Final Technical Report

R 8372

New insights into promoting rural innovation: Learning from civil society organisations about the effective use of innovation in development.

Report prepared by Andy Hall, LINK Co-ordinator, Hyderabad, India hall@merit.unu.edu

Background

This project addressed policy issues concerned with making more effective use of science, technology and innovation (ST&I) in rural development initiatives that seek to reduce poverty. The research was principally undertaken in India, but also included one case study from Uganda. Looking at a number of rural technology sectors the project sought to pilot test the use of the innovation systems conceptual framework as (i) an appropriate approach for understanding innovation processes that reduce poverty, testing its applicability in different sub-sectors of rural activity and (ii) derive lessons from innovation processes associated with civil society led initiatives that are effectively using ST&I in poverty reduction. An unusual feature of the project was its strategy of establishing a Rural Innovation Policy Working Group (RIPWG) in India to link the research more effectively to policy makers. It is hoped that this policy group will be a prototype mechanism for generating a policy debate on rural innovation grounded in on-going empirical experiences of innovation in development.

Report overview

This report begins with an overview of the research undertaken and outlines what the main implications are for DFID, other international donors, and national policy making bodies. It also discusses some potential follow up activities that DFID might like to consider. Following this are some comments on the project process and the strengths and weaknesses of this. Lists of activities and publications are given in two annexes. Interested reader should also refer to the 2004/ 2005 annual report for this project.

Research overview and implications for DFID and others

1. Overview main findings

Introduction

Conducted in collaboration with the Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy and the Centre for Policy Research (CRISP), India, this study has explored pro-poor rural innovation processes associated with civil society activity in India and Uganda. The project tested two propositions. The first of these is that there are lessons to be gained from civil society organisations about how pro-poor innovation can be enabled. The second proposition is that a useful way of generating lessons is to explore civil society activities with the help of the innovation systems conceptual framework.

Revisiting an old problem with innovation systems thinking.

The innovation system concept is gaining increasing policy recognition as a valuable policy analysis and planning tool (Hall et al 2001; Hall 2005; World Bank 2006). Its attraction is that it recognises, in the same way that has been apparent to many in the development sector, that innovation is not a research driven process simply relying on technology transfer. Instead, innovation, as a process of generating, accessing and putting knowledge into use is a much more complicated and context embedded. Consequently its main determinates are the interactions of different people and their ideas, and the social setting of these interactions and relationships. The innovation system concept's other important insight, and again one which is now widely recognised in the development sector, is that institutions matter. That is to say that the attitudes, habits practices and ways of working that shape individuals behave have an enormous impact on whether or not innovation takes place (often relating to whether different people can interact productively) and who's agenda the subsequent innovation benefits.

While it is easy to dismiss these insights as nothing new in main stream development think, the importance of these lines in the fact that this provides a framework linking two critical estates that have in many senses drifted apart. The first is the research establishment and its unshakable belief that technology development is the way to solve the problems of the poor. The second is the development sector (and we place much of DFID's bilateral efforts in this category) and its understandable disillusionment with the weak performance of science and technology as a driver of social and economic development. The essence of the framework is the proposition that technology and other forms of knowledge can and does bring about the innovations (technical, institutional, market, organisational) needed for development progress. However this will only take place when the correct conditions are created for bringing different ideas and bodies of knowledge together and allowing new ideas that emerge from this to be put into productive use. The caveat being that the framework recognises that such arrangements will only meet specified social and economic goals if incentives and governance structures are in place that can coax innovation process in this direction. How to create conditions that are both supportive of innovation and relevant to the livelihoods of poor people is a central question of this research.

The point of departure of this research was the recognition that many of the organisations involved in knowledge intensive development activities (research, technical advice, training) are still hampered by a very rigid set of habits and practice, i.e. institutions. These continue to set the "industry standard" of how these knowledge intensive activities should be conducted. And, because they are shaped largely by the idea of research-driven innovation, their effectiveness is weak and their ability cause disillusionment with science is high. Thankfully civil society provides a space for organisations that do not feel obliged to follow the rules. These organisations can deal with knowledge in different ways, driven by the desire to show results rather than the need to conform to accepted ways of doing things.

This phenomena has been referred to as *innovations in innovation* (Hall et al 2004). That is, new ways of working that allow knowledge to be used more effectively for social and

economic gain. These are process innovations in the innovation process. The central hypothesis of this research is that unfettered by the norms of science and related institutions, civil society has been able to find many way of integrating scientific and other forms of knowledge into the development process. In other words it has found new ways to innovate and these represent a rich source of lessons that others seeking to promote innovation for developmental purposes could learnt from.

Case studies

This research has undertaken 10 case studies (a list is provided in the annex). One of these was undertaken in Uganda and the rest in India. The studies were undertaken by national collaborators and consultants. The selection criteria were that a civil society organisation needed to play a central role in the initiative and that was some clearly identifiable pro-poor outcome. Finding were presented and reviewed at a workshop in May 2006 and the planning and findings of these studies have been discussed with the projects Rural Innovation Policy Working group.

The cases were as follows: (i) Systems of rice intensification (SRI); (ii) Pineapple processing in Orissa by tribal communities; (iii) Development and promotion of renewable energy-based agro-processing driers; (iv) Rural solar lighting systems; (v) Integrated support of artisan fisheries; (vi) non-pesticide management approaches; (vii) The use of traditional healers in HIV/AID care; (viii) upgrading rural weaving enterprises; (xi) Marketing of medicinal plants; and (x) Watershed based rural development. # i to vii have been written up as formal stand alone case studies. # viii to x are practitioners reports. The SRI report was based on a very large body of material including practitioners reports and histories.

Rather than trying to summarise all 10 cases, an overview is presented of four of these cases as a way of illustrating the critical lessons arising from civil society experience.

1. Technical innovation or a new form of innovation capacity?: The case of Systems of Rice Intensification India.

Systems of rice intensification is a new approach to producing rice that challenges many of the established practices of rice production and the science that underpins this. It was developed by civil society organisations in Madagascar and has subsequently been championed by a number of international development individuals – particularly Norman Uphoff – and subsequently spread to Sri Lanka and more recently to Southern India. The approach involves wider spacing of transplanted rice seedling and limited water use (instead of the usual flooding). The extraordinary thing about the approach is that it gives much higher yields than conventional rice approach -- twice as high and even higher has been reported. While the rice scientific establishment – notably the International Rice Research Institute (at least initially) dismissed the approach – there is now a growing (albiet grudging) acceptance that the approach has something to offer.

There has now been quite widespread experimentation with the approach in South India and this has been lead by farmers, civil society organisations and SRI enthusiasts. Three important points emerge from this case.

The first concerns the way SRI spread. The initial spread was through an informal network of civil society organisations who were willing to try the approach despite, and probably because of the fact that it was entirely counter to scientific wisdom on rice production. Latter on government research and extension organisations in the Southern State of Andhra Pradesh were willing to test and later promote the approach. This however was the result one particular individual who was willing to face the wrath of the scientific establishment -- of which he was part -- and acknowledge the potential of this approach. The other feature of the spread of SRI is that quite often champions emerged who felt obliged to promote it. Not because they were involved directly in research or rice production, but just because they saw the value of the approach and felt it important that such an approach should at least be on the menu of option available for others to try.

The second issue concerns the question of what was actually being promoted. While at one level SRI was a set of principles for growing rice in a new way. Actually more accurately it was a set of principles for exploring rice production techniques in different social and agro-ecological environments. So for example, while SRI can be viewed as a way of reducing input costs and rising yields to improve incomes, some groups of farmers adapted it as way of dealing with water scarcity where it could make the difference between producing a crop and not producing a crop. In this sense SRI was actually a new way to bringing about locally relevant rice production innovations. That it is to say that it was a new capacity rather than a new technology. This point has got lost in many of the debates about SRI which got stuck on technological efficacy.

SRI was also part of a new capacity in the way in which farmers and civil society experimentation with the approach generated new research questions that the scientific community needed to deal with. For example, why was it that water stressing rice improved yield? Unfortunately the scientific community did not (and in fact could not) recognise SRI as a dialoguing point where civil society could contribute to new research agendas. Instead the scientific community criticised SRI from conventional viewpoints and lost the opportunity to gain from a new source of ideas about science and innovation.

The SRI case has many parallels with another one of our cases: namly that on non-pesticide management in Andhra Pradesh. At one level this was a story about how a civil society organisation worked with farmers and research and development partners to create locally relevant past management techniques. Yet more accurately what this really was an innovation in how to create local capacities to respond to an evolving set of pest problem without resorting to pesticide use. Not recognising this, the State Government's poverty elimination programme is currently trying to promote the pesticide management techniques that were developed in the initial pesticide free village. In actual fact the transferable element of the initial success was the process lessons on how to create the local capacity to innovate and not the non-pesticide management technologies.

2. The habits and practices of a successful organisation. The case of TIDE agro-processing dryers.

This case deals with the efforts of an NGO, Technology, Informatics and Design (TIDE) to introduce and popularise energy efficient dryers for agro-processing. In the rural economy of South India where TIDE is operating, important livelihood opportunities for poor people involve fish drying and processing of spices and rubber. Upgrading drying technology can improve incomes and sustainability and alternatively it can form the nucleus for new small enterprises operated by the poor. The case illustrates, however, the way that, in order to have developmental impact, technological change needs to be embedded in a cluster of other changes, relationships and interventions.

Tide found that this involved development and support of self help groups (the organisational focus of the initiative), including strengthening entrepreneurial skills and facilitating access to credit; and networking self help groups for marketing purposes; It involved branding innovations to help with marketing; And it involved linking into complimentary initiatives, notability the state sponsored poverty elimination programme, but also local manufactures of agricultural equipment. Other technology assistance was also needed from a National Fisheries Research Institute and from a donor sponsored fisheries project.

Of equal importance, however, the case also illustrates that the ability to bring about this clustering -- and hence innovation -- is largely determined by the habits and practices TIDE. Specifically its ability to see beyond technology and technology transfer; to recognise the need for other changes and relationships; and the recognition that this package can't be specified at the outset and has to be developed organically in an experimental learning-based way. An important contribution of this case is the way it describe in detail what these habits and practices are. Broadly these habits are those that allow TIDE to make the most of partnering -- in its widest sense – a core methodology; and those habits which proved space and flexibility for mid-course correction throughout the innovation process.

This case and the very similar case of household solar lighting also talk to the bigger question of the poverty focus of initiatives and what this means. Certainly having a pro-poor mandate and the habits and practices that value and maintain focus on the needs of the poor is important. Yet it is also clear that pro-poor innovation has got to involve sound innovation practices, (as well as a pro-poor agenda), if it is actually going to create the livelihood opportunities that poor people need. And when it comes to interventions that are organised around an explicit technical change focus – as in these two cases – a focus on the poor alone is not enough. A broader set of changes and new relationships have to be part of the intervention.

3. In for the long haul of innovation: Integrated sector support and the case of the South Indian Federation of Fishermans' Societies.

This case discusses the historical development of the South Indian Federation of Fisherman's Societies (SIFFS) over the last 20 years. While the nature of the support that

the federation has provided has evolved significantly over the time, its focus has remained on artisan fishing communities. These are one of the poorest social groups in India and the past two decades have seen their livelihoods threatened by mechanised trawling and a social backdrop of exploitation through highly skewed marketing arrangements and social exclusion resulting from issues associated with caste and community.

In this changing context, innovation has been critical to maintaining fishing as a viable livelihood for this community. The case illustrates the way it was not just technical support from SIFF that was required, but a whole range of different types of change and support that were needed to maintain a continuous process of innovation. So for example, in the early years of support one of the key challenges was to improve the technical efficiency and safety of fishing. To achieve this SIFF in collaboration with an international NGO helped in the design and manufacture of a new type of plywood boat. Again this was not just a matter of researchers coming up with a new design – and in fact a national research institute had done precisely this and it had not led to the introduction of the new boat. Instead SIFF facilitated a network of partners to design test, adapt and manufacture the boat. And, because this involved organisations working closely with fishing communities the design was well suited to their needs and was subsequently widely accepted.

Latter on in this case marketing issues became in important issue needing attention and SIFFS reoriented its programme and the organisations it partnered with to address this new need. Later still policy research and advocacy became them main focus of support to the sector and finally SIFFS moved into helping communities access credit.

A number of things are notable here. First is the integrated nature of sector support. Its not just technical change that is required but other changes and complimentary support. Second is the way the needs of the sector change. If SIFF was still supporting technological upgrading of fishing boats its support would be grossly out of step with the needs of the sector. SIFFS was able to usefully reorientation its programme of support, often changing its role and the way it was organised in order to achieve this. The case is less clear on how it was that SIFFS was able to keep its finger on the pulse of the sector. What is clear is the nature of arrangements that facilitated SIFFS to take the long term view and change when it needed to. In this case it was the vision of a series of donors that not only recognised that support had sustain over an extended period – at least 10 years – but also that a high degree of flexibility and autonomy was needed so that SIFFS could grow and evolve in it its most appropriate roles. This long term view allowed SIFFS to facilitate a continuous process of innovation that has had wide spread economic and social impact on one of the poorest communities in India.

4. Institutional innovations to strengthen the capacity of a pro-poor practice: The case of THETA -- Traditional and Modern Health Practitioners Together against AIDS and Other Diseases.

This case discusses an innovation in health care provision in Uganda. It involves a civil society initiative THETA that has promoted collaboration between traditional healing systems and bio-medicine as a way of addressing the health needs of the poorest. Traditional healers remain the health care system of choice for the poor in many parts of Uganda. Modern healthcare systems lack resources and often poor people have limited confidence in them.

The THETA initiative was triggered by a very specific set of circumstances in Uganda in the early 1990's. Namely:

- The severity of the HIV/AIDS crisis in the country.
- The Government of Uganda's response to the crisis of openness at a time when most countries still denied the problem.
- The Government's policy of encouraging anyone with positive solutions to join in the fight against AIDS.
- Claims by some traditional healers of ability to successfully cure AIDS
- The number of patients observed complementing modern medicine with traditional medicine or opting only for the latter
- Recognition in the medical field of the significant contribution of traditional healer as practitioners in the health system

In fact the THETA case grew out of series of increasingly larger projects experimenting with using traditional healers to treat some of the secondary conditions associated with HIV/ AIDS and its transmission. The case highlights the way developing the capacity of a pro-poor "organisation" – traditional healers – can be an effective way of reaching the poor. However the attendant interventions that have been required to put this health care innovation into practice have involved changes at the technical, institutional and policy levels.

For example, the project used science to test and improve the efficacy of some of the herbal based traditional treatments. In innovation system language this would be viewed as the complementary use of different knowledge sources to bring about new outcomes – more effective / acceptable cures in this example. The civil society organisation in this case has played an important role in broking this process bring together these complementary sets of knowledge.

One of the greatest resistances to using traditional healers has of course come from the bio-medical profession itself. Promoting the proposition that these are complementary medical systems was an essential institutional change needed to mainstream traditional healers and probably one that only civil society organisation could advocate for. In the same way THETA has been prominent in national and regional discussion on AIDS prevention and has been part of a commission to frame legislation to formally recognise rational heals within Ugandan law.

This case has many lessons. The first is that there was an environment that both triggered and enabled the use of traditional healers and gave space to organisations like THETA to experiment with approaches that might not have otherwise been permissible. This hints at the importance of organically developed initiatives in preference to externally generated approaches and the value of investing in these local innovations. The second is the way the focus of the innovation was on strengthening a practice that was already pro-poor and the implication this has for picking initiatives that deserve further support.

The third point is the way, like many of the other cases, that the overall innovation was actually a clustering of technical, intuitional and policy changes and the way that there were an evolving series of issues that needed to be dealt with. The fourth point, which is particularly important from the perspective of this research project is the way that despite the fact the case dealt with a very different sector to all the other and despite the fact that it was a very different national setting, many of the broad lesson and principles were strikingly similar. This provides confidence in the finding across all the case studies and helps us identify some truly generic issues.

Summary of main findings.

Clearly the illustrative cases discussed above can not do justice to the wealth of information contained in the case studies, but they certainly provide support for the hypothesis that civil society is an important source of lessons on the innovation process. A number of important points are notable and warrant further emphasis.

- Innovation is abundant in civil society activities and often involves a set of interrelated changes – technology, ways of working, policy and ways of organization production and marketing.

- Civil society organizations play two important roles. As a space for trying out new ideas and ways of working that would often not be permissible in main stream research and development organizations. As a mechanism for facilitating links to technical and other expertise and to policy.

- Within civil society space individuals often play pivotal roles either in championing an innovation or an alternative innovation process, or as a "connector" who has no involvement in the alternative innovation process but want others to find out about it.

- While it seems rhetorical to say that civil society organizations introduce a strong pro-poor agenda, the empirical evidence confirms that it is very often true. But to be pro-poor initiatives need to be pro-innovation also. Pro-poor organisations that have a narrow technology transfer mentality will not create new livelihood opportunities for the poor. In other words socially responsible agendas have to be couple with the habits and practices which enable innovation.

- Two modes of pro-poor action were observed. The first being the development of pro-poor business models through cluster of technical, organizational and institutional innovations and subsequent efforts to bring these to scale – for example agro-processing or weaving enterprises. The second was an integrated sector support approach, helping poor people cope with changing contexts in their sectors – for example artisanal fisheries.

- The more successful modes of support involved long term interventions – 10 years and more -- where the approach and focus of support was able to evolve and develop organically, often in response to the changing needs of the pro-poor sector or the pro-poor enterprise. For example, technical change may be more important at certain times, but subsequently policy or marketing issues maybe become the priority. A learning-based approach was a crucial part of the capacity of civil society organization that worked in this way.

- Two common constraints to pro-poor innovation emerged: the difficulty of developing productive interactions with research organizations and with the policy making processes; and a lack of bank lending mechanisms for taking pro-poor business innovations to scale. These two issue could provide useful intervention points for programming activities.

How useful is the innovation systems concept?

The research team that have undertaken this research have been developing and using the innovation systems approach for a number of years. We believe it has allowed us to reveal some the processes and factors governing pro-poor innovation that are not necessarily apparent though approaches such techno-economic appraisal, livelihood analysis, cost benefit analysis or market appraisals. Admittedly there is, to borrow a phrase from the Profumo Affair, an element of "we would say that wouldn't we". We never the less feel that the empirical evidence from our cases supports our contention that understanding innovation as an embedded process of knowledge sharing and learning where institutions and institutional change are centre stage, provides a convincing explanation of the sources of success in the cases we have explored.

The research team has recently taken this work one step further in a study for the World Bank (World Bank 2006) by developing an intervention framework aimed at moving beyond strengthening agricultural research systems. The next logical step for those interested in promoting rural innovation would be to attempt the same exercise for knowledge-based rural development initiatives more generally. We note that DFID in its new Research Into Use programme has adopted much of the innovation system language.

References

Hall, A.J. 2005 Capacity development for agricultural biotechnology in developing countries: an innovation systems view of what it is and how to develop it. Journal of International Development. Vol 19, No.5:pp 611-630

Hall, A.J., B Yoganand, Rasheed Sulaiman V., Raina, R, Prasad, S, Niak, G and N.G Clark. (Eds) (2004) Innovations in Innovation: reflections on partnership and learning. ICRISAT, Patancheru, India and NCAP New Delhi, India 238pp

Hall A.J., , M.V.K. Sivamohan, N. Clark, S. Taylor and G. Bockett. (2001) Why Research Partnerships Really Matter: Innovation Theory, Institutional Arrangements and Implications for the Developing New Technology for the Poor. World Development Vol. 29, No 5 pp783-797

World Bank 2006 Enhancing Agricultural Innovation: How to go beyond the Strengthening of Research Systems. The World Bank: Washington DC pp149

Implications for DFID and others.

Clearly research liked this has a myriad of design implications for individual projects and this is not the place to deal with them all. But what are the big issues? The first is that the case discussed here and the many others which have been documented recently (Douthwaite, 2000, Biggs 2005, 2006 Hall et al 2003 and 2004) highlight that donor distinctions between research and development initiatives would seem to make little sense. Artificial separation of the research and technology development process from the more general development process is actual weakening innovation capacity. It disconnects knowledge creation from the context of economic production where it needs to be used, and it prevents the creation of the relationships needed to share knowledge, perspectives, agendas and learning.

It is also, we believe, symptomatic of an anti-science and technology bias in much of development practice. While donors like DFID stoutly deny this accusation, the agricultural science and technology research supported by DFID is safely hived off either through investments in the CGIAR or by outsourcing its research programmes with no operational connection to bilateral programmes where the majority of its money is spent. In the cases we have observed, the more successful civil society interventions have seen the need to bring in research and technical services into their development interventions. The cases have even come up with new ways of mobilising research expertise and organising its contribution. They have recognised that innovation is an integrated process and have been happy to ignore the traditional distinctions between the two estates of research and development. And these cases have shown that getting the innovation process right is an equally important contribution to pro-poor innovation as having a socially responsible, pro-poor mandate and out look.

The second related point is that many donors continue to make is that having invested heavily in research, they then feel obliged to invest in technology transfer to try and maximise their impact of their earlier investments – a common strategy in the CGIAR for example. This is understandable, but it is never the less a major mistake. As our cases show, the critical issue is the need to promote interactions between research and knowledge use. In the same vein the cases also show that technical change is embedded in a much broader cluster of changes that are needed to collectively bring about

innovation. A narrow focus on technology transfer will not create this cluster of accompanying changes. As we saw with the technology focused cases of TIDE dryers and solar lighting, technological change is only one element. The cases such as SRI and NPM suggest that actually what needs to be transferred is not the technology, but the process knowledge on how to build local capacities to innovate.

On a topical note, the Research Into Use Programme (RIUP) of DFID is vulnerable to falling back into old technology transfer ways of working that the findings of this project would suggest are flawed. While recognising the ambitious scope of RIUP, its initial starting point of identifying "validated" technologies that can then be matched with a demand for those technologies raises many alarm bells. The innovation systems language associated with RIUP needs to be translated into a fundamentally different approach. In this approach institutional learning and change (rather than technical change) should be given centre stage in the longer term process of experimentally building the capacity to innovate around selected developmental themes.

The challenge for DFID is two fold. The first is to breakout of the technology transfer mind set and start to address the underlying need to help strengthen innovation capacity in its widest, systemic sense – better patterns of interaction between scientific and economic, social and policy actors; habits and practices that promote interaction and learning; and governance structures that ensure that economic and social aspirations are addressed in a sustainable way.

The second related challenge is to break out of the false dichotomy that views science technology and innovation interventions as separate from development. This is largely a bureaucratic distinction, but illustrates an underlying mind set. Perhaps recognising that "research" needs to be thought about as part of a capacity strengthening activity and that this is integral to the development process would help break out of this. Without such a change in mind set, large amounts of money will continue to be wasted on research and technology transfer-like activities.

Moving away from these strategic points about the structure of development assistance, what are the implications for programming at a national level. Two major points emerge.

The first point concerns picking winners. That is identifying promising civil society activities that are promoting pro-poor innovation. Public funding to such initiatives would provide more choice in approaches, bring legitimacy to promising alternatives and act as source of learning to inform interventions design. This runs counter to much of development intervention thinking where problems are first identified and then attempts made to solve these. How about something novel like supporting success, filling gaps and scaling it out so that more people can be part of this success. This sort of thing is referred to by some in language of positive deviance.

The second point concerns the creation of a new space for action. The creation of new public policy and intervention space to address the theme of rural innovation in a truly integrated and holistic fashion. There a number of dimensions to this. The firsts relates

to the fact that rural innovation (particularly in India, but also elsewhere) is a mandate that cuts across many well established groups and their attendant institutions -- different research councils, Department of rural development and so forth. The second is that the types of intervention required are different. The focus needs to be on both building new patterns of interaction and creating the incentives to allow alternate approaches and ways of working to emerge that strengthen pro-poor innovation capacity. This is really a case of propagating the idea that interaction and learning to work in different ways can add value to existing technical and development expertise and interventions. This is something that is clearly not happening in the existing set up, but which is something that is desperately needed.

It is difficult to specify at the outset what this new policy and intervention space would look like and of course this would be highly contextual to different country settings. Perhaps all that can be said is that countries need to establish a "rural innovation learning facility", so that all actors from policy makes to the poor themselves could learn how to innovate.

Next steps

The findings of this project have been discussed with the projects own Policy Working group (RIPWiG – see below) throughtout the research process; findings have been presented at an international conference in October 2006, and a summary of the project and its findings has been made available through the UNU-MERIT LINK web site (www.innovationsystems.org). The project has generated a large amount of primary information in the form of case study reports (see publications annex). The project has not yet fully exploited the richness of the material it has generated. Currently the project team is preparing a book proposal to make a collection of the most useful of the case studies. While one might assume that the last thing that is needed is an other book, in fact so few social and policy studies of rural innovation (in the contemporary) exist that such a collection is both policy relevant and useful for teaching purposes. The case study material will also be used in the training programmes of UNU-MERIT, CRISP and its partners.

It would seem that DFID should try and make use of the material developed in the project and the expertise that has been built up in the research team as a result of this project. We would like to see DFID make more use of this expertise in relevant areas of their work such as the RIUP.

Comments on project process

This has been a 2 year project with a modest budget and a large agenda. In retrospect the project would have been better to do less case studies and to make more of them during the life of the project. All researchers in the project put in substantially more of their time than was budgeted for and they will continue to spend time on further developing the outcome of the project.

One of the good things that has come out of this project is that it has helped build a strong team of researchers in India working on this theme. Although in fairness we all knew each other well, this project has given us the operational focus to further strengthen our small network. Its has also been part of the operational focus that has allowed UNU-MERIT and CRISP to form a larger initiative on rural innovation, namely the Learning INovation and Knowledge (LINK) network (see www.innovationstudies.org) . This is a network of rural innovation policy studies hubs in South Asia (Hyderabad, India) and East Africa (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia). The project has generated significant information to fuel this network.

One of the novel features of this project was the establishment of a Rural Innovation Policy Working Group (RIPWIG) as an advisory and promotion group. This was much more challenging than we anticipated. We got good support from a small group of senior individuals, a hard core of which attended most of the meeting (see annex for details). As researchers, it took us some time to tune into what policy actors where interested in. To help in this orientation, the RIPWIG tasked us to investigate government schemes and critique them. It is fair to say that it took us two years to find out what excited them and what was needed to engage them in useful discussion. One of the useful outcomes of the RIPWiG was that it led to the research team working with one of the members on a new project that this member was interested in. The RIPWiG has not been dissolved at the end of the project. Instead it is being expanded to act as a an advisory and promotion group for the UNU-MERIT LINK initiative in South Asia.

The most disappointing aspect of the project has been DFID's reluctance to engage with the research team. For example, the Rural Livelihoods Advisor in the DFID Delhi office agreed to be a member of the RIPWIG. However the Advisor attended none of the meetings (all held in Delhi) and only on one occasion sent a representative (a junior member of staff) in their place. Senior and busy Indian policy actors attended these meetings, so why not DFID? The London office has been equally uncommunicative. Other than reminding us about over due reporting, we have had not had feedback on our annual report or material we have sent. We understand that DFID is a large and busy organisation, but why commission policy relevant research and then disengage entirely from the policy research process? It will be interesting to see if we receive feed back on this final technical report.

Case studies Annex

1. Aagor Weaving Programme: A Case Study on Upgrading Traditional Weaving to Access Niche Domestic and International Markets.
Prepared by Jennifer Liang, ANT, Gwahati, India.

2. Integrated pest management (IPM) in Andhra Pradesh, India: Three case studies in rural innovation.

Prepared by Laxmi T. Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy, Hyderabad, India.

3. System of Rice Intensification in India: Implications for Promoting Pro Poor Innovation.
Prepared by Shambu Prasad C. Centre for Research and Innovation and Science Policy, Hyderabad and Xavier Institute Management, Bibaneswar, India, India.

4. Institutional innovations in herbal medicine sector-a case study of FRLHT.
Prepared by Shuresh S. Gramooglia, Banaglore, India.

5. Linking the Poor to markets through value addition- a case of IDEI in Orissa.
Prepared by Rasheed Sulaiman V, Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy, Hyderabad, India.

6. Integrated sector support to promote pro-poor innovation: The case of SIFFS
Prepared by Rasheed Sulaiman V, Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy, Hyderabad, India.

7. Solar Energy for Rural India: Pro-poor Innovations in Innovation.

Prepared by Rajeswari S. Raina, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, India

8. Learning from civil society led rural innovation: fish drying micro-enterprises in coastal villages
Prepared by Rajeswari S. Raina Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, India

9. Traditional and Modern Health Practitioners Together against AIDS and Other Diseases (THETA): Promoting Collaboration between traditional healing systems and Biomedicine.
Prepared by Agnes Naiga, NIDA associates, Kampala, Uganda.

10. One step forward and no step ahead: NGO's and the Dilemma of innovation.
Prepared by Tara, Institute for Rural Management, Anand, India

Publications / documentation Annex.

General

Hall, A.J. (ed) 2005. RIPWiG Reporter. Edition No.1 Discusion newleter of the Rural Innovation Policy Working Group. UNU-INTECH: Hyderabad, India

Laksmi, T. 2005 Hypothesis and research questions for IPM civil society study. Project report of Centre for Research and Innovation and Science Policy. 4pp.

Agnes Naiga 2005 New insights into promoting rural innovation, lesson from promoting rural innovation. Shortlist of Possible Case Studies in East Africa. Project report of NIDA 9 pp

Rajeswari Raina 2005 Innovation for Development: an analysis of two Government schemes. Project report / workshop handout accompanying presentation. 4pp.

Saeed Parto 2005 New Insights into Promoting Rural Innovation: International lessons from Civil Society, draft report of UNU-INTECH, Maastricht, the Netherlands 35 pp

Shuresh S. 2005. Institutional innovations in herbal medicine sector-a case study of FRLHT. Consultancy report 17 pp.

Case study reports.

Jennifer Liang 2006 Aagor Weaving Programme: A Case Study on Upgrading Traditional Weaving to Access Niche Domestic and International Markets. Project report 15 pp

2. Laxmi T 2006 Integrated pest management (IPM) in Andhra Pradesh, India: Three case studies in rural innovation. Project report 29 pages

3. Shambu Prasad C 2005 System of Rice Intensification in India: Implications for Promoting Pro Poor Innovation. Project report 47 pages

4. Shuresh S 2005 Institutional innovations in herbal medicine sector-a case study of FRLHT. Project report 15pp

5. Rasheed Sulaiman V 2006 Linking the Poor to markets through value addition- a case of IDEI in Orissa. Project report 18 pp

6. Rasheed Sulaiman V 2006 Integrated sector support to promote pro-poor innovation: The case of SIFFS . Project report 27pp.

7. Rajeswari S. Raina, 2006 Solar Energy for Rural India: Pro-poor Innovations in Innovation. Project report 29pp

8. Rajeswari S. Raina 2006 Learning from civil society led rural innovation: fish drying micro-enterprises in coastal villages. Project report 27 pages

9. Agnes Naiga 2006 Traditional and Modern Health Practitioners Together against AIDS and Other Diseases (THETA): Promoting Collaboration between traditional healing systems and Biomedicine.

10. Tara 2006 One step forward and no step ahead: NGO's and the Dilemma of innovation. Project report 5 pp

Conference papers
(note: these paper form a special session on rural innovation at the Globelics 2006 conference. The team was invited by the conference organisers to develop this session. Globelics is an annual international conference that brings together innovation policy researchers)

T. Laxmi, 2006 NPM as a means of enhancing Rural Innovation Capacity. Globelics 2006, Trivandrum India.

Rasheed Sulaiman 2006 New insights into promoting pro-poor rural innovation: lessons from civil society. Globelics 2006, Trivandrum India.

Rajeswari Raina 2006 Development and Diffusion of Energy Efficient Devices –Lessons for pro-poor innovation from TIDE. Globelics 2006, Trivandrum India.

Andy Hall 2006 Towards an understanding of pro-poor rural innovation capacity: addressing the challenge of the a new rural economy. Globelics 2006, Trivandrum India.

Annex. Members of the Rural Innovation Policy Working Group

Sl	Name	Organisation	Address	E-mail	Phone
1	Mruthyunjaya	ICAR-NAIP	National Director, National Agricultural Innovation Project, ICAR, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan- II, Pusa, New Delhi 110012, India.	ndnatp@icar.org.in	011- 2584 8772 fax:011-
2	OP Agarwal AK Verma	CSIR CSIR	Head R & D Planning Division, CSIR. Anusandhan Bhavan, 2 Rafi Marg, N.Delhi. 110001. Jt. Adviser. R.&D Planning Div. CSIR.	op_agarwal@yahoo.com akverma@hq.csir.res.in	011-23713011, 23710453 fax-01-23710340/ 23714788 011-23711978, f fax: 011-23710340
3	Wilfred Lakra	TRIFED, Ministry of Tribal Affairs	Managing Director, Tribal Co-operative Marketing Federation, (TRIFED) II Floor, NCUI Building, No. 3, Siri Institutional Area, August Kranti Marg New Delhi 110 016.	trifed@nda.vsnl.net.in	(O11) 26866084.
4	Anuj Sinha Shashi Ahuja Raghav Saha	Department of Science and Technology (DST)	Technology Bhavan, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi - 110016. Director, Science and Society Programme, Technology Bhavan, New Mehrauli Road, New Delhi - 110016.	sanuj@alpha.nic.in raghav@alpha.nic.in	011-26567373, fax: 011-26960207 011-2685 9581
5	Maj. S. Chatterjee	Vigyan Bhavan	Room No. 310 A Office of the Principal Scientific Adviser to the Government of India, Vigyan Bhavan - Annexe, Maulana Azad Road, New Delhi 110 011.	schatterjee@alpha.nic.in	011-26533486 (Of.DST) 011-23022035 (Vigyan Bhavan)
6.	Anil Gupta	National Innovation Foundation	National Innovation Foundation, India PO Box 15051, Vastrapur Ahmedabad 380 015, Gujarat	anilg@sristi.org	079-26324927
7.	Jagpal Singh	CAPART	Dy. Director, CAPART. India Habitat Centre Zone-V-A, 2nd Floor Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110 003.	capart@caparthq.delhi.nic.in drjagpals_rtd@yahoo.com	011- 24642393,24656697 fax: 01-24648607
8	Rohini Nayyar	Planning	Advisor, Rural development Planning	rohini@yojana.nic.in	011-23096592

	(Chairperson-RIPWG)	Commission	Commission, Yojana Bhavan, New.Delhi. 110001		
9	J. K. Mohapatra,	Min. Rural Devp	Jt. Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development, R.No 163, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi- 110001	j.mohapatra@nic.in	011-23383553 Fax- 011-23388207 Or 2338 2408
10	Arun Kumar	Development Alternatives	Development Alternatives B-32, Tara Crescent Qutab Institutional Area New Delhi – 110016	tara@sdalt.ernet.in akhosla@hotmail.com akumar@devalt.org	011-2685-1158, 2696-7938
11	Mihir Shah	Samaj Pragati Sahyog (SPS)	SPS, Jata Shankar Rd. Post. Bagli, Dist. Dewas. M.P. 455227.	samprag@vsnl.com	07271-272727 / 275500 / 275550
12	D Raghunandan	Centre for Technology& Development	D-158, Lower Ground floor, Saket, N.Delhi-110 017	ctddsf@vsnl.com	011 26524323
13	Ken de Souza (represented by Srinivasan Iyer)	DFID (India)	Director DFID (India) British High Commission B 28, Tara Crescent, Qutab Institutional Area New Delhi – 110 016	k-desouza@dfid.gov.uk	011- 2652 9123
Researchers					
14	Andrew.J.Hall	Senior Researcher	UNU-Intech,Keizer karelplein19,6211 TC Maastricht, The Netherlands	hall@intech.unu.edu andyhallmails@yahoo.com	+31-43-3506345
15	Guru Naik	Program Director	CCF India,22 Museum Road,Bangalore-560001	guruzi@ccfindia.com	09810570770 09845410955
16	Shambu Prasad.C	Associate Prof.	Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar 751013.	shambuprasad@gmail.com shambu@ximb.ac.in	0 9440396242
17	Rasheeed Sulaiman V	Scientist	National Centre for Agricultural Economics and policy Research, Pusa Librarhy Avenue,PB No. 11305 New Delhi110012	s.rasheed@indiatimes.com	09810431610
18	Rajeswari Raina	Senior Research Fellow	Centre for Policy Research Dharma Marg, Chanakyapuri New Delhi 110 021	rajeswari_raina@yahoo.com rraina@cprindia.org	011- 2611 5273 -76 ext. 214 09810956469
19	T.Laxmi	Researcher, CRISP	C/o ICRISAT,Patancheru,Hyderabad-502324.AP	Crisp.research@cgiar.org	040 3071 3615 09849090642