches typically work independently, she wants to see them work together, looking at how technologies shift the nature of participation and voice. Her third area of interest is violence, power, and democracy, investigating how different political actors use violence and how this affects democratic practice at the local level. Lastly, is methodologies for democracy, exploring what is needed for research to become more democratic. In regards to this last interest, she is especially interested in visual storytelling and participatory media.

John, COADY, Canada

John is now at the Coady International Institute for training practitioners (often activists), a program that arose from a movement within eastern Canada for participatory democracy. The institute aims to strengthen citizen leadership for the strengthening of democracy. He has three areas interest for research. First is the question of democratic pedagogy and what are the pedagogies to improve citizenship. This includes looking at what are the skills necessary for citizen engagement and how do people learn them, especially in contexts where power is shifting so quickly. Second, he sees that the economic realm was largely ignored in the Citizenship DRC, but economic inequality is a pressing concern as it hinders social equality and democracy. Acknowledging this, how can economic or market spaces be democratized? How can civic agency be linked with political and economic agency? Lastly, is the question of technology and the role of social media in voice and advocacy, allowing for citizen-led accountability. In the accountability and transparency debate, the emphasis is typically on the supply side, which assumes citizens have the knowledge and capacity to use technology. Putting the led back into citizen-led technology, how can citizens exercise their voice and use the technology to do so?

Becky, UTSC, Canada

Is interested in developing a better understanding of what barriers and opportunity exist for young people that are interested in engaging in politics. This fits with the technology and the social media movement.

Laura, CEBRAP, Brazil

Is working with CEBRAP on policy making in Brazil, especially in the health sector. Currently, they are trying to institutionalize some of their work. She is also editing a journal, but trying to find a balance between research and activism. She is interested in international collaboration and public policy on health, specifically comparative studies considering ethnic groups, mobilization, and conflict.

Simeen, BRAC, Bangladesh

Is currently working with BRAC University and her current research passion is the labour market. The informal economy is undermining the rights of people, especially women, so she is interested in the implications of this. Part of exploring this topic is seeing how associational life as a form of social protection develops at the informal level.

Paul, UTSC, Canada

Has three major research interests. The first is the environment of ethnic and religious sectarianism and fragmentation. He wants to investigate how informal dynamics, such as clientelism, affects participation and citizenship in formal settings. A key question to investigate is how participation can be encouraged to allow citizens to negotiate with clientelism and not be dominated by clientelism. Second is advocacy for and participation within pro-poor social policy-making, especially regarding people with disabilities. The third is participation and violence, focusing on what is going on within the opposition and what networks are emerging within communities.

Hani, IDS Sussex, UK & Egypt

Is from Egypt and his thesis looks at the role of social media in a post-uprising setting. Some research questions he is interested in are:

1. Has technology been instrumental in the popular uprisings
2. How relevant is social media in the long-term creation of democracy, and
3. How resilient is social media?

These research questions arise as social media has been used for grassroots activism but the potential for counter efforts to be taken by the government poses a threat to progress being made. This research is important as the current literature on these topics is often built on speculation. Current perspectives on the role of technology are polarized, from cyber-skepticism to cyber-utopianism. In analyzing the role of technology, we must also avoid reductionism, for example, twitter simplifies issues that are quite complex. We are

faced with the task of disentangling the complexity and trying to find answers for new issues.

Gary, OISE, Canada

His research looks broadly at reconstruction in Haiti, specifically, local projects that are internationally connected and which affect youth. He is interested in how the NGOs that implement these projects are constructed. His three main research topics include

1. Democratic pedagogies, looking at the nuances of the physical space in which citizen voices are to be heard
2. The importance of researcher reflection on his/her selected methodology.
3. Examining what is the “north” and what is the “south” as well as what populations are participating and not participating. Lastly is the undertaking of an institutional ethnography.

Shylashri, India

Sees that the common frames for researchers of citizenship and democracy are coalitions, clashes, engagement with the state, and struggles over rights. The focus of her research is investigating how rights are articulated and framed in formal and informal settings. She is especially interested in how the courts respond to different populations in granting their rights. On the side of the rights holder, she looks at the mechanisms by which the poorest access their rights. She sees that there is the potential for a comparative study, investigating what mechanisms work, allowing citizens to access their rights, and what are the tradeoffs. She is also interested in investigating the process of how rights become constitutionalized.

She is currently writing a travelogue/ethnography, looking at questions of how old cities (for example Hyderabad) have encountered globalization and modernization. Potential research themes she sees for CORD are looking at how people get out of the patronage relationships. Another potential avenue is examining how new technologies shape the outlooks of politicians.

Matt, DDC, Canada

Is from the Deliberative Democracy Consortium (DDC) (the North American partner for Logo Link). The DDC is trying to popularize strategies for popular democracy that originated in the global south. To do this, the DDC has a journal for public deliberation on current issues. They also look for ways to use technology to strengthen democracy. He has created a guide for IBM business and government on how to engage and be engaged by the public. He is interested in creating a guide that allows people to plan for stronger local democracy, where responsive states and active citizens help build each other. So far, he has found that spaces need to be legitimate, deliberative, and meaningful. It is also important that we be critical of local associations as some do more harm than good. A major focus must be put on the sustainability of structures.

Alex, UTSC, Canada

Is currently working at IDS of Sussex and has experience working around Brazil and Portuguese-speaking Africa, as well as parts of Latin America. His research mostly looks at health and how indigenous people frame, engage with, and challenge policy. He also looks at social protection and climate change. He would be interested in CORD researching representation, especially regarding indigenous peoples. He is also interested in unruly and informal politics that make the system work and shape the power relations of democracy. Additionally, in regards to the nature of the geographies of aid, he asks, within the rising powers of development, where is democracy; what have we lost in democracy with neoliberalism; and can we incorporate the things we care about in democracy back into development?

Vera, CEBRAP, Brazil

Works for a human research centre. trying to bridge different approaches to research. Within this centre, she is part of a citizenship and development group comparable to CDRC. There is currently a hot debate about the role of the state, civil society, and the market in defining, implementing, and monitoring social policy. Her research looks at how this combination works to deliver public health in Brazilian municipalities. She would be interested in CORD looking at different approaches and comparing them. She also sees investigating how IT can help in the research process and the diffusion of research outputs to be beneficial for CORD.

Leslie, UTSC, Canada

His research interest is knowledge access and its role in democratization. A project he is working on in relation to this interest is Bioline; this project helps Southern researchers to get their research out to the world. This effort is to counter the assumption made by institutions that because journals are from the global south, they are not as valuable. For this project to succeed, structural change is more important than technical work. CORD should make its information accessible in order to challenge the current structures. An area of research for CORD could be investigating is how to we make a space where researchers, participants, and the community can be part of the knowledge production process. In addition to research, we also need to lobby and mobilize to improve open access policy. One last issue Leslie wishes CORD to consider is that as the network increases in value with more people, the cost of exclusion increases.

Roberta, UTSC, Canada

Her current research interest is indigenous participation in Latin America, looking at how they make change while remaining autonomous. She is currently doing comparative work between Latin American and Canadian indigenous politics and representation. A cross-cutting theme she would be interested in is indigenous representation.

Ryan, UTSC, Canada

Is an economist by training, and currently focuses on food provision, land reform, peasant livelihood, food security, and sovereignty. His specific interest is the formation and formalization of alternative economies, for example, the food sovereignty movement which is trying to give food producers greater influence in what gets produced. He sees that CORD could get involved in harnessing finance for developing economic systems that reflect our social values. To do this, we should investigate how we can look at this wide-spread occupy movement and implement change. There are lessons to be learnt from alternative currencies and barter economies driven by people in desperate situations.

Lawrence, UWC, South Africa

His research focuses on unruly politics. Seeing that some people are forced to live outside of formal institutions, what do they do to fulfill their needs? He utilizes participatory-action research and promotes the use of more methodologies and generating different kinds of knowledge. In addition, he values simultaneous advocacy efforts to complement research.

Bettina, UTSC, Canada

Recognizing the prominence of informal and extra-institutional spaces, she examines mediation that occurs between citizens and the state. To do this, she looks at organizations of the poor and the state at the local level.

Developing Cross-Cutting Research Themes in Working Groups**Alex, Institute for Development Studies**

Recognizing that CORD is intended to be “a southern-led platform committed to producing knowledge on the processes and dynamics of pro-poor social change”, participants were given the task of brainstorming what research themes CORD should focus on and how CORD should operate. In four smaller groups, participants attempted to consolidate the wall of sticky notes created during participant introductions, establishing two to four research themes that would include everyone’s research interests. These smaller groups then presented their ideas to the entire group. Participants were also asked to establish how CORD should operate by agreeing on some shared operating principles and practical ideas for enabling collaboration.

Meta-Clustering: Presentations (Round 1)**Group One**

Came up with three meta-clusters including informality, marginality, and space and citizenship. Regarding informality and the clientelism associated with informality, this group proposes to look at how extra-institutional the lives of the urban poor and marginalized are.

Group Two:

The first meta-cluster proposed by this group was social networks, looking at how technology promotes empowerment and/or exacerbates social exclusion. The second meta-cluster was unruly and informal politics, examining how effective these types of politics are at meeting the goals of citizens, as well as the wider implications of unruly and informal politics on democracy. The third cluster, being politics of the informal economy, looks at how informality affects citizen's access to their rights. The fourth and final cluster of this group is pedagogy and democracy, looking at the politics of knowledge production.

Group Three

This group focused on how CORD research should be conducted, suggesting that CORD push theoretical boundaries through grounded empirical research on contemporary dynamics of citizenship. Dynamics such as representation, mediation, unruly politics, social rights, and cognitive justice should be included. They also propose CORD studies the policy process in a broadened comparative perspective. For example, comparing systematically citizens or civil society involvement in policy formation, implementation, and monitoring.

Group Four

The first meta-cluster was technology, activism, and democracy, looking at the political economy of access as well as the impact of technology on users. The second was dynamics of informality, examining representation, space for participation in urban settings, and the effects on livelihoods. The third was the relationship between participatory economics and participatory politics, looking at how physical capital, financial, natural capital, can be linked to more participatory politics.

Mind-mapping CORD's meta-clusters**Alex, Institute for Development Studies**

The main themes of all four groups meta-clustering groups were drawn out and put into a mind map. Mediated by Alex, participants deliberated on the synthesis of the mind map, establishing temporary meta-clusters and their sub-categories.

Day 2: Tuesday May 22nd, 2012**Meta Clustering (continued)****Shylashri**

To organize the mind map from the day before, Shylashri suggested six meta-clusters and sub-categories for each meta-cluster. The six meta-clusters suggested were:

- Extra-institutionality and Dynamics of Citizenship

- Democratizing the economies to achieve substantive citizenship
- Agency, mobilization, activism in achieving substantive citizenship
- Marginality and Citizenship
- Pro Poor Policy and Citizenship
- Knowledge and democracy

Meta-Clustering: Presentations (Round 2)

In an effort to finalize what CORD would focus on and how it should operate, participants were asked to form groups, with each group discussing one of the meta-clusters created by Shylashri. The “Pro-Poor Policy and Citizenship” was amalgamated with the “Marginality and Citizenship Group”. Groups were instructed to come up with sub-topics of these meta-clusters and create two or three points for each sub-topic.

#1: Extra-institutionality and the dynamics of citizenship

Shylashri

- 1) Mediation and unruly politics reshaping political authority
 - What makes the outcome from mediation binding?
 - How are the political, spatial, economic, and cultural boundaries redrawn and what is their impact on citizenship rights?
- 2) Types of mediators and practices of mediation that are emerging between formal (state/public authority) and informal spaces in urban/rural settings
 - What is the politics of visualization/recognition.
 - Is the recognition of extra-institutions for redistribution legitimate?
 - What are the ambiguities in the role of the broker/mediator?
 - What questions does it raise in terms of legitimacy and representation?
- 3) Forms of unruly politics that exist or have emerged and how they impact regimes and the shaping of new forms of government and democratic politics
 - Under what conditions do some sort of mediation coexist with unruly politics?
 - What is new about unruly politics and in what contexts does it emerge?
 - What is the impact on democratic practice and on democratic outcomes?

#2: Democratizing the economies to achieve substantive citizenship

Lawrence

- 1) popular ways of gaining control over economic activities and its effect on political empowerment
 - “informalization,” changes to rights and resistance
 - local politics and policies of regulation of the informal sector
 - What are the impacts of innovation and violence?
 - forms, strategies, and discoveries of mobilization and informal workers

- recognizing the dark side of informality but learning how people can claim their rights
- 2) ICT and transformation of citizenship (person-to-person platform such as Kiva)

#3: Agency, mobilization, activism in achieving substantive citizenship

Roberta

- 1) Are disruptive tactics more likely to bring about pro-poor policy change than more moderate tactics?
- 2) How can new spaces for agency be created, consolidated, and expanded in resiliently restricted environments?
 - How do you talk about agency in relation to political regimes that are path dependent?
- 3) What is the causal importance of digital social media in promoting and sustaining mobilization in fragmented social environments?
 - Can we channel this into something productive?

#4: Marginality and Citizenship

1. When does marginality matter politically?
2. What kind of political environments facilitate the emergence of marginalized communities?
3. What are the various strategies that marginal communities adopt to engage with and instrumentalize networks of power?
4. How do the interactions between the global discourse, state, and the marginalized reconfigure norms of universality?
 - a. What are the implications for public policy?
5. How is marginality produced and transformed/overcome in particular contexts (cities, peripheries, rural areas etc.) and what is the impact on democratic engagement/citizenship rights?
6. What are the tools for thought and practice that help promote consciousness of democracy and citizenship in a given context?
 - a. What are democratic forms of knowledge?
 - b. What is the pedagogy for how knowledge for democracy is learned and shared?
 - c. What types of networks will promote a pedagogy of democratic knowledge?
 - d. What research methods are appropriate to understand these questions?
 - e. Which tools (technologies, approaches, methods) would CORD adopt?
7. Paired comparisons
 - a. For instance, use two old cities/two marginal areas or a marginal area and old city or two mega cities and discuss the creation/evolution/tactics of transformation etc. of marginality in those contexts.
 - b. Do similar contexts produce different outcomes of democratic citizenship or do different contexts produce similar outcomes?

#5: Knowledge and democracy

Leslie

- 4) Whose knowledge is being used and shared and how can a process of democratizing knowledge be enabled?
 - democratizing knowledge is often prevented by lack of translation
 - issues of access to knowledge (walled gardens of traditional publishing business models vs emerging discourses on open access to academic journals)
- 5) If part of CORD's mission is to be a southern-led platform, what does "southern-led" exactly mean?
- 6) How do southern researchers access their knowledge to build knowledge about democracy and how do they diffuse that knowledge?
 - Can we map this out?
 - explore how knowledge is being diffused in south-south and north-south channels
- 7) Is there a pattern about knowledge networks and digital networks?
 - How do they form?
 - How inclusive are they?
 - Who participates in the networks?
 - this could help us understand policy formation better

Current Challenges for Development Research

Peter Taylor

Peter provided a review of what has been achieved in regards to the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs). Some of the biggest challenges currently facing development include justice, inclusive equity, and sustainability. Problems that continue to affect the daily lives of millions of people are conflict and violence, access to energy and water resources, and sanitation.

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was introduced, noting that many of CORD's objectives are involved IDRC's strategy. The IDRC is meant to support research and collaborative institutions. One focus area of the IDRC is "Governance, Security, and Justice", where they look at citizen engagement in countries where security, justice and abuse of political power are an issue. They also support sustainable and inclusive growth, investigating how the desire to achieve economic growth can be balanced with the achievement of equity and justice. Another research area related to CORD that the IDRC is interested in is researchers' ways of working (WOW). They see that there should be a marriage of WOW with the substantive themes to create important research projects.

The new trend for ways of thinking and acting is through think tanks, which are no longer a solely intellectual initiative as they seek to influence policy-level decisions. Think tanks

assists organizations to reach their goals in order to influence wider systems. One example of their efforts is “matching funds”, which encourages collaboration between organizations funded by think tanks with other institutions not funded by think tanks.

One area currently being investigated by think tanks is how policy actors engage with people who are being affected by the policies. There is a strong interest in the idea of mapping these knowledge processes. Initially it has been found that policy makers most often get information from government documents due to the ease of access. This entails that there is a need to create awareness about the availability of other forms of knowledge. In order to conduct this research within the power relations of the policy making process, it is important to first understand research-policy relationships. The capacity of individual researchers and institutions must also be built, but the challenge for the IDRC is deciding if the focus should be on strengthening individual researchers or institutions.

The current funding environment proposes the challenge of the value put on the “efficiency” of a project. This is ensured by measurable results that allow for accountability. It is difficult to combine the new ways of working and the dimensions that are being imposed by donors. Fortunately, there is room for negotiation in this results based environment, but there must be a powerful narrative and objective.

Questions for presenter:

Shylashri: What sorts of cooperation could you have between institutions already funded and those not funded?

Peter's response: Collaborative research and joint proposals for policy engagement or research could support efforts to understand how organizations can best promote their own research.

Alex: There has been a paradigm shift, as shown by the quote, "the south is split into two and no one wants to be in the north anymore". How is the IDRC positioning itself in the south and how is it engaging with rising powers?

Peter's Response: There is a strong interest in really helping institutions within countries to tap into domestic sources of funding and partnerships instead of looking externally.

Joanna: In Citizenship DRC they had the time to think about what collaboration means. Should you match the content of your research with how you work? Also, the role of researchers is important, but what do you see as the role and nature of networks?

Vera's response: There is very little institutional support for networks. There is actually tension between funding institutions and individual or collective research initiatives.

Bettina: Can you think of examples of innovative networks that bring together researchers and policy makers? What kind of research activists do we want to include?

Leslie's response: A new view, promoted by Carolyn Wagner, is that funds should go to networks (as infrastructures) rather than institutions.

Peter's response: First and foremost to be considered is what is the research issue that is being addressed and what is the best manner by which we can address it. If the network is the most effective body for the objectives, the IDRC will likely fund it. No mechanism, frame, or way of working is privileged.

Joanna: What is your experience of what collaboration means? How do networks work together?

Peter's response: I think it's extremely variable. Across all the program areas, there's a large range. It depends on the approach of the program.

John: Do you have any insight on cutbacks with respect to funding, for example, how has the Canadian context changed? What are the emerging patterns that we as practitioners should be aware of?

Peter's response: IDRC has decided to reduce or close some program areas instead of cutting budgets from all programs. Actually, social and economic programs have received an increase in their budget. Another effect is the cutback of about 80 job positions. A bigger challenge this environment poses is that funders are becoming more stringent as they must be accountable to public. The emerging dialogue within IDRC stresses the importance of strengthening connections with Canadian researchers.

John's response: You can't use any words that reflect anything political and expect to be funded.

Alex: Is there difficulty with regard to receiving funding for research initiatives in countries that may not be considered to be "poor enough", such as India or Brazil?

Peter's response: There is no clear impression as to whether funding is allocated with a regional bias.

John's response: CIDA has a clear short list of their prioritized countries, which are not necessarily the poorest; it's hard to figure out the logic of this list. Where there is strong Canadian interest, such as mining, is clearly a criteria whereas before it might have been a little more discrete.

Bettina: Is there any discussion of local actors that IDRC may be willing to partner with?

Peter's response: The inclination is to look to bilateral sources for support. National governments may become a more important source of funding, but it depends on the context. There are also many wealthy philanthropists setting up foundations, but acquiring funding from them might just be luck. With the institutions we've been working with, we

have been encouraging them to map their environment and see where they can get funding.

Alex: Clarifying how those engagements work, how can we engage funder to funder? Could IDRC continue that conversation? Are there opportunities for synergies between funders? Is that part of the plan?

Peter's response: This will happen in certain contexts, organizing around certain program areas.

Workshop with Taking IT Global: **New technologies and platforms for global collaboration and research**

Michael Furdyk, Taking IT Global

Created in 1999, Taking IT Global was the creation of an online community, using social networking to tackle social issues. Their objective was to inspire, inform, and involve people towards a pathway of action within their community. They have also created a course helping social innovators launch their ideas. Their success can be seen with their “Global Issues” section alone attracting 5.1 million people last year. Being offered in thirteen different languages and partnering with many different organizations such as World Vision, this open access platform is available for CORD to utilize in achieving their objectives.

Michael facilitated a discussion with participants, requesting everyone to suggest what they want to see in CORD’s collaboration with Taking IT Global. Suggestions for the future platform include:

1. *Perform as a Research tool:*
 - map research data (possibly for comparison)
 - a safe place to store primary research data
 - facilitate virtual site visits
 - include participants in data analysis process
 - consider research collaboration, data analysis, and data collection during creation of platform
 - allow for use of IT in the research process
2. *Perform as a networking tool:*
 - easy online collaboration with other CORD members and the outside world
 - facilitate online face-to-face conferences
 - consider and facilitate the different relationships (researchers and participants, researchers and the network, and researchers and agents of change)
3. *Be user friendly:*

- make resources from different countries and in different languages easy to access
- attracts users to access and utilize research outputs
- easy to update
- make it easy for people to contribute to the platform
- training on use of the platform
- utilizing cell phones with internet
- a real-time feedback loop for updates
- visual data along with text data
- a personal profile

4. *Be constructive:*

- target young people
- provide mentorship opportunities for new researchers
- include a capacity building component
- a living digital library
- utilizing Taking IT Global's existing platform

Day 3: Wednesday May 23rd, 2012

Grant Writing Session

Joanna, Institute of Development Studies

To determine an approach to grant writing, participants were asked to break into their research themed groups and then clarify an idea for a project in need of a grant. Meta-clusters were finalized into extra-institutionality, marginality, and knowledge and democracy. This practice of grant writing included the determination of theoretical boundaries and forms of engagement; who is going to lead the grant writing and the project involved in the grant; and finally where to look for funding. Each of the small groups presented their decided approach to grant writing to the whole group.

Grant writing group work: Presentations

Laurence, Extra-Institutionality

While many people live extra-institutionally, politics and economics does not recognize this. We can only understand the extra-institutionality of people's lives if we explore the political

economy and mediation. In terms of unruly politics and mediation, it is key to look at the consequence of these practices for citizenship and democracy.

Shylashri (with the assistance of others) will apply to the IDRC by July 1, 2012 for funding for an event (similar to this one). Laurence and Bettina will formulate an application regarding mediation by the middle of July 2012. Alex and others will make an application regarding unruly politics.

Paul, Marginality

This group is interested in looking at the gap in the access of universal rights by the marginalized, focusing on the effect of context and strategies used to narrow the gap. There is particular interest in the health sector. There is potential funding from the IDRC for a project like this if it is Southern-led; SSHRCC may also be useful. Paul will take lead on seeking other sources of funding in Canada.

Leslie, Knowledge and Democracy

The rationale for knowledge and democracy projects is that even though there is a lot going on with democracy, we still don't understand how the knowledge is created and disseminated. There is an empirical, theoretical, and discourse gap. The empirical gap is related to the capacity of activists compared to researchers.

Possible organizations to bring on board for this project include:

- Centre for Internet Society
- Access to Knowledge for Development Centre - The American University in Cairo, Egypt
- Access to Knowledge Center - CEBRAP, Sao Paulo, Brazil
- Taking IT Global
- Coady International

Funding targets:

- ✧ IDRC, OSI
- ✧ Microsoft (in the future)
- ✧ Open Government Partnership
- ✧ DFID
- ✧ Brazilian Political Sciences Association (ABCP)

Objectives:

- ✧ map more fully the actors involved in knowledge production on democracy
- ✧ use a democratic/participatory methodology to guide questions and responses (user-interactive platform, story mapping, etc.)
- ✧ allow activists to reflect on praxis and to network with each other regarding ethical considerations

Fundraising Brainstorming

Joanna, IDS Sussex

In search of possible funding opportunities, participants were asked to discuss what funding bodies would be worth pursuing for CORD's network activities. Suggestions for funding include:

- **IDRC**
 - TTI
 - GJS
 - Special Initiative
 - Global Health
 - Taking IT Global
- **Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) for:**
 - Conference grants
 - Partnership grants
 - Seed grants
- **Open Government Partnerships**, especially Brazilian government-related funding
- **ZIF** (Centre for Interdisciplinary Research)
- **OSF** (Open Society Foundations)
- **Centre for International Governance Innovation:**
 - Rohinton Medhora, the past president of IDRC just became the president of this group and would likely be interested in this initiative
- **Canadian-Brazilian partnership** (FAPESP- University of Toronto)
- **Tomorrow Today:**
 - Supports work in International Development Studies
 - They don't have a defined agenda, but fund large-scale collaboration
 - 60,000 pounds
 - It may be too early to look for them
- **National opportunities:**
 - Might be too early, but come back to these opportunities
- **INFOYS**
 - IT organization based in India

The 'What' of CORD

Paul, UTSC

In attempt to try and find some commonalities among the various themes, Paul suggested:

- Heading: Creating Citizenship
- Name: Global Interdisciplinary Network for Collaborative Research on
- Creating Citizenship
- Explanatory Statement: the everyday struggles for access and quality (also looking at social justice)

- Problem: the differential nature of citizenship and rights in the global south
 - depends on position in different power struggles
 - different forms of exclusions and marginality

The 'How' of CORD:

Joanna, Institute of Development Studies

To better solidify how CORD should continue, Joanna asked everyone to consider:

- what is it that excites you about this group?
- what kinds of activities would you like to pursue (other than research)?

What is exciting about CORD?

1) Working Together (like minded people coming to work together)

- South-south critical collaboration
- Being a citizen of a "southern led" network (as a "northern" researcher)
- Connection and building relations with other researchers and practitioners
- Comparative insights
- The diversity of backgrounds and areas of interest
- Interdisciplinary and coming from different contexts
- A group of sharp, nice, and committed people
- Learning and mentorship opportunities from experienced researchers who do interesting research
- The group: nice people, easy going, interesting, and an appetite to collaborate
- Common interests in collaboration (in practice and in theory)
- Collaboratively disentangling complex conceptual issues
- Travel

2) Intellectual excitement

- Developing a relevant and practice-inspired research agenda
- Intellectual collaboration, reflection, theorizing, and challenging
- The amazing capacity to come up with several very relevant research issues/questions
- Innovative research questions addressing salient phenomenon

3) Commitment to new forms of engagement (new methodology and engaging policy)

- Participatory methodologies using web platforms (participant research and analysis)
- Innovation in methods, what can be linked
- Online collaboration
- Exploring key and original areas of research and engagements

What should we do together?

1) Future meetings in person:

- Face-to-face meetings/workshops:
 - Sharing of ideas and insights
 - Discussing frameworks, results, and possibilities to moving further
 - Work on our commonalities
 - Theory/comparison/engagement
- Not meeting online
- Meet twice a year
- Meet in different countries
- Face-to-face meetings at various stages of the research project
- A final symposium to deliver findings
- Sub-theme meeting to deepen our comparative work in focused ways
- Sharing of research around how digital networks can foster agency and/or critical consciousness

2) Utilize online technology:

- Building a virtual collaborative platform
- Collaborative blogging
- Build a shared set of readings and resources for mediation, unruly politics, and democracy
- E-conferences: coming up for air
- Small working groups online to discuss:
 - Methods
 - Process
 - Outcomes
- Online conferences (video)
- Online discussion forums

3) Develop methodology:

- Learning about methodology
- Properly comparative participatory process
- Methods labs: peer learning/innovation on methods for democracy
- Methodological sharing
- Building researcher-practitioner methodology group
- Research engagement, engage other actors (ex: policy makers)
- Collaborative intellectual endeavor
- Collaborative policy advocacy dialogues and events
- Explore research/engagement nexus
- Engagement with other actors of development
- Diving deep theoretically and coming up for air (online and face-to-face)
- Experiential learning

4) Other:

- Writing that is not tied to consultancy project deliverables and actually contains ideas

- Field trips and visit partner institutions

Meanings and challenges to be a Southern-led network

Bettina

We need to address the need for a practical proposal on how to approach this partnership and the structure of CORD. Answering this requires considering the leadership of the network as a whole and the southern aspect of it. One way of working could be that as we develop our projects, the steering committee (originally Vera, Bettina, and Simeen) continues to work, but draws people in that work in distinct areas so that whoever is hosting the meeting or working on a particular project gets drawn into organizational practices. For this to work, care must be taken to not just outsource organization to the various groups.

This “Southern-led” concept is of pragmatic concern due to the affect of this title on fund-raising abilities. Conceptually, CORD must ensure that research questions are coming from and driven by Southern debates. A difficulty that CORD as a network faces is that the south is split into two and “Southern” CORD participants are from the rising south. Additionally, the categorization of people from the north living in the south as well as people from the south living in the north proves complex. These considerations are all important, as we want to make the identity of CORD distinct without reproducing the typical north-south focus.

Ideas were brainstormed to address the lack of participants from more fragile contexts. Other people who could be invited into CORD include:

- Other CORD members that could not join this workshop
- Other partners we are currently engaged with that may be interested in comparative work
- Practitioners or NGOs working on a related sector (LogoLink or Southern-led civil society networks on citizen engagement such as Polis, PRIA, etc)

Timeline Planning

Joanna, IDS Sussex

To create an action plan for the next year, participants were asked to outline their individual and group plans, centering these plans around their existing work; plans for collaborative projects among meta-clustered groups; and the plans of CORD as a network. Plans should be within the scope of the next year, making the next six months in a high level of detail with the rest of the year a little less detailed. The result of this activity is outlined in the “Output” section of this report on page 11.

Public Symposium

On Wednesday May 23rd, a Public Symposium was held at UTSC for the purpose of presenting CORD's research agenda to interested academics, students and community members. Speakers had the opportunity to share their current and upcoming research projects, as well as to explain the work of their institution or organization in general. The event was chaired by Professor Paul Kingston from UTSC and opening remarks were given by the UTSC Dean of Arts and Science, Rick Halpern. Participating CORD members included: *(Click the following links for videos of each presenter)*

- [Dr. Bettina von Lieres, UTSC](#)
- [Shylashri Shakar](#)
- [Simeen Mahmud](#)
- [Hani Morsi](#)
- [Laura Waibich](#)
- [Laurence Piper](#)

The symposium concluded with a [Question and Answer session](#), during which attendees has the opportunity to learn more about the work of CORD's members.

Conclusions and Final Comments

All participants present at the workshop would likely agree that the first major CORD meeting was a resounding success. Not only did the workshop facilitate the exchange of ideas amongst members of the network, but it also brought to light many of the needs and challenges that will continue to present themselves within the future of the collaboration.

Indeed, through a combination of experimental ways of working in a participatory fashion, combined with the lively debates and different skill sets brought forward by varying individuals, the workshop assisted in the solidification of researcher relationships and brought forth constructive organizational and research goals for the short and long term future of the network.

Currently, a planning committee has been put in place to plan another CORD workshop in New Delhi, India in December 2012. The goals of this workshop will look to bring forward concrete research papers and proposals in order for CORD members to begin contributing effectively towards the goals of the network. Moreover, the India workshop hopes to further discuss ideas for securing concrete operational and research funds for CORD, as well as to present a preliminary online collaborative platform to facilitate long-distance research relationships amongst members.

All in all, the Toronto CORD workshop was an excellent foundation for CORD's collaboration, and all members are looking forward to being strong and active participants within the network's future activities.

APPENDIX

A: Workshop Agenda

Monday, May, 21, 2012	
9:00 am to 9:30 am	Welcome and Introductions Leslie Chan (IDS-UTSC), Paul Kingston (IDS-UTSC)
9:30 am to 10:00 am	Background to CORD and aims of the workshop Facilitators: Vera Schattan Coelho (CEBRAP – Brazil), Simeen Mahmud (BDI-BRAC, Bangladesh), Bettina von Lieres (IDS-UTSC)
10:00 am to 11:00 am	Lessons from the Development Centre for Citizenship, Participation and Accountability: Building a global research network Facilitator: John Gaventa (COADY International Institute, Canada), Joanna Wheeler (IDS Sussex, UK)
11:00 am to 11:30 am	Tea Break
11:30 am to 1:00 pm	Round Table: Participant Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of current research projects ○ Ideas for cross-cutting themes ○ Hopes for our collaboration Facilitator: Bettina von Lieres (IDS – UTSC)
1:00 pm – 2:00 pm	Lunch
2:00 pm to 3:30 pm	Developing cross-cutting research themes in working groups Working in groups to deepen cross-cutting themes and to define CORD'S collaborative research agenda Facilitator: Alex Shankland (IDS Sussex, UK)
3:30 pm to 4:00 pm	Tea Break
4:00 pm to 5:30 pm	Working groups report back Sharing our themes with the other groups, synthesis and discussion

Facilitator: Alex Shankland (IDS Sussex, UK)	
7:00 pm	Dinner at Leslie Chan's house
Tuesday, May 22, 2012	
9:00 am to 10:30am	Open discussion based around themes pulled out from the previous day's sessions, to end with a checklist of comparative research projects for us to take forward Facilitators: Shylashri Shankar (Centre for Policy Research, India) Laurence Piper (University of Western Cape, South Africa)
10:30 am to 11:00 am	Synthesis presentation (Vera Schattan Coelho (CEBRAP-Brazil))
11:00 am to 11:30 am	Tea Break
11:30 am to 1:00 pm	New challenges and priorities for global development research: with Peter Taylor, Senior Program Specialist, Think Tank Initiative, IDRC
1:00 pm to 2:00 pm	Lunch
2:00 pm to 3:30 pm	Workshop with Taking IT Global: New technologies and platforms for global collaboration and research Facilitator: Leslie Chan (IDS UTSC)
3:30 pm to 4:00 pm	Tea Break
4:00 pm to 5:30 pm	GRANT WRITING Facilitators: Vera Schattan Coelho (CEBRAP-Brazil) and Bettina von Lieres (IDS-UTSC)
6:30 pm	Dinner out: downtown Toronto
Wednesday, May 23, 2012	

9:00 am to 11:00 am	Grant writing report-back <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Steps • Activities and plans, time-lines, key events, fundraising strategies, next meeting • Launching our comparative research projects <p>Facilitator: Joanna Wheeler (IDS Sussex, UK)</p>
11:00 am to 11:30 am	Tea Break
11:30 am to 12.30 pm	Evaluation and Closure
1:00 pm to 2:00 pm	Lunch
2:00 pm to 4:00 pm	Public Seminar at the University of Toronto <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simeen Mahmud (BDI BRAC, Bangladesh) • Hani Morsi (IDS Sussex) • Shylashri Shankar (Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, India) • Laura Waisbich (CEBRAP-BRAZIL) • Laurence Piper (University of the Western Cape, South Africa) Bettina von Lieres (IDS-UTSC)

B: Workshop Evaluation

Participants were requested to complete three sentences on a piece of paper to provide facilitators and the group with feedback on the current workshop and advice for the future. The three sentences to complete along with participant's opinions were:

It was good that...

Organization

- the UTSC team were such wonderful hosts.
- it was so well organized.
- we stuck to the time-line.
- extremely well organized, like clockwork.
- the facilitation was excellent.
- location.
- organization.
- inclusion.
- warm welcoming.

Participant interaction

- a sense of possibility and promise was "affirmed in diversity".
- we combined re-connecting with old friends and connecting with new ones.
- to meet so many passionate and focused researchers working on such important research.
- everyone was pleasant and the discussions were congenial.
- people blended well.
- to see old friends, meet new people, wonderful support/organization, exciting intellectual ideas, and lots of possible synergies/learning.
- I've met very interesting people and that we've managed to give content/shape to this collective project.
- we met face-to-face.
- there was a very diverse set of perspectives.
- the working groups were small.
- lots of chances for socializing outside of the workshop.
- collaboration.
- many new people showed such excitement in joining CORD.

Quality of work

- we worked hard.
- there was good energy and lots of ideas.
- we could combine relaxed and friendly connections with sharp and exciting intellectual exchange.
- we produced more than we had anticipated, exceeding expectations.
- Results
- there are focused projects emerging and new partnership.

It was a shame that...

Time

- we had to rush the substantive discussions.
- we rushed (especially on the engagement on research focus and questions).
- time was tight.
- we had no time to further discuss CORD's identity (the "How").
- we didn't have more time in deliberative group sessions.
- we were under so much time pressure.
- we did not have enough time to discuss collaboration in greater detail.
- there was not enough time and funding.
- there wasn't additional time to pull things together in a more focused plan.

Participant selection

- not more "southern" partners were present.

Other

- I couldn't completely leave all my other work behind and just be in this space.
- I missed the first day.
- Ranjita couldn't be here.

It would be nice to...

Maintain momentum

- sustain the energy and enthusiasm for collaboration on interdisciplinary research.
- harness/transfer the energy and focus in the room onto the Wiki.

Meet again

- meet in India in October 2012, South Africa in March 2013, and Brazil in September 2013.
- Meet more regularly (face-to-face).
- go on a field visit.
- meeting again in October/November.
- we had more time to learn a bit more about Canada.

Participant selection

- have more engagement with policy/practitioners and to have space to share/hear about people's work.
- engage with practitioners and/or activists.
- have more participants from the south.