

Access to knowledge can make change a reality

RIU

Validated RNRRS Output.

New knowledge is shedding light on how pro-poor institutional learning and change occur, and how to encourage and promote them. It includes syntheses of principles and procedures as well as lessons that can be useful to a range of actors. These insights are part of a pro-poor innovation framework that can be used to guide the application of knowledge, technology and information for pro-poor economic and productive impact. Numerous organisations are using the framework to guide policy making for change in norms, habits and practices, including the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development, International Livestock Research Institute, Institute of Rural Management (India), as well as several civil society organizations.

Project Ref: **CPH13:**

Topic: **6. Promoting Success: Partnerships, Policy & Empowerment**

Lead Organisation: **Centre for Research on Innovation & Science Policy, India**

Source: **Crop Post Harvest Programme**

Document Contents:

[Description](#), [Validation](#), [Current Situation](#), [Current Promotion](#), [Impacts On Poverty](#), [Environmental Impact](#),

Description

Research into Use

NR International
Park House
Bradbourne Lane
Aylesford
Kent
ME20 6SN
UK

Geographical regions included:

[India](#),

Target Audiences for this content:

[Crop farmers](#), [Livestock farmers](#), [Fishers](#), [Forest-dependent poor](#), [Processors](#), [Traders](#),

CPH13**A. Description of the research output(s)**

1. Working title of output or cluster of outputs.

In addition, you are free to suggest a shorter more imaginative working title/acronym of 20 words or less.

Policy advice and planning frameworks to help strengthen pro-poor institutional learning and change

2. Name of relevant RNRRS Programme(s) commissioning supporting research and also indicate other funding sources, if applicable.

Crop Post Harvest Research Programme

3. Provide relevant R numbers (and/or programme development/dissemination reference numbers covering supporting research) along with the institutional partners (with individual contact persons (if appropriate)) involved in the project activities. As with the question above, this is primarily to allow for the legacy of the RNRRS to be acknowledged during the RIUP activities.

R 8310- Institutional Learning and change- A capacity development approach to exploring and strengthening post-harvest innovation systems in South Asia

SI No	Partner Organisations	Individuals involved
1	Livelihood Solutions, Delhi	Guru Naik
2	National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research (NCAP) New Delhi/Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy (CRISP), Hyderabad	Rasheed Sulaiman V
3	Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi	Rajeswari Raina
4	ICRISAT, Hyderabad/UNU-MERIT, Maastricht	Andy Hall
5	University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK, Kabarak University, Kenya, African Centre for Technology Studies, (ACTS),Kenya	Norman Clark

R8500- Institutions for Poverty Reduction-understanding and enabling institutional changes that promoted pro-poor post-harvest innovation

SI No	Partner Organisations	Individuals involved
1	Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi	Rajeswari Raina
2	National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research (NCAP), New Delhi/Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy (CRISP), Hyderabad	Rasheed Sulaiman V
3	Centre for Technology and Development, New Delhi	D.Raghunanadan
4	UNU-MERIT, Maastricht	Andy Hall

4. Describe the RNRRS output or cluster of outputs being proposed and when was it produced? (**max. 400 words**). This requires a clear and concise description of the output(s) and the problem the output(s) aimed to address. Please incorporate and highlight (in bold) key words that would/could be used to select your output when held in a database.

Problem- An earlier study on crop post harvest innovation (R7502) revealed how **institutions** (rules, norms, habits and practices that govern relationships and influence outcomes in different organisations), constrain (and facilitate) development of partnerships. Partnership among the different actors within an **innovation system** is essential for **rural** innovation and this would necessitate developing new ways of working. **Institutional learning and change** (ILAC)- the process that can enhance learning at the level of the individual, the organisation or the system and allows development of **new ways of working** is the way forward for building an effective innovation system.

Box 1: Key concepts

Innovation system

At its simplest, an innovation system can be described in terms of three elements:

- (1) *all the organisations and individuals* involved in generating, diffusing, adapting and using new knowledge;
- (2) The *interactive learning* that occurs when organisations engage in generation, diffusion, adaptation and use of new knowledge and the ways in which this leads to innovation; and
- (3) the *institutions*- rules, habits and conventions-that govern how these interactions and processes occur.

Rural Innovation- It refers to the changes that take place in rural areas when knowledge, technology or information is made available and put into socially and economically productive use. Promoting rural innovation is not just about promoting knowledge, technology and information, but about developing the capacity to access, adapt and apply this knowledge in a particular context.

Institutional learning- It concerns the process through which new ways of working emerges, It concerns learning how to do things in new ways. It asks the question “what rules and norms have to be changed to do a new task or to do an old one better?”

Addressing these institutions is especially important for the poor who have restricted access to knowledge and information products and limited capacity to participate in the governance mechanisms of innovation systems. Evolution of the required diversity of approaches and trajectories necessary to support the poor (diversity of aspirations and opportunities that the poor can realise), would necessitate formation of appropriate coalitions of partners and institutional learning and change among the different actors and in their relationships. Little was known on how **pro-poor institutional changes** happen and how to encourage and promote pro-poor institutional learning and change. The projects (R8310 and R8500) used an innovation systems framework to unravel these issues and were implemented to generate policy relevant knowledge on how to promote pro-poor institutional learning and change.

Output- The major output of the projects (R 8310 and R8500) was **policy** advice on how to promote pro-poor institutional learning and change. This output was generated through synthesis of lessons (principles and procedures) on institutional changes that bring about pro-poor post-harvest innovation and experimenting with

ways of promoting these lessons with a range of other actors.

5. What is the type of output(s) being described here?

Please tick one or more of the following options.

Product	Technology	Service	Process or Methodology	Policy	Other Please specify
			X	X	

6. What is the main commodity (ies) upon which the output(s) focussed? Could this output be applied to other commodities, if so, please comment

Our focus has been on the post-harvest sector, but the policy relevant insights on enabling pro-poor institutional learning and change could be applied in other sectors and commodities.

7. What production system(s) does/could the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options. Leave blank if not applicable

Semi-Arid	High potential	Hillside	Forest-Agriculture	Peri-urban	Land water	Tropical moist forest	Cross-cutting
							XX

8. What farming system(s) does the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options (see Annex B for definitions).

Leave blank if not applicable

Smallholder rainfed humid	Irrigated	Wetland rice based	Smallholder rainfed highland	Smallholder rainfed dry/cold	Dualistic	Coastal artisanal fishing

9. How could value be added to the output or additional constraints faced by poor people addressed by clustering this output with research outputs from other sources (RNRRS and non RNRRS)? (**max. 300 words**).

The policy advice on enabling pro-poor institutional learning and change have been widely promoted through publications, participation in policy consultations, conferences, meetings, facilitated capacity development programmes and capacity development workshops. However, considering the large number of stakeholders and their huge institutional inertia more efforts are needed to promote these lessons widely. This would include:

- a. exploring other rural sectors that the poor are engaged in with special emphasis on pro-poor institutional changes
- b. organising advisory and promotion groups to advise the project and act as conduits for promoting the findings more widely
- c. organising capacity development workshops to facilitate adoption of a systems approach to

innovation and promoting lessons on pro-poor innovation more widely

- d. organising action research studies and using it as a platform to build relevant coalition of partners and bring about learning based (system-wide) institutional changes
- e. forming learning alliances with rural financial agencies to understand issues related to financing for rural innovation and promote uptake of “innovation systems” principles in rural financing
- f. networking with other policy and research actors in different regions to explore similar issues in various rural sectors, learn lessons and facilitate change.

The project team has been exploring some of these issues by undertaking case studies on some of the RNRRS projects and this include: R-8266 Integrating markets, products and partners: linking tribal communities to markets through value addition; R-8262 Developing a coalition approach to non-timber forest products for better livelihoods of tribal communities of MP; and R-8267 Exploring market opportunities through a research, industry and users coalition: sorghum poultry feed.

The project team has been also involved with two non-RNRRS projects led by UNU-MERIT. The first project, (DFID Funded project- Promoting Pro-poor rural innovation: lessons from civil society) allowed us to draw new insights on a. pro-poor innovation in civil society organisations (CSOs); and b. using a Rural Innovation Policy Working Group (RIPWiG) to advise and promote the work. The second project (World Bank funded project on Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: Tools and Options for Strengthening Agricultural Innovation System Capacity) allowed us to explore the nature of innovation systems in 8 sectors from 4 select countries

11. Please specify what other outputs your output(s) could be clustered. At this point you should make reference to the circulated list of RNRRS outputs for which proformas are currently being prepared.

R7502

Validation

B. Validation of the research output(s)

10. How were the output(s) validated and **who** validated them?

*Please provide brief description of method(s) used and consider application, replication, adaptation and/or adoption in the context of any partner organisation and user groups involved. In addressing the “who” component detail which group(s) did the validation e.g. end users, intermediary organisation, government department, aid organisation, private company etc... This section should also be used to detail, if applicable, to which social group, gender, income category the validation was applied and any increases in productivity observed during validation (**max. 500 words**).*

The output was validated in two ways. Firstly, the research team in India has been involved with 3 CPHP projects: a. R-7502(1999-2003); b. R-8310 (2003-2004); and c. R-8500 (2004-2005). Each project was based on the outputs of the previous project and added value to it. Each project was thereby validating the outputs from the previous project. The Andrew Barnett review report on “Lessons from the DFID’s Crop Post Harvest Research

Programme- Partnerships for Innovation” at several places has quoted the methodological and process related insights that were developed from these I projects (Source: Journeying from Research to Innovation, CPHP, March 2006).

The other form of validation has been that the organisations needed to use our policy advice have indeed tried it out in their own organisations. The specific cases include:

- The CGIAR initiative on Institutional Learning and Change (hosted by IPGRI)- This initiative was implemented while we were exploring issues related to institutional learning and change (R-8310) from CPHP and non-CPHP initiatives. Both ILAC projects used institutional history as a method to draw institutional insights.
- The World Bank funded study “Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: Tools and Options for Strengthening Agricultural Innovation System Capacity”- This study developed a diagnostic framework based on the innovation systems concept and it tested this framework by exploring eight sectors in 4 countries.
- The recently initiated National Agricultural Innovation Project (NAIP) implemented by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (2006-12) with support from World Bank has borrowed several useful insights from all the projects (R7502, R8310 and R8500). NAIP (www.naip.icar.org.in) is trying to promote public-private partnership in agricultural research and learn lessons from its implementation to bring about the desired institutional reforms in the National Agricultural Research System (NARS). To help the senior and middle level managers in the NARS to embrace an innovation system perspective, the project team organised a capacity development workshop for the senior managers of NAIP in November 2005 (More details are on www.cphpsouthasia.com.)
- Technical backstopping to International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) on application of innovation system framework to analyse fodder innovation. The project team has been providing technical backstopping to the Fodder Innovation Project implemented by ILRI to help them embrace the innovation system framework.
- Interest shown by NEDFi and NABARD on studying how financial arrangements influence rural innovation. To explore issues in financing rural innovation, the research team organised a workshop in Guwahatti (North East India). The North East Development and Finance Corporation (NEDFI) and the National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development (NABARD) have expressed their interest in collaborating and funding a research study on financing rural innovation.
- Invitations to present the work related to innovation systems, institutional learning and change and pro-poor innovation at several national, regional and international conferences.
- Curriculum development on “innovation management” at the Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubneshwar (XIMB), Orissa (More details are on www.cphpsouthasia.com) and the recent request for collaboration for developing a course on rural innovation from Institute for Rural Management (IRMA), Anand, Gujarat.

11. **Where and when** have the output(s) been validated?

Please indicate the places(s) and country(ies), any particular social group targeted and also indicate in which production system and farming system, using the options provided in questions 7 and 8 respectively, above (max 300 words).

Our target group has been the policy makers, innovation policy analysts, R & D managers in agricultural and other rural enterprise/industrial development organizations, civil society organizations, besides a range of actors interested in promoting pro-poor rural innovation.

Current Situation

C. Current situation

12. **How and by whom** are the outputs currently being used? Please give a brief description (**max. 250 words**).

The outputs from these projects are being currently used by the following organisations.

Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR)- The National Agricultural Innovation Project (NAIP) implemented by ICAR is using the concepts and approaches developed by the projects in planning and implementing NAIP. Bringing about institutional reforms in the National Agricultural Research System (NARS) is the overarching goal of NAIP. NAIP is currently setting up several “consortiums” comprising research and non-research actors to address issues related to agricultural research and development (www.naip.icar.org.in) This project is heavily influenced by the lessons on institutional learning and change synthesised by the project team. This includes insights on forming and managing coalitions, learning lessons from collation approach and using these to guide institutional change.

International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD). Two members of the project team are lead authors of the IAASTD assessment team constituted for the ESAP (East and South Asia and Pacific) region. IAASTD-ESAP is currently using the insights developed from these projects on Institutional change and innovation systems in their assessment exercise (www.agassessment.org).

The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) is using the methodology and analytical framework developed from these studies in the new project “Enhancing livelihoods of livestock dependant poor people through increasing use of fodder: India and Nigeria” (Fodder innovation project- Phase II(2006-2011)

Institute of Rural Management (IRMA), Anand (India) is currently using the knowledge generated from these projects in designing a course on Rural Innovation for the post-graduate programme in rural management.

Apart from these, civil society organisations like Technology Informatics Design Endeavour (TIDE), Bangalore, the Centre for Technology Development (CTD), New Delhi, Centre for Community Development (CCD) Gajapati district Orissa, are using the insights on pro-poor institutional change and rural innovation in several of their new projects.

13. **Where** are the outputs currently being used? As with Question 11 please indicate place(s) and countries where the outputs are being used (**max. 250 words**).

Already answered in question 12

14. **What is the scale of current use?** Indicating how quickly use was established and whether usage is still spreading

(max 250 words).

The scale of current use is modest. Our outputs are related to policy insights on institutional change (change in norms, habits and practices in organisations). These changes require facilitation and relatively longer time frame to be adopted. Our publications, especially journal articles and policy briefs were helpful in sensitising the policy and academic community fairly fast. Facilitated Institutional Learning and Change efforts and the two capacity development workshops we organised (2004 and 2005) allowed us to sensitise other stakeholders (agricultural scientists, R & D managers in Universities and research institutes and civil society organisations) on the possibilities of applying new frameworks such as innovation systems and ways of bringing in pro-poor institutional changes. There is every reason to believe that the usage is spreading, though at a slow pace. There is an increasing demand on the project team for collaboration in research projects, policy consultations, capacity development programmes and curricula development activities. We are selectively responding to them based on availability of funding, personnel, and our own commitments.

15. In your experience what programmes, platforms, policy, institutional structures exist that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the output(s) proposed here and in terms of capacity strengthening what do you see as the key facts of success? (max 350 words).

Promotion of outputs has been facilitated by some of the following programmes, platforms, policy and institutional structures.

- Establishment of the Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy (CRISP) at Hyderabad primarily to consolidate and strengthen the innovation policy studies initiated out of the CPHP projects in South Asia.
- Andy Hall's participation in the CGIAR-ILAC initiative
- Rural Innovation Policy Working Group (RIPWiG) that was formed in India as an advisory and promotion group
- The World Bank sponsored study led by UNU-MERIT (Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: Tools and Options for Strengthening Agricultural Innovation System Capacity)
- Participation of Rasheed Sulaiman V in working group (Agricultural Extension) and Rajeswari Raina in the task force (Bio-diversity and GMOs) constituted by the Planning Commission of the Government of India for the XI Plan (2007-2012).
- Participation of Rajeswari Raina in scenario planning exercise for National Agricultural Innovation Project (NAIP)
- Evolution of the National Agricultural Innovation Project (NAIP) and selection of Dr. Mruthyunjaya as its National Director (Dr. Mruthyunjaya, was previously the Director, NCAP. Note that NCAP had been a key partner in all these projects)
- Selection of Rasheed Sualiman V and Rajeswari Raina as lead authors in IAASTD for the East and South Asia and Pacific Region.
- Establishment of the South Asia Rural Innovation Policy Studies Hub of LINK and hosting of the same by CRISP at Hyderabad. LINK (Learning INnovation, Knowledge) is an initiative of United Nations University – Maastricht Economic and social Research and training centre on Innovation and Technology (UNU-MERIT). Its goal is to advance the understanding of innovation for a New Rural Economy in developing countries through concepts, lessons and guidelines and by facilitating discussions amongst scholars, policymakers, development investors and practitioners dealing with rural development. Coordinated out of offices in Hyderabad (India) and Addis Ababa (Ethiopia), the LINK regional hubs bring together local clusters of researchers, policymakers, and development organisations. The hubs are linked through UNU-MERIT to the international community of scholars and policy experts working on innovation policy studies in developing

countries.

- Participation in national, regional and international conferences.
- Work on (i) other sponsored projects such as the study on institutions for sustainable livelihoods, and analysis of impact pathways for enabling pro-poor priority setting in the rice-wheat consortium (RWC) of CIMMYT-IRRI, (ii) the project proposals for developing rural enterprise clusters using the innovation systems principles for the North Eastern States (currently being reviewed by the NEDFi), and (iii) initiation of work on the 'sector development strategy for *mahua*' as a pro-poor innovation system for tribal development, sponsored by the Office of Scientific Advisory Committee to the Prime Minister, Government of India.

Current Promotion

D. Current promotion/uptake pathways

16. *Where is promotion currently taking place? Please indicate for each country specified detail what promotion is taking place, by whom and indicate the scale of current promotion (max 200 words).*

In India, currently promotion is taking place through the research team's (Andy Hall, Guru Naik, Norman Clark, D. Raghunandan, Rajeswari Raina and Rasheed Sulaiman V) participation in new research projects; Rural Innovation Policy Working Group (RIPWiG); working groups and task forces constituted by the Government of India, capacity development programmes, curricula development initiatives and workshops and conferences. The organisations to which the teams currently belong namely, UNU-MERIT, Maastricht; CPR, New Delhi; CRISP, Hyderabad; CTD, New Delhi and ACTS, Nairobi are also promoting the outputs from the projects in several ways.

In other regions in South Asia, currently we are using the publications (journal articles, policy briefs) to promote the outputs. IAASTD for ESAP Region has provided a window of opportunity to promote the work in the region. We plan to promote some of these outputs through LINK (UNU-MERIT's new initiative) and its recently initiated regional hubs in South Asia and East Africa.

17. *What are the current barriers preventing or slowing the adoption of the output(s)? Cover here institutional issues, those relating to policy, marketing, infrastructure, social exclusion etc. (max 200 words).*

Bringing about institutional changes is very difficult and the process needs to be facilitated. The linear approach to knowledge development (Research) and promotion (Extension/Technology Dissemination), continues to hold sway in most of the public sector. Systems perspectives to innovation have started to penetrate these barriers through special programmes or projects, policy consultations, etc.. Several institutional innovations are being tried in these kind of special projects, but very few people are able to understand the importance of learning lessons from them. Moreover, very few people have skills at unravelling the process and learning lessons so that these could guide institutional reforms. Institutional change among several actors needs to be facilitated as part of action research projects, specially designed learning alliances etc.. Very few in the policy circles realise the importance of knowledge about habits and practices and the experimental nature of reform process and the need for learning lessons from them. Rural innovation policy studies are not considered as an important area of

research by most of the social sciences, mainly because of rigid disciplinary definitions and habits and practices within social sciences. Capacity to understand, appreciate and implement a systems approach to innovation and institutional change continues to remain an important barrier.

18. What changes are needed to remove/reduce these barriers to adoption? This section could be used to identify perceived capacity related issues (max 200 words).

- a. Improving the capacity of policy makers, R and D managers, bankers, and CSOs to appreciate the importance of institutional learning and change and ways of promoting these changes
- b. Forming learning alliances with some of the partners so that the institutional learning becomes a process of self discovery and not an externally generated reform package.
- c. Forming a wider coalition of policy actors (advisory and promotion group) to promote outputs more widely and adequate resources to respond quickly to their demands for helping with select sectors
- d. Undertake capacity development workshops for Senior and middle level managers in various rural sectors on ways of promoting (pro-poor) institutional learning and change to bring about (pro-poor) innovation.
- e. Exploratory studies on specific sectors (beyond crop post-harvest) and using these studies to bring about stakeholder dialogue and facilitate development of joint activities (One of the ways of bringing about institutional learning and change is to promote joint activities)
- f. Lead and participate in policy working groups dealing with rural innovation (at the regional and global level)
- g. Collaborate with rural management universities/institutions to facilitate curricula development dealing with rural innovation.
- h. Participate in and organise national, regional and international consultations
- i. Cultivate a critical mass of rural innovation policy researchers through specific projects/programmes

19. What lessons have you learnt about the best ways to get the outputs used by the largest number of poor people? (max 300 words).

The outputs from the projects are related to policy and institutional change. These have no direct poverty relevance. The outputs are basically intended for use by a wide range of policy, research, and development actors in the public, private and NGO sector, and are meant to change their ways of working or institutional arrangements to work in pro-poor manner. The poor can gain significantly if national programmes and donors (DFID, World Bank, etc) understand and implement this policy advice. Action research, workshops, capacity development programmes, and policy advocacy for institutional learning and change are the best ways to promote use of these policy relevant outputs by these actors.

Impacts On Poverty

E. Impacts on poverty to date

20. Where have impact studies on poverty in relation to this output or cluster of outputs taken place? This should include any formal poverty impact studies (and it is appreciated that these will not be commonplace) and any less

formal studies including any poverty mapping-type or monitoring work which allow for some analysis on impact on poverty to be made. Details of any cost-benefit analyses may also be detailed at this point. Please list studies here.

Impact on policy and institutional changes are difficult to estimate due to several methodological difficulties. As mentioned earlier, the output of this research was not expected to have a direct or immediate impact on the poor. Moreover, we believe that understanding and facilitating learning (institutional learning) is more important in this case than assessing impact on poverty.

21. Based on the evidence in the studies listed above, for each country detail how the poor have benefited from the application and/or adoption of the output(s) (max. 500 words):

- *What positive impacts on livelihoods have been recorded and over what time period have these impacts been observed? These impacts should be recorded against the capital assets (human, social, natural, physical and, financial) of the livelihoods framework;*
- *For whom i.e. which type of person (gender, poverty group (see glossary for definitions) has there been a positive impact;*
- *Indicate the number of people who have realised a positive impact on their livelihood;*
- *Using whatever appropriate indicator was used detail what was the average percentage increase recorded*

Already answered in question 20.

Environmental Impact

H. Environmental impact

24. What are the direct and indirect environmental benefits related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 300 words)

This could include direct benefits from the application of the technology or policy action with local governments or multinational agencies to create environmentally sound policies or programmes. Any supporting and appropriate evidence can be provided in the form of an annex.

Not estimated so far.

25. Are there any adverse environmental impacts related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 100 words)

No. Adoption of pro-poor habits and practices in organizations working with the marginal/poor populations and ecosystems like semi-arid regions or tribal tracts will only add to the environmental management skills of the poor.

26. Do the outputs increase the capacity of poor people to cope with the effects of climate change, reduce the risks of

natural disasters and increase their resilience? (max 200 words)

Policy insights on promoting institutional learning and change strategies within the innovation system, once widely implemented, would promote pro-poor innovation which would increase the capacity of the actors including the poor to cope with/manage/effectively respond to different kinds of shocks, like changes in global prices, avian flu or other epidemics, climate change etc. As an indirect or enabling outcome of the projects, the capacity of the poor to cope with emerging stress/other risks better will improve with new habits and practices, improved knowledge flows and interactions among coalitions of policy, R&D, finance and other service actors along with the poor. Continuous learning as part of rural innovation coalitions will considerably reduce the response time and improve the nature of response of these innovation coalitions to new problems and risks. Basically the move from ad hoc responses to rigorous systems perspectives based analysis of contexts and responses will improve the resilience of entire systems (natural, physical and social capital) and strengthen the most vulnerable in these systems.
