



RESEARCH PROGRAM ON
**Climate Change,
Agriculture and
Food Security**



5 Key Institutional Change Areas for Adopting a Social Learning Methodology with CCAFS and the CGIAR System:

A synthesis paper

Authors ••

Liz Carlile
liz.carlile@iied.org

About Us ••

The CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) brings together the world's best researchers in agricultural science, development research, climate science and Earth System science, to identify and address the most important interactions, synergies and tradeoffs between climate change, agriculture and food security. CCAFS is a strategic partnership of CGIAR and Future Earth, led by the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT). www.ccafs.cgiar.org

Introduction

The CGIAR Research Programme on Climate Change Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) is co-constructing a strategy for Climate Change Communication and Social Learning (CCSL). Not to be confused with the general CCAFS Communication Strategy for disseminating materials and raising profile etc, CCSL is about an attempt to fundamentally change how CGIAR scientists and the communities they work with and for, communicate their shared knowledge and experience and learn together. It is about ensuring a relevant and dynamic transformative change that truly recognises the needs of communities facing the harsh realities of climate change today not just in 50 years time.

To embrace a social learning methodology right from the start the CCAFS team has been working with a community of people working in communications, participatory methodologies, knowledge management and social learning to think together about the implications of such a strategy for CGIAR and how CCAFS might begin to take this

forward. This community will grow and expand as new people are introduced to the programme.

The first step in the CCSL co-construction process was a call for proposals to develop a discussion paper designed to catalyse a dialogue with an initial group of people. Drafted by IDS and IIED this paper did four things: gave a background to the theory of climate change communication and social learning, presented findings from a survey and case studies of climate change communication initiatives and presented the idea of single, double and triple loop learning¹. It also looked at some of the implications of adopting such an approach within a large entity like the CGIAR. Participants at the first workshop in Addis were tasked with thinking through the implications of a triple loop learning approach for a CCAFS climate change communication and social learning strategy. Since the workshop, CCAFS has facilitated the start of a community of practice or Sandbox (www.yammer.com/ccsl), and innovation funds for exploring ideas and initiatives in pursuit of understanding how social learning works and will be finding further opportunities for

¹ Social Learning is defined in a number of ways by different people. Perhaps for this brief introduction Devaux's definition (Feb 2009) – social learning brings about a shift from “multiple cognition” to “collective cognition”. Individuals involved in social learning processes begin with quite different perceptions of their current situation and the potential for change; as they interact, they develop common, shared perspectives, insights and values” helps to situate the principle outcomes of good social learning. The action of learning is nicely summarised in the Triple Loop Learning concept (Armitage 2008) that shows that true social learning is a process of looped interactions from action to reflection leading to changed behaviours in new actions. This concept leaves out the nuance of power relations and social differentiation which true social learning processes need to recognise but it demonstrates the importance of an iterative process to learning.



learning together in building this strategy.

This synthesis paper presents five key change areas deemed critical by the participants of the Addis Workshop to inculcate a process of change in working with communities and partners. These change areas are those key areas where the group felt that CCAFS needed to devote attention if it was to take this challenge seriously. Further research commissioned by CCAFS has tasked IDS and IIED to review the literature of others' experience of social learning and what the critical success factors are. We are looking forward to seeing where there is overlap or difference with the change areas identified at the workshop. An early finding suggests the importance of well facilitated and structured processes, although this was not defined as a key change area in our meeting it is an implicit part of understanding what the preconditions are for a good social learning process and this is part of all the key change areas.

Below, there is a template for defining each change area, saying why the group in Addis felt it important for social learning and the CCAFS strategy as well as a description of the work to be one next as proposed by participants. The five areas, with no significance in the order:

1. Documentation
2. Social Learning within CCAFS
3. Endogenous Social Learning
4. Social Differentiation
5. Time Scales

Working groups at the workshop identified both the change areas and the project activity for each change area. The material below comes from the presentations of each of the working groups exploring this at the workshop.

1. Documentation

Change Area Aim: To properly understand, analyse and test social learning as tool for transformative change

Definition:

This change area was about making sure we really analyse and test social learning as a tool, that we really understand what it is, how it works and can cite good examples of where it has worked, where it has not worked and what the different levels of impact might be in certain situations. This learning needs to be documented and shared with the research and policy communities. We need to communicate with confidence and with good evidence before we can have any certainty that this kind of approach will be adopted and that it adds value both for those engaged in the process and those who need to demonstrate impact. Documentation can include research and literature reviews that already include experience and evidence of social learning as well as documenting new case studies and pilot studies.

Rationale:

One of the challenges is to make sure that social learning is really understood and recognisable as a methodology and not just as a new and more fashionable term for participation, advocacy or organisational learning. The evidence suggests that social learning is a particular methodology – with a wider remit than participation – that looks more closely at the relative value of knowledge, how it is perceived and used in a collective response to a challenge and how to ensure that all participants are learning. The significance of “triple loop” learning where a community changes collective behaviour together by learning and acting together presents a subtle nuance. To understand this fully will be helped greatly with good documentation of examples and the use of this methodology when dealing with particularly complex or “wicked” problems will be vital.

Implications for CCAFS:

The number and range of projects

that the CGIAR science community is involved with is enormous and projects vary from large global studies with very long timeframes to more local community-based projects where communities are dealing with daily challenges. Transforming learning approaches in this environment is extremely challenging and will require top level buy-in as well as creative ways to get buy-in with the scientific community. Good documentation, an archive of examples and approaches provides the substrates from which new approaches and ways of working can germinate.

Also the CGIAR community can provide a testing ground for analysing, monitoring and documenting new ways of working. Those researchers who are prepared to design projects using social learning methodology can also document their experience to be shared. Indeed many CGIAR projects are already demonstrating that considerable thought goes into the design of project to ensure wide participation and shared learning. A glossary of CGIAR terminology for these activities would help in developing a shared internal discourse.

Project work expected to take place:

It was recommended that this change area look at building an Inventory of Cases looking at testing Social Learning as a model. These cases would look in detail at what has worked and what has not worked and then document the results. The following steps would be taken to facilitate this:

1. **Building and inventory of cases/projects and then selecting key ones to study.** Selection would be based on a set of criteria to be agreed such as success or failure, ongoing or finished, inside or outside the CGIAR system and so on. Possible examples provided cited were PROLINNOVA and CGIAR Bangladesh.
2. **Identifying a team to carry out the study.** This would be a multidisciplinary, socially



differentiated team involving the “owners” (beneficiaries?), researchers, champions.

3. **A methodology would be established for analysing the case studies.** This would consider the context, baselines, activities, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts. Information would be collected through various channels and would include site or field visits.
4. **Analysis or testing of findings would focus on different categories around knowledge, attitudes, skills and practice.** This analysis would need to identify a mechanism of causality and attribution. Working with an analytical framework and key indicators could provide a sound basis for agreeing some shared understanding of success.
5. **Writing and sharing case studies.** The findings would be shared with the case study communities, within the CGIAR community, within the community of practice and with global policy community.

It is envisaged that we are embarking on a 4-10 year cycle of change and this documentation exercise should start directly – it should be part of the catalyst for change as well as documenting the journey. The pilot case studies and the documentation process will require different skills set – facilitators, researchers, communications and media people. We are already in the process of carrying out an Impact Assessment that is looking across the literature for what others have learned from examples of social learning projects but we will need to take this learning and test it further.

Selecting the case studies to work with will be the role of CCAFS – and their partners. CCAFS is also extremely well –positioned to support some of the funding and logistics, supporting the networking and dissemination of ideas and to help build and support the development of a growing body of

work, a global public good. A budget of \$200,000 was suggested.

Where we are now:

It is clear that a universally recognised methodology for evaluating the impact of social learning tools and approaches would help to consolidate the learning from this process. The second study – the Impact Assessment – being carried out by IDS and IIED is beginning to see key themes emerging for key success factors. Developing a framework from this work could be a vital next step.

Next Steps:

Build the Inventory of Cases

- Determine process for submitting proposals to the Innovation Fund or to CCAFS.
- Put forward proposals for good case studies to add to the inventory.
- Establish selection criteria by which to choose cases to study.
- Identification of a multi-disciplinary team to work on the case studies.
- Establish a methodology with which to analyse the case studies.
- Identify key indicators for success with which to evaluate the case studies.
- Write up and share findings.

2. Social Learning within CCAFS

Change Area Aim: “Social Learning is validated within CCAFS (CGIAR) as a mainstream methodology and sees an increase in well-designed social learning projects within CGIAR initiatives and programmes over the next five-seven years

Definition:

As Collins and Ison (2009a) point out, ‘the term social learning has arisen in response to a growing recognition that learning occurs through situated and collective engagement with others’. Social learning moves us well beyond a simple linear process of information

provision and even two-way communication into something that is much more about explicitly seeking to engage stakeholders in a process of shared knowledge creation that induces behaviour change through a shared process of learning by doing.

Social learning does not necessarily take place by just bringing stakeholders together and there is a danger of thinking that just by putting people together something will happen. Reed et al. (2010) argue “that while considerable evidence suggests that participatory processes can facilitate social learning, the fact that participation takes place does not guarantee that social learning has happened”. Conversely, it may also take place without facilitated participatory processes (for example, it may occur spontaneously through social media). The significant point, particularly in the CCAFS context, is that what results is ‘a change in understanding that goes beyond the individual to become situated within wider social units or communities of practice’ (Reed et al 2010).

A social learning approach adopted and promoted by CCAFS within the CGIAR system is aiming to achieve a significant step change, championed by the work of CCAFS and others in CGIAR who are.

Rationale:

This change area is all about working to promote a behaviour change within the CGIAR system – this is a big challenge and at the heart of it is how to support or incentivise an institutional change process. Much discussion was held around the role of CCAFS as a partner in a social learning environment and the recognition that the CGIAR centres combine a global and local engagement. It was felt important that the CCAFS CCSL recognises where CCAFS can contribute added value and where it needs new kind of partnerships to make this happen. The way the CGIAR is funded, organised and researchers incentivised means that a social learning methodology



would appear to carry high transaction costs in terms of time let alone the challenge of bringing together different kinds of knowledge to contribute to a shared learning outcome however, the potential for unlocking a more dynamic and effective delivery of results would mean that this approach is more cost effective. The exciting part is the appetite and enthusiasm within the CCAFS team that will ensure this methodology has the greatest chance of adoption.

Implications for CCAFS:

This change area is essentially an internal communications and organisational management challenge for CCAFS. Participants for this Change area identified the Goal as "Social Learning is validated within CCAFS (CGIAR) as a mainstream methodology". It was felt that the indicators for success here would include:

- A significant percentage of CG funded proposals to include explicit reference to and design of project including social learning as a central part by 2020.
- A dynamic based of "artefacts" or products (tools, activities, processes, publications etc) with shared attribution and use – a clear connection here to the change area around documentation.
- A porous CGIAR and partners' network with two-way learning.

Such a change clearly demands buy-in at the very highest level within the CGIAR management and within the family of hard and social scientists. This demands a consistent and thoughtful process to create an enabling environment for change. It means leveraging key opportunities for talking about change, providing the evidence for change and for determining a good communications strategy for change. This change would unfold more quickly if there was a strong alignment and added value in achieving strategic priorities and to demanding delivery targets.

For CCAFS and CGIAR investment in a more deliberative, transaction-heavy way of working and the evidence supporting this change must ensure that people can see the added value demonstrated in the impact at community level. There must be no doubt that this is the best way forward for real development impact. Institutions like the CGIAR – and many others are struggling with meeting high numerical delivery targets in uncertain and complex situations. Social learning needs to make this easier and not more complex.

Project work expected to take place:

The two principle activities in this change area were developing a Dynamic Basket of Good Practices and Catalysing Social Learning across CCAFS network.

The activities underpinning this approach were to support the CCAFS vision that using social learning methodologies would be fairly well mainstreamed by 2020 – what would a different CGIAR look like, what would CGIAR projects have achieved with such a different approach, how would a combination of scientific knowledge and community knowledge have changed the landscape for solving the key global problems that CGIAR is set to address over the next ten years?

Opening up CCAFS systems and knowledge resources to partners and others provides CCAFS an opportunity to show leadership, likewise identifying and organising groups that can catalyse social learning and helping create a community of practice.

Change processes need champions and an advisory group working inside the CGIAR system and advocating outside the system can help to motivate and mobilise those who are interested in taking the work forward. Training, awareness raising, coaching and mentoring were all seen as activities in this change area that would be essential to driving forward institutional change.

This growing community of people prepared to champion a social learning methodology is a vital part of building the interest and influence to make this change.

Where we are now:

Our most recent research is suggesting that a social learning approach that does not include a change in methodologies in institutions but only affects the individuals involved can cause greater dissatisfaction and disempowerment². Increased knowledge and awareness and then an inability to make anything happen is potentially worse than a less inclusive process. Embracing this reality would have a considerable impact on stimulating internal behavioural change.

A key challenge to this change area was whether CCAFS/CGIAR has the right expertise in social learning to take leadership. Two responses here are that CCAFS will not be doing this alone – it will always be working with partners and with alliances to implement projects but perhaps more importantly this is a co-learning process that will involve all parties in responding to collective challenges. Some interesting work was done at our most recent meeting that looks at where CGIAR is positioned in its work with partners and across the different levels³. Further exploration of where CGIAR can add value will be helpful.

Next Steps:

Develop the Dynamic Basket of Good Practices

- Articulate the internal social learning goals for CGIAR.
- Use the Inventory of Cases and additional research to begin to build a list of good practices that will help CGIAR achieve those goals.

Catalyse Social Learning across the CCAFS network

- Identify and organize an advisory group and champions that will catalyse social learning within the

² <http://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/24456>

³ <http://prezi.com/benk2g5cuc5y/social-learning>



organization.

- Identify partners and alliances to involve in the process.
- Organize training sessions, awareness raising campaigns, and coaching and mentoring schemes to encourage institutional change.

3. Endogenous Social Learning

Change Area Aim: That all CCAFS/ CGIAR social learning processes or projects recognise the importance of context specific local structures, governance, cultures and systems.

Definition:

Endogenous social learning is social learning that is firmly rooted in the political, economic and social frameworks of the locality or region. It would be social learning that brought together stakeholders that represented not just a socially differentiated community of actors but a set of actors that acknowledged the governance, traditions and local authorities of the region as well as an understanding of the local organisations and trade federations.

Rationale:

Communication and social learning is always context specific and in situations where social learning methodology can really add value to achieving impact at community level it may be a very particular context indeed. Learning processes must take into account the “local” situation – the values, priorities of the group or community engaged in the process. At an individual level and even local policy level we recognise the importance of context but in a social learning context – where we are drawing together the collective knowledge and understanding of a particular situation – it is even more important. Local rights, traditions and customary laws can be mechanisms that support or undermine a collective change. Local institutions, organisations and processes can be key players in a determination to innovate or try new things.

Implications for CCAFS:

A good understanding of endogenous social learning represents a significant opportunity for CCAFS in establishing a successful way of working at community and regional level. Communities with centuries of experience in developing customary laws, defending rights, securing livelihoods can not only contribute knowledge about how to adapt to climate change but they can contribute an understanding of how to use different channels for change. A good understanding of how communities work together, how they are linked and connected within the region, and what kind of infrastructure and capacity for local change and development exists sets some good understanding of the preconditions for a good “social learning environment”.

Project work expected to take place:

At the Addis workshop the recommendations for the endogenous social learning change area indicated the need for an Opportunity Assessment – a closer look at where particular communities, localities or regions offered the potential for developing a strong social learning opportunity. This would include an assessment of local capacity and whether that offered a particular affinity to work on areas CCAFS felt it could address, assessing the scale and potential for change in the community.

An endogenous approach would be supported by the development of two tools: a Learning and Evaluative Framework – a tool, guide, or set of principles that would help steer subsequent projects, and a Joint Needs Assessment. The Learning and Evaluative framework would be the tool for enhancing endogenous social learning within projects and the Joint Needs Assessment would help ensure good selection criteria for possible projects. This change area would focus on developing a terms of reference for such an assessment that would look at the role of local innovation or

support funds, what kinds of research support in climate change and food security might be needed, what levels of capacity were available and how experiences and knowledge could be documented. It would also include ways to measure how effectively different parts of the community were involved.

The recommendation of the group was there should be three pilot studies identified that would specifically focus on endogenous social learning – case studies where there would be strong evidence of the social learning potential, strong evidence of working relationships between communities and local institutions, the role of customary laws, strong local values and priorities. The aim would be to run three projects over a two year period to help engage partners and build relationships – this would provide an opportunity to document and assess changing needs and redefine the process.

Where we are now:

Further research on social learning in the impact assessment is revealing the importance of repeated mutually beneficial interactions over a period of time. This supports the idea of running a pilot project over a couple of years that fully recognises local practices, values and priorities. Endogenous social learning is clearly not a “different” social learning, but without this local focus and an understanding of local priorities and values social learning is unlikely to take place.

Next steps:

Develop the Opportunity Assessment guidelines

- Determine key areas to include in the guidelines, e.g. traditions, values, rights, etc.
- Draw up a worksheet that will help CCAFS to evaluate which areas present opportunities.

Develop the Learning and Evaluative Framework

- Determine the principles and terms of reference for the framework.



- Develop the Joint Needs Assessment.
- Determine which key areas to include in the Assessment, e.g. funding, research support, capacity, knowledge, experience.

Design and conduct three pilot studies to test the three tools. These would be around case studies with 1) strong evidence of social learning potential, 2) strong evidence of working relationships between communities and local institutions, and 3) strong evidence of the role of customary laws, strong local values and priorities.

4. Social Differentiation

Change Area Aim: That any CGIAR social learning projects and processes recognise the complexities of social differentiation and the related power relations

Definition:

The dictionary definition of social differentiation is “the distinction made between social groups and persons on the basis of biological, physiological and socio cultural factors as sex, age, race, nationality etc. It is about recognising that any community is made up of different groups of people who represent both collective and individual interests. In the last few months, a more detailed exploration on social differentiation, the implications for CGIAR projects and case studies with a strong focus on social differentiation has been started. This will help to underpin the subsequent work of this change area.

Rationale:

An understanding of social differentiation was an important change area identified because it has a vital part to play in identifying the real needs of communities. Decision making on future food security and climate change at the local level is often not inclusive or equitable. In communities where there are strong hierarchies or caste structures it will

be difficult to ensure the inclusion of the full range of voices who have something to say. In communities/countries/groups where free speech has been curtailed or dangerous for political reasons it can be difficult to ensure the right spaces for discussion and engagement. For real social learning to take place it may be important to collect the views and experience of all members of society or certainly those who are not used to working together. A social learning approach will need to ensure it facilitates the right kind and number of processes, perhaps running in parallel that ensure the engagement of different groups in an unthreatening and relevant way.

This change area is indeed critical to successful social learning but has the potential to be hidden. Social learning should imply the engagement of stakeholders across the spectrum but unless there is a conscious effort to understand the social structures, hierarchies and social norms, critical views and experiences relevant to solutions will be missed. In the same way that endogenous social learning needs to recognise values, priorities and governance, social learning that recognises the social differentiation of a given community needs to facilitate and ensure equality of engagement.

Implications for CCAFS:

A key implication for CCAFS in adopting a social learning approach that recognises social differentiation is to ensure it is working with the right partners and that projects are designed in a way that responds to the communication needs of the different groups involved. Learning processes adapted for different groupings might need to refer to particular timings, particular people present or not present, particular seasons or needs etc. The use of different language for both clarity of understanding but also to capture nuance – for example people may say different things if working in an official language than they may in a colloquial or tribal language. Translating hard science in a way that relates to daily practice may inform

choices for different communication methodologies.

What is the project work that is expected to take place? Workshop participants envisaged a programme to catalyse change to ensure there was a good understanding of the role of social differentiation within social learning approaches. Some of the work here was similar to that proposed in the social learning within CGIAR change area. An important part of the next steps here was to review CGIAR projects to find further opportunities for projects that speak to a more socially differentiated approach as well as to review and speak to those who are already prioritising this way of working. Creating a working group within CCAFS was seen an important way to catalyse further thinking. The report to review the project is underway and a working group to help champion social learning within the organisation has been established.

Similarly, building a network, or a community that builds our understanding and experience of social differentiation for social learning (Social LSD) was suggested as a critical part of this catalyst. Using the skills already housed with the CCAFS team and within ILRI in particular, facilitating the right kind of catalytic spaces for good dialogue, discussion and development was a key part of next steps.

The final activity for this change area was to support the development of a research agenda – an agenda built through a social learning process using all three loops, again much the same as the change area activities for social learning.

Where we are now:

Much of the activity highlighted here was felt to be too removed from the community level. Much of the work of the community of practice already established will help with building the understanding of social differentiation and in identifying further projects to support. Importantly though, this change area needs to work harder outside of the community and with



external partners to think about where social differentiation is designed into projects and where it is not.

Next steps:

- Solicit knowledge and experiences from members of CGIAR using this approach.
- Review all CGIAR projects to find opportunities to use this approach.
- Begin building a network/ community of internal and external practitioners and develop a space/ platform for these practitioners to share and build learning on this approach.
- Develop a research agenda on the topic using a triple looped learning process.

5. Time Scales

Change Area Aim: to understand how different peoples/communities perceptions of timescales hinder or encourage greater engagement for social learning

Definition:

For the purposes of the CCSL project, time scales refers here to the different perceptions that people have about timescales when thinking about the kind of information/ knowledge/ or research needs that they have. At community level those dealing with the effects of climate change – either adapting to a volatile and unpredictable climate patterns or mitigating behaviour in response to perceived climate risks – need to share knowledge and use evidence from research that addresses their immediate problems. The global scientific community currently working on climate change issues tend to be researching the science of climate change over the next 10-50 years rather than addressing smaller scale, immediate solutions at community level.

The importance of recognising these different “time scales” in this change area is also pointing to the need to

reconcile the short term and long term perspectives at the same time. Urgency can underpin a view of time so urgency for the farmer is immediate, urgency for a global response to climate change is no less urgent but it has a different time frame. Adaptation at the individual and local level brings knowledge and learning that will contribute to scaling up adaptation solutions over the longer term. Those researching longer term adaptation needs may need to use different entry points – around immediate problems – in order to gather knowledge or experience and share ideas for learning over the longer term.

Rationale:

One of the pre-conditions for social learning to work is a real shared understanding of needs, priorities and values for those learning together. Strong social learning needs to reflect an equal, open and transparent way of working to a shared agenda. It may require different channels of engagement to lead to changed behaviour but the parameters of the problem must be equally shared. If co-constructors are working to different time- agendas then there is an immediate tension as to purpose and outcome. It may be that it is important to identify relevant timescales for a particular issue and identify stakeholders who can represent those timescales – e.g. immediate needs from the community, short term needs from local policy makers, longer terms needs from global/national planners or academic community and so on.

Implications for CCAFS:

The mission of the CGIAR centres is to research global solutions to global problems – it does this through a number of different size projects across its 15 global research centres. Some research themes and some projects are much more focussed around working at the community level, others make no apology for working on potentially more ambitious global questions that need original research and hard science to push forward. CCAFS however

is uniquely well-placed to situate its work – under theme 4 – to consider where the importance of the longer time frame and the shorter time frames can be aligned to respond to needs of communities in the present and scaling up ideas for a more resilient future. CCAFS is ideally situated to work with its scientists to define a framework or models to help bring these different perspectives together. Some of the future scenarios planning work done by CCAFS and others help to amplify the role of time and the implications of looking ahead – the CARE PSP case study, for example, raises issues of time when thinking about probabilities of weather predictions. Communities prefer “probabilities” over predictions.

Project work expected to take place:

Whilst workshop participants recognised the challenge of different framings of time it was felt the first step in this change area would be to craft a Theory of Change that addressed the issues of short term and longer term adaptive capacity and how longer-term considerations can be addressed through short term incentives to invite greater participation from stakeholders. Development of this theory of change would lead to developing three particular methodologies for sharing with future projects: a time-horizons evaluation framework, an incentives framework and methodologies for evaluating subsequent change.

The Time horizons evaluation tool and Incentives framework would help to frame a series of sequenced activities and commissioned research that would look at current methodologies for risk management, psychology and behavioural economics. It would look more carefully at the target audiences, the role that they play within a given scenario and their time windows and how that relates to local, national, regional and global levels. These activities and research would then underpin the development of a tool to provide methodologies that others could use to test how effectively time scales were aligned in future projects.



It is envisaged that there will be a number of commissioned research activities looking at how state of the art thinking on psychology, behavioural economics, risk and development social science can frame a view of particular CCAFS project in particular regions. It is also envisaged that there would be subsequent evaluation of these projects.

Where we are now:

This theme was a critically important change area that was identified by a number of people but it is the one that is the least well defined from participant discussion. The challenges by the peer group of experts invite greater clarity on how we can create incentives for different stakeholders to consider different timescales. Some interesting work was done by the group working on this to look at the different timescales and interests of different groups to start the framing but it was clear that it needed some further thinking and articulation through these next project ideas.

Next steps:

Develop a Theory of Change

- Identify main time scale issues.
- Identify solutions for bridging long term and short term needs, as well as increasing stakeholder involvement.

Develop the Time Horizons Evaluation Tool and Incentives Framework

- Conduct research on current methodologies for risk management, psychology and behavioural economics.
- Identify key assessment areas to

include in the Evaluation Tool, e.g. target audience, time window, national context, etc.

Conclusions

The five change areas outlined here will be mapped against the second literature review carried out by IDS and IIED with a view to challenging or aligning them with the perceived pre-conditions for good social learning emerging from the study. The sandbox is developing discussion themes and it is clear that these discussions could invite particular comment in the five areas.



Acknowledgements