CROP POST HARVEST PROGRAMME

Institutional Learning and Change-A capacity Development Approach to exploring and strengthening post-harvest innovation systems in South Asia

R No 8310

ZB No 0358

PROJECT FINAL REPORT

Start date – End date
(July 2003 - Dec 2004)

Core Partners:

Guru Naik
Rasheed Sulaiman V
Rajeswari Raina
Andy Hall
Norman Clark

Joint Managing Partners:
Guru Naik
Rasheed Sulaiman V

Managing Partner's Institute
Livelihood Solutions

Project Final Report

Section A Executive Summary

A very brief summary of how the outputs of the project contributed to the purpose, the key activities and highlights of dissemination outputs. (Up to 500 words).

Strengthening pro-poor institutional learning and change within the post-harvest innovation system demands a. identification of the principles and procedures involved in strengthening post-harvest innovation system, b. improving the capacity of the various stakeholders to apply, develop and promote these approaches and c. process insights on how to achieve this through an interactive policy research process. The project has synthesised the principles and procedures involved for this (output 1), primarily through case studies on pro-poor post harvest innovation and have experimented with approaches such as networking, training on theory and application of the innovation systems framework and facilitated institutional learning and change approaches to improve the capacity of various actors to promote these approaches (output 2). The principles and procedures emerging from these cases are being circulated widely through policy briefs and through a proposed report/compendium. The formal training on rural innovations, the database of individuals and organisations involved in post-harvest innovation and interested in applying the emerging insights would develop a momentum and wider interest in promoting these approaches. The processes adopted by the project and what we have learnt during this process (process insights) have been documented and analysed (Output 3). This is an important contribution for all others who are interested in doing policy research for strengthening the innovation capability in the post harvest sector and also in other sectors related to rural development. All the above project outputs would contribute to pro-poor institutional learning and change in post harvest innovation systems.

Section B Background

B.1 Administrative data

NRIL Contract Number: Z	Managing Partner(s)/Institution(s): 1. Guru Naik, Livelihood Services, Gurgaoan, Haryana 2. Rasheed Sulaiman V, National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research, New Delhi-12 (INDIA)
DFID Contract Number: R	Partner institution(s) a. National Institute of Science Technology and Development Studies (NISTADS, New Delhi (INDIA) b. International Crops Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics, Andhra Pradesh, India/ UNHU-INTECH c. University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK/ Kabarak University, Kenyas
Project Title: Institutional Learning and Change: a capacity development approach to exploring and strengthening post-harvest innovation systems in South Asia	Target Institution(s): Actors and organisations in the post harvest innovation system

Research Programme: Crop Post-Harvest	Start Date: July 03 End Date: Dec 04
Thematic area: Post-Harvest innovation policy	Budget (i.e. Total Cost): GBP: 93449

Section C Identification and design stage (3 pages)
Poverty focus

How did the project aim to contribute to poverty reduction? Was it enabling, inclusive or focussed (see definitions below[1])? What aspects of poverty were targeted, and for which groups?

Poor people have restricted access to the products and governance of crop post-harvest innovation systems. Pro-poor innovation systems need to respond to this issue. Evolution of the required diversity of approaches and trajectories necessary to support the diversity of hopes and aspirations and opportunities that the poor can realise, would necessitate institutional learning and change across the different actors/agencies and in their relationships. The project tried to address this problem by focussing on the policy and institutional changes necessary to address the weaknesses in transforming structures that cause restricted access of the poor to the post-harvest innovation systems. The project falls under the category "enabling" as it is trying to strengthen the institutional and policy environment that will underpin poverty reduction strategies. The project aimed to contribute to poverty reduction by addressing the need to shift the thinking and practice that informs and shapes the broader policy environment and through experimenting with a number of approaches to facilitate this process of institutional learning and change in post harvest innovation systems.

Please describe the importance of the livelihood constraint(s) that the project sought to address and specify how and why this was identified.

Poor people face lack of access to the products (for example, processing, storage and packing technology and marketing innovations) and beneficial outcomes (for eg: safer food, preferred food, environmentally sustainable employment opportunities in agro-based enterprises) of crops post-harvest innovation and weak or no participation in their governance (ie decision making on priorities and approaches, evaluation of success or failures). In the terminology of sustainable livelihoods framework, this problem concerns lack of access to transforming structures and is characteristic of an underlying lack of social capital (in the broad sense of networks). This is reflected in weak networks linking the poor to post-harvest innovation systems, lack of representation and voice and skewed governance of these systems. This is a generic problem of post-harvest innovation systems in India and in other regions where the R and D and innovation process is embedded in similar institutional context.

These livelihood constraints were identified mainly through the findings from the previous CPHP project "Optimising Institutional Arrangements for demand driven post-harvest research, delivery, uptake and impact on the livelihoods of the poor through public and private sector partnerships" (R 7502) that had examined the way the partnerships have evolved (and not evolved) in the post-harvest sector. The learnings from this project provided several useful insights and these were used while formulating this proposal. Review of studies on rural livelihoods in the two Indian states (Madhya

[1] **Enabling**: addresses an issue that under-pins pro-poor economic growth or other policies for poverty reduction which leads to social, environmental and economic benefits for poor people
Inclusive: addresses an issue that affects both rich and poor, but from which the poor will benefit equally
Focussed: addresses an issue that directly affects the rights, interests and needs of poor people primarily

Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh) also brought out the issue of weak networks the poor have and the resultant inability to readjust to the relatively rapid change in farm and non-farm situation witnessed in the 90's. The project coalition thought it important to address this need through formulating a project that can directly address the policy and institutional changes necessary to enhance the capacity of post-harvest innovation to respond effectively to the needs of the poor.

How and to what extent did the project understand and work with different groups of end users? Describe the design for adoption of project outputs by the user partners?

The end users primarily identified by the project are the policy makers and practitioners (including grass root and community organisations) that are involved in the process and outcomes of post harvest innovation systems and are committed to promoting a poverty focus in these systems. The project worked with the different groups by undertaking the following activities.

a. *Case studies*- Interacting and learning with the 3 other CPHP Projects in the region and by undertaking case studies covering interventions in the three other sectors, lac, medicinal plants and biomass based dryers. Findings from these case studies are being widely disseminated through policy briefs, journal articles and as cases/learning materials in the capacity development workshops.
b. *Networking*- Developing a community of practice in the post harvest innovation system comprising scientists, research managers, extension specialists, rural development administrators, the NGOs, the processors, equipment manufacturers, the farmers and farm women who are all involved in different aspects of the post harvest innovation system.
c. *Facilitated Institutional Learning and Change Exercise*- Working with two institutions involved in post harvest research (Central Institute of Post Harvest Research and technology) and extension (Krishi Vigyan Kendra of Central Plantation Crops Research Institute) and facilitating development of partnerships with organisations having complementary expertise and pro-poor focus. For instance, in the CIPHET case, we initiated dialogue with the DFID funded Livelihood project in Madhya Pradesh, the Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihood Project. (Value addition is an important area of intervention identified by the MPRLP) In the case of KVK, CPCRI, we facilitated the establishment of partnerships between the KVK and TIDE, an NGO working for the promotion of biomass based post harvest equipment and the State Poverty Eradication Mission, Kerala (*kudumabsree). A workshop was also organised involving all these partners at CPCRI, Kasaragod during 27-28 October 2004.*
d. *Training Programme on Rural Innovations*- Worked with about 20 participants (representing research, extension, policy, export promotion and NGO sectors involved in post harvest related activities) through organising a capacity development workshop at ICRISAT from 22-29 November 2004.

The project partnered with several of these potential users in all the above activities, thereby paving a path for adoption of the project outputs and thereby influencing policies and institutional changes towards the emergence of a pro-poor post harvest innovation system. To promote the findings of this project, the ILAC project team also gave lectures on these issues to a number of other organisations.

Institutional design

Describe the process of forming the coalition partnership from the design stage and its evolution during the project?
Is there an explicit institutional hypothesis? If yes, is it trying to attack a failure or inadequacy in a mechanism?

What other institutional factors were seen as being important?

Process of forming the coalition partnership:

Three partners knew each other from working together in previous CPHP projects, and had analysed and recommended a coalition of partners as the way ahead for effective innovation systems. Formally, the first meeting of all the partners in this coalition was in ICRISAT, at the Concept Note workshop in 2002. The core partners then were Dr. Andy Hall (ICRISAT), Dr. Rasheed Sulaiman (NCAP), Dr. Rajeswari Raina (NISTADS) and Dr. Norman Clark (Univ. of Strathclyde).

The partners also had read, reviewed, and cited each others research papers. Along with complementary analytical skills (in innovation systems, learning and communication, institutional reform, science policy), and the mandates of the respective organizations (institutional and policy issues related to agricultural and rural technologies and development), a commitment to questioning and seeking solutions to the dominant agricultural R&D paradigm (evident from some formal conferences/seminars where the partners heard each other speak), a willingness to share literature, information and ideas, and a capacity for self critical reflection and learning, were also important traits among partners that led to this coalition. During several informal discussions, conferences and project workshops, the partners discussed how an analysis of institutional contexts and learning processes could help post-harvest research projects, and how such a project could use the specific skills of each of the coalition members.

A colleague Dr. Stephen Biggs was also instrumental in enabling the first informal meetings between Hall, Sulaiman and Raina. As the project proposal progressed to the PMF stage and some of the institutional requirements of the project (such as need for networking, local NGO contacts, flexible project management) became clear, the initial coalition requested Guru Naik to join the coalition and become a joint-Managing Partner along with Rasheed Sulaiman. Here again, previous work experience (the tomato box case) helped identify and bring Naik into the project.

Evolution of the coalition during the project::

To start with, the coalition initiated a review of literature on aspects related to Institutional Learning and Change and Capacity Building. These were compiled and synthesised in the book "Innovations in Innovation". During Nov-Dec 2003, the team initiated the fieldwork for the case study of lac and medicinal plant sector. By early 2004, it became clear that the work environments and consequent professional commitments for three of the coalition members, Clark, Hall and Naik are going to change. This forced the coalition to think of strategies to contract out some of the works assigned to each of them. However, the coalition maintained former communication patterns, consultations and ways of working (processes) wherever possible.

The coalition has evolved to encompass a wider network of researchers and other individuals involved in post-harvest operations– mainly through the process of looking for, discussing with and identifying people to undertake selected case studies of learning and change in innovation clusters, inviting to and interactive participation in two workshops organized by the ILAC team, etc. Specific changes within the core ILAC coalition are:

(i) development of capacities within the coalition – members learning new skills and finding new ways of working, such as project management skills, communication strategies for specific stakeholders, understanding and participating in technical/process details discussions (fuel efficient and cost-

effective dryers, lac), increased confidence in addressing/interacting with policy makers;

(ii) expansion and development of new research projects and project development processes along lessons learnt – these involve new partners with new and relevant skills/institutional contexts;

(iii) involvement in and a commitment to help and institutionalize some practices and concepts (institutional learning, facilitated capacity development, process documentation and analysis of lessons learnt) in other (extended) networks such as in CapNet India, and organizations such as CGIAR (ILAC), TIDE, CASA, and IIM (A).

(iv) increased awareness of problems within coalitions of diverse interests and skills, and improved capabilities to resolve such problems;

Explicit institutional hypothesis:

Pro-poor institutional learning is the route to effective post-harvest innovation systems. This is the technical hypothesis. The explicit institutional hypothesis is that there are ways or processes that enable this institutional learning. And this institutional hypothesis is tested by documenting and analysing these ways and processes within this project, as well as interactively with other stakeholders/collaborators involved in pro-poor post-harvest innovations.

Initially, the need for this project to specifically understand the process innovations in research projects was felt and discussed in two ways. The first was during the evolution of the CPHP project R 7502, where the partners realized and provided evidence on the way process innovations and technological innovations were both crucial to effective innovation systems. Secondly, the project partners felt that despite excellent and target oriented publications highlighting these findings, existing practices and institutional arrangements/processes in the post-harvest sector (R&D organizations, private-public partnerships, policy –making organizations, NGOs, markets and other stakeholders) had not changed. This ILAC project was designed to address these findings and inadequacies in existing mechanisms through facilitating innovative ways of working or processes – specifically through facilitated capacity development exercise and interactive policy research.

Other institutional factors influencing design of the project:

The institutional output of this project documents and analyses the processes that enabled learning within the project. For the project partners the institutional design was influenced by recognition of and dissatisfaction with (a) existing linear and top-down knowledge hierarchies in formal post-harvest R&D organizations/policy making bodies, (b) limited communication and opportunities for communication among different post-harvest stakeholders, (c) lack of pro-poor organizational features/structures, (d) social science research that had not yet identified and analysed the processes that facilitate the capacity for learning and innovation among these actors. The project was designed to tackle these inadequacies. Methodologically, besides a coalition of partners with complementary skills, better communication, linkage building, and facilitation strategies, the project consciously decided to work with and do case studies of three existing CPHP projects (designed along an innovation systems framework), and three non-CPHP innovation clusters.

Section D Implementation process (5 pages)

How was participation maintained among the different stakeholders (the Managing Partner(s) and the Core other Partners and, where relevant, user communities) in the research process?

Authentic participation was ensured by the project design, especially through regular and open/transparent communication (because two of the partners were outside India and travel and other professional commitments of partners in India). One of the operational rules set was about transparency and scope for deliberations in all decisions, primarily to avoid asymmetries in information flow and learning. This includes:

- Copying all e-mails regarding project matters to all coalition members
- Frequent meetings among all partners based in India
- Sharing important literature
- Debating and contesting ideas in the literature with respect to field experience
- Sharing field notes/drafts for comments and needed follow-up
- Shared understanding about lead responsibilities and authorship/ credit
- Ensuring that differences in organizational cultures (international research centre, NGO, University, agricultural research council, industrial research council) associated with each member in the coalition will not interfere with the functioning of the project
- Exploring opportunities within each of the different organizations to generate an ambience for the uptake of lessons or joint learning with the project

In each activity taken up with research organizations, NGOs, policy-makers, or with existing innovation clusters, the project made conscious attempts to highlight the purpose of this project, and explain how participation in a partnership mode, with the goals, stakes, costs and processes clearly stated would be useful for specific stakeholders, short and long term goals (of individuals and organizations), and for the innovation cluster itself. In each of the project activities the agenda was (i) to facilitate institutional learning among partners –by identifying and highlighting their process innovations/ways of working, changes therein, and (ii) to enable partners/case study organizations/clusters to build the skills necessary for documenting and analysing learning processes. In the latter case participation was limited by the constraints in the user organizations – especially NGOs or small groups like SHGs, who had limited skilled personnel, and were working on tight budgets. To deploy one person to document and analyse the learning processes and consequent changes in ways of working was too heavy a demand (even though they would appreciate the need to inform others about these ways of working that go along with, shape and enable technological change).

Details (e-mail communications) of the participatory processes involved in organising the TIDE-CPCRI-ILAC interactions is illustrated in Annexure IV c.

What were the major changes that took place during the implementation period. For each one, explain why they came about and how well did the project manage them?

1. Changes in jobs/professional commitments of partners: Three of the five core partners Clark, Hall, and Naik moved to new jobs/organizations. Though their

professional commitments were more or less research, teaching and guiding, advocacy and review/advise, as before, there was a new time line that the project had to contend with given these new professional demands on the time of three of the core team members. Specific responses made within the project were: (a) to re-work and reduce substantially, the time allocation earmarked against these partners, (b) to develop a strategy to find individual consultants who could undertake the case studies and other work formerly allocated to these partners, (c) to meet, discuss (it was important that these consultants understand the innovation systems framework, and have the capacity to analyse the institutional lessons learnt within each innovation cluster case studies) and identify, as well as contract out these studies, and (d) specifically for the Managing Partner(s) to reallocate and learn project management and financial management skills- develop new capacities given that one of the two Managing Partners now had a new job and limited time. The project managed these changes well – but was affected by the time and intellectual effort taken up in these changes and management activities.

2. Changes in CPHP management: The programme management in South Asia shifted from Hall in ICRISAT to Shambu Prasad in CRISP (Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy) in April 2004. ILAC team was instrumental in setting up CRISP.

3. Transfer of key officers/bureaucrats identified to collaborate with the project: This came about because of change in Government and political affiliations of public sector employees. This was particularly the case with the facilitated capacity development exercise that the project had committed to do – by bringing together a post-harvest R&D organization (CIPHET) and a major public sector poverty eradication programme (DPIP- in M.P.). Since the initial contacts made in DPIP, in Rewa (M.P.) were strong the project kept the attempt going with DPIP – discussing and trying other contacts in M.P. and also contacting the World Bank office in Delhi (managing the DPIP). It was through these interactions that the team learnt about the bureaucratic overload and routine administrative approach to poverty reduction in DPIP.

   As the DFID (India) work took shape in M.P. with the initiation of the MPRLP, the ILAC team met and discussed the ILAC agenda with the CEO of MPRLP. The MPRLP and CIPHET are keen to work together on post-harvest innovations in tribal areas/products. The Director of CIPHET agrees that this would bring to CIPHET the much-needed opportunity for learning and institutional change. Since the MPRLP has just begun work, it was decided that the 'Learning Forum' constituted under the MPRLP could host a meeting between the two potential 'poverty reduction' partners, bring more locally relevant post-harvest/other infrastructural/service partners, and devise strategies for working together. An important lesson for the project concerned the capacity to decide when to give up one track/line of investigation that was not working. Perhaps the project should have pursued this objective of facilitated capacity development with more than one poverty eradication programme (as it did later) instead of focusing on one.

4. National and state level policies: These policy elements that induced changes in post-harvest technologies were, (a) policies (especially incentives) encouraging agro-processing and trade in processed goods, (b) policies (disincentives) prescribing environment friendly manufacturing practices, (c) policies and specific programmes that responded using S&T inputs, to needs of tribal/non-farm/urban/ livestock sectors. The project tried to and did successfully map the

ways in which individual organizations and innovation clusters responded to these policy and programme changes influencing the post-harvest sector. Specific mention here must be made of how this project interacted with and studied, and helped modify the processes or build new partnerships in (a) the innovation system of fuel efficient dryers and stoves, (b) design of vegetable grading/processing units, (c) design of and planning for effective eco-development strategies for tribal areas in Madhya Pradesh (d) facilitating integrated/systems thinking in water management projects, conservation agriculture projects, etc..

What were the strengths and weaknesses of your monitoring system? How did you use the Information provided by your monitoring system?

The monitoring system derives from the discussions in the coalition about the previous project monitoring exercise, where there was a felt need for monitoring indicators to measure the process or institutional aspects of the project. The key strength of the monitoring system – sets of three monitoring domains against each project output and monitoring indicators for each of the domains – is that it enables the coalition and any external actor or reviewer see the distinction between the project technical outputs (analysis of and lessons from cases of institutional learning in innovation systems) and the institutional outputs (the ways of working or processes that lead to this analysis and learning within this coalition). The monitoring domains always helped check if the project milestones were on track. In every instance of communication with other collaborators/stakeholders outside the core coalition, the project maintained a record of the communication and analysed it to reveal the learning and change enabled through these. This monitoring system also informs the coalition about the perspectives and views that other stakeholders (scientists/policy-makers/other CPHP project members/NGOs/ and others) have about this project (ILAC) and its purpose.

One of the key findings from monitoring domains and measures 2.2 and 3.1, was that there was a perception of this project gaining from or feeding on the positive results of the other CPHP SA projects. It was this discovery that enabled the coalition to re-address (at least among the three CPHP cases and three non-CPHP cases analysed) the fact that the analysis of process innovations and learning processes especially, does not depend on technological successes. These monitoring indicators (revealing wrong perceptions among collaborators and inadequate communication strategies within the coalition) helped orient discussions and presentations to address the need to learn lessons from technologically successful and not-successful projects. The coalition also then articulated more clearly, the factors/processes that enable and lead to these lessons within coalitions.

A weakness of the monitoring system is that despite building interactive processes or ways of working into the project, there is still a significant lack of understanding among public sector scientists about the need for an 'institutional analysis' of post-harvest projects/innovations, the need for systems concepts and benefits to science from understanding/learning about systems interactions. Having hypothesised that failures are important steps to learning, the project team decided to convert this monitoring input – a failure to communicate effectively to the scientific audience the role of and need for institutional learning – into a constructive process of designing better communication methods and involving scientists in discussions on 'how' their own laboratories, programmes or organizations have learnt lessons. A recent occasion (December 6th 7th 2004) to try this was available at the CPHP write-shop organized in CRISP, ICRISAT, to fulfil the CPHP programme objective of getting each project to write its own institutional history. The ILAC coalition utilized this opportunity to present its own institutional history

and interactively involve/discuss learning processes within each project with the scientists in the other CPHP projects.

Another effective use of the monitoring system was from the response we received to the book 'Innovations in Innovation' (2004) and the paper presented at the ILAC Conference in IFPRI (February 2003). While many appreciated the quality of publications and one partner (Andy Hall) was directly involved in preparing the background document, project flier, and designing the processes for CGIAR's ILAC programme, the coalition noticed the apathy of individuals and organizations when it came to changing their own ways of working or processes. Systematic feedback revealed that even those who desired new and pro-poor processes in their research organizations could do little for want of the enabling policy environment – including policies and processes for personnel assessment, curriculum development, etc. Along with this, the two workshops organized by the ILAC team revealed a need for significant capacity development efforts before even those innovation clusters practicing principles of successful innovation systems could appreciate these very same principles and how they learnt these lessons as well as enable other innovation systems to learn these principles or lessons. Two projects evolved from this concern for involving policy makers directly in the research process as an advisory/critique group, or even as coalition members. One of these projects, involving a Rural Innovation Policy Working Group was initiated in July 2004 (sponsored by DFID UK) and the other one on 'process innovations' for marginal/tribal areas with a strong capacity development agenda is under review with CPHP (NRI).

What organisations were involved at the end of the project? Were there changes to the coalition (joining/leaving) during the project? If yes, why?
Include a complete list of organisations involved, directly or indirectly, in the project and describe their relationships and contributions.

The five member project coalition remained throughout the project period. The professional changes made by three members of the coalition have been detailed in the Institutional Analysis report (Annexure VI b). The list of organizations involved – roles, relationships and contributions is given in Table 1.

Table 1: List of organizations involved in the project directly/indirectly – their relationships and contributions

Sl. No.	Organization	Main relationships and contributions
1	National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research (NCAP)	Policy research centre of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), NCAP's involvement in this project by way of participation of Rasheed Sulaiman has given more acceptance to the policy findings that emerge from this project within the ICAR and wider agricultural research community
2	Livelihood Solutions and Livelihood Services since May 2004	This organisation of which Guru Naik is the Director, provided the appropriate management (administrative and financial) support to the project.
3	ICRISAT – and UNU/INTECH since April 2004	Both these organisations where Andy Hall have been working provided the crucial access to the project to communicate to an international audience on issues related to partnerships and institutional learning and change ideas. It also provided access to important professional contacts within the CGIAR and other donors.
4	University of Strathclyde and	Professor Norman Clark represented these organisations in the project. Normans experience with innovation studies and capacity development

	Kabarak University since December 2003	provided the right conceptual oversight to project interventions
5	National Institute of Science, Technology and Development Studies (NISTADS)	Policy think tank of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). NISTADS's involvement in this project by way of participation of Rajeswari Raina has given more acceptance to the policy findings that emerge from this project within the CSIR, Department of Science and Technology and wider (industrial) research community
6	Central Institute of Post-Harvest Engineering and Technology (CIPHET)	Involved with this project indirectly from the beginning. CIPHET could appreciate the value of our work for post-harvest research and is a part of the facilitated Institutional Learning and Change exercise we are engaged with. CIPHET's support to our work helped us in linking with several post-harvest scientists working with the All India Co-ordinated Research project on post-harvest technology.
7	Madhya Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project (MPRLP)	This DFID funded livelihood project is currently involved with the facilitated Institutional Learning and Change exercise we are engaged with CIPHET.
8	Technology Informatics Design Endeavour (TIDE)	This NGO which is also a case study organisation of the ILAC project partnered with the ILAC facilitated Institutional Learning and Change exercise. TIDE led the Capacity Development Workshop on market skills for rural value added products organised by the project at CPCRI
9	Central Plantation Crops Research Institute (CPCRI)	CPCRI is a partner in our facilitated Institutional Learning and Change exercise. Collaborated and hosted the Capacity Development Workshop on market skills for rural value added products. CPCRI and TIDE have now partnering in several activities
10	State Poverty Eradication Mission, Kerala (*Kudumbasree*)	Participated in the Capacity Development Workshop and is currently providing the pro-poor focus to the activities of CPCRI and TIDE. Both organisations are working with the Self help Groups of poor women organised by the Kudumbasree.
11	International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) South Asia Region	Collaborated with the Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations organised at ICRISAT. The ILAC team is working with ILRI (through CRISP) to support the fodder innovations project by providing crucial institutional insights
12	Centre for Research on Innovation and Science Policy (CRISP)	The ILAC team set up CRISP mainly to provide continuity to the CPHP programme co-ordination for the region. Apart from reporting and getting guidance on this project from CRISP, the ILAC researchers are collaborating with CRISP to develop it as a hub for innovations studies and capacity development activities on Institutional Learning and Change.
11	NABARD	The ILAC team sent a copy of the book 'Innovations in Innovation' to the NABARD Chairperson following the Chairperson's remarks on learning processes within organizations. NABARD expressed an interest in capacity development programmes in rural innovation for rural banking professionals. The ILAC team has been following up on this with the Regional Office of NABARD in Karnataka and will initiate (a) a collaborative case study on one rural innovation supported by the Bank, and (b) a proposal for capacity development of rural banking professionals to support/enable rural innovations.
14	Aga-Khan Foundation	The ILAC team was sent the AKF call for proposals for their rural innovation fund. This was sent from CRISP. In a meeting to discuss the proposal with the Programme Officer, AKF, in Delhi, the ILAC team presented the key findings of the ILAC project and the attempts we were making to get these messages across to other stakeholders in rural innovations and development. The Officer requested us to meet the CEO of the AKRSP, in Gujarat, and expressed an interest in exploring more meaningful synergies with the ILAC team and CRISP than just a proposal or project. This, they said could go from a synthesis of the

		lessons from their work on dry land agriculture, to courses on rural innovation in the AKF Universities.
15	CapNet India	This network - Capacity Development and Networking for operationalizing Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) has developed and adopted an action plan where the typical (as practiced in CapNet global or other regional networks) Training of Trainers etc. has been complemented by (and in some capacity development arenas replaced by) a portfolio of facilitated capacity development experiments. A copy of the CapNet action plan is enclosed.
16	ResNet SA	This is an interactive research network for water research in South Asia, where the ResNet call for concept notes clearly reflects lessons learnt about the 'research processes'. The assumption here is that integration demands a different 'way of working' governed by a different set of rules/norms. Besides demonstrable research products, projects on IWRM should also give us an understanding of *how* the research process was initiated, formulated, implemented, re-designed, monitored, evaluated, and how the lessons learnt at each stage helped the research process.
17	Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies on Ecology and Development (CISED	ILAC has been discussing with a range of researchers keen on interdisciplinary methods and CISED is one organization where researchers have asked for ways by which disciplinary barriers can be removed or reduced, and means to get researchers and other stakeholders to discuss and learn from each other. The ILAC team has discussed some of the observations it has on these learning approaches that its case studies have revealed. But we need to give them the papers – once we have drafts ready.

How will(have) project outputs affect(ed) the institutional setting?

How will the technical outputs of the project (if successful and if adopted) change the organisations and the relationships between them and in what way? Refer to the project's technical hypothesis.

The project's technical hypothesis is that "the route to more effective crop-harvest innovation systems is pro-poor institutional learning and change." In reality most organizations and individuals in the post-harvest sub-sector lack access to the processes and institutional arrangements that facilitate this pro-poor institutional learning and change. While the project is aware that these problems of poor governance mechanisms (inadequate organic linkages and working relationships between different post-harvest system components that can deliver pro-poor public goods, lack of a pro-poor voice and representation in scientific/ technological decision-making, etc.) are generic to most developing country R&D organizations, the project made specific attempts to enable learning about these institutional contexts and change the ways of working or institutional arrangements in specific organizations. Thus different capacities for institutional learning were enabled in different organizations- a few crucial ones are summarized here:

Project output 1: Promotion of principles and procedures involved in strengthening pro-poor post harvest innovation systems.

This output, synthesised and summarised in a book, a policy brief, conference papers and workshop presentations, training notes, and power point presentations (made by the coalition members and other stakeholders participating) in these workshops/seminars to train/promote ways of strengthening pro-poor innovation systems (Attached here), affected the perceptions, demands and ways of working in some key organizations (these are listed above). These institutional influences were expressed as:

(a) Conscious decisions within organizations to include process documentation and lessons learnt from these experiences as part of project work (this is specifically the case with TIDE, Capacity Development and Networking for IWRM (CapNet India) launched by UNDP, and the Interactive Research Network for South Asia (ResNet SA)
(b) Request for institutional analysis of on-going research programmes/projects (this was made specifically from the Rice-Wheat Consortium, CASA, International Livestock Research Institute, and Aga Khan Foundation)
(c) Recognition of the need for capacity building among research managers, policy makers, rural banking and other infrastructure managers, co-operatives and private sector organizations. This was articulated at the workshops and discussions throughout the project period.
(d) Demand from natural science and social science participants for more effective evaluation methods and incentives – again articulated in workshops.
(e) Formation of a Rural Innovation Policy Working Group (RIPWG) as part of a follow-up project to experiment with new ways of promoting rural innovations, and the response, and specific request from this RIPWG for procedures to promote rural innovations in mainstream Government schemes.

Project output 2: Strengthening and sustaining the capacity of stakeholders to apply, develop and promote systems perspectives on pro-poor innovations.

This output was delivered mainly in the form of two project workshops organized in CPCRI, Kasaragod and ICRISAT, Patancheru. The demand for these workshops came from several sources, including the recommendations of the Scientific Advisory Council of CPCRI, technology transfer problems faced by KVK of CPCRI, the management and field operations problems in post-harvest technologies/processes faced by TIDE, the constraints in poverty eradication through processing and marketing rural products faced by the Kerala State poverty eradication mission, the problems in financing rural enterprises addressed by NABARD and others in the rural banking system, technological and marketing problems women's SHGs and micro-enterprises, and several other individuals and organizations who had interacted with the project coalition.
The institutional settings affected by these outputs include –

(a) Better understanding of processes of partnership building and evolution of coalitions of stakeholders – application of these processes are likely in the collaborations built by this project, between TIDE and CPCRI, and between MPRLP and CIPHET.
(b) Demand for capacity development experiments and designs thereof, to replace or become part of conventional training programmes – this was evident in the deliberations of and action plan adopted by CapNet India (a coalition of actors for capacity development and networking to facilitate integrated water resources management) in similar post-harvest clusters in East Africa (discussed and planned with Prof. Norman Clark), in discussions held with the Department of Science and Technology (DST) – Science and Society Division, CAPART (Ministry of Rural Development), and NABARD (Head Office and Karnataka State).

Project output 3: Process insights gleaned from this project on how to do interactive policy research documented, analysed and promoted among post-harvest sector stakeholders.

The project had at the outset visualized this output as a conscious learning mechanism for the project partners. The synthesis or process insights have been written up as institutional output of this project. The process of achieving these

institutional insights while conducting interactive policy research, capacity development and networking had been shared and discussed with a range of stakeholders- (a) the three CPHP projects, (b) the three non-CPHP projects/ innovation clusters, (c) policy makers and scientists, (d) NGOs and civil society organizations, (e) donor agencies – DFID (India), ICEF, AKF, and DST. All these stakeholders express a keen interest to understand these processes for doing and facilitating interactive policy research and a willingness to experiment. There was a common demand from all stakeholder organizations for capacity development both process-oriented and material (as in specific personnel and funds) for constantly documenting, analysing and drawing lessons. Somehow, the process insights are still seen, even among the stakeholders who appreciate the need for process insights, as something over and above the technical insights or components and not as an integral part of the technical details of the project that must be understood and promoted.

Section E Research Activities (15-20 pages)

This section should include a description of all the research activities (research studies, surveys etc.) conducted to achieve the outputs of the project analysed against the milestones set for the implementation period.

Information on any facilities, expertise and special resources used to implement the project should also be included.

The project initiated the following sets of activities to achieve the project outputs as given below:

Literature Review on Institutional learning and Capacity Building- The partners initiated this activity immediately after the project memorandum was approved. This review revealed more clearly the importance of institutional learning and change as a way of creating the constantly shifting links, partnerships and approaches that underpin innovation. The three major concerns that further research in this area must address were identified as follows:

Firstly, the main thrust of enquiry needs to be on understanding how institutional learning and change takes place, and how it can be strengthened and promoted. Secondly, ways of exploring how learning takes place is an empirical question itself. Furthermore, a research question of this type would lend itself to an action research approach whereby ways of building learning and change capabilities are investigated in real time and supplemented with case histories from wider experience. Thirdly, the research and capacity building action research activities needs to be embedded in the greater task of developing a community of practice that simultaneously builds consensus and advocacy as well as linking research into the range of stakeholder interests (farmers to policy makers) associated with how innovation is organised and promoted. To make the same point differently, this suggests an approach whereby research is used to feed training and facilitate institutional learning and change activities which themselves then form the basis for the development of a network or community of practice. This is very much a shift in direction away from the formal policy research that we conducted in our earlier work, where the approach was to develop broad principles and recommendations for research managers and planners.

This mixed approach to policy research that we suggest should be referred to as interactive policy research signifying the iterative, systems nature of the approach and distinguishing it from the conventional policy research approach critiqued for example, Sutton (1999). In addition to the conclusions we draw from our earlier research work,

advocay for such an approach can also be seen in recently published views of the organisational capacity development literature (Ticehurst and Cameron, 2000) and the evaluation and capacity development literature (Horton, 2002; Horton and Mackay 2002, Stein, 1997). These sources stress the need to design, negotiate and implement change (eg: new policies and institutional arrangements) with the full participation of the stakeholders involved. Beijing and Hotland (2001) for example provide an example of how this Interactive policy approach has been used to develop agricultural extension policy in Albania. Horton (2002) provides an useful definition of capacity development that highlights the reason we give such importance to an interactive policy research perspective; " the process by which individuals, groups and organisations improve their ability to perform their functions and achieve the desired results over time".

This institutional learning and change agenda also concerns the need for research teams to learn how to operationalise this interactive policy approach. This in itself will be a key source of institutional and methodological lessons. This perspective of removing the (notional) distinction between the researched and the researchers is emerging as central to much of the debate about good practice in development (eg: Abbot and Gujith 1998; IDS 1998; 2001), and there is considerable literature on ways of pursuing such approaches (Lusthaus et al, 1995; Binbridge et al.200; Lawrence et al.2002). Of course, the innovation systems framework attaches similar importance of these learning mechanisms. Indeed, as this perspective notably recognises, relationships and interactions between agents have to involve non-price relationships and that while the transaction costs theory of institutions (for example, North 1990) cannot explain the dynamics of such systems, an interactive learning theory of institutions can (Lundvall et al.2002). The novelty of this interactive policy approach that we are suggesting here, however is the use of this case study material to illustrate in training and capacity development exercises in supporting pro-poor post harvest innovation.

1.2 Case studies of CPHP Projects and other relevant experiences to explore the way Institutional Learning take place and other institutional mechanisms that lead ot pro-poor post harvest innovation
1.3 Case studies of pro-poor innovation validated or challenged with existing theories of innovation and social change
1.4 Synthesis of institutional learning and other pro-poor innovation principles

a. <u>CPHP cases</u>

Case 1: Developing a coalition approach to non-timber forest produce for better livelihoods of tribal communities of Madhya Pradesh

This project is located in one of the poorest tribal blocks of Madhya Pradesh State, where the tribal populations eke out a living from the collection and marketing of non-timber forest products (NTFP). While the processing options do exist, they are used rarely for want of both technological and institutional support facilities. Previous attempts at bringing processing technologies to these tribal communities have often left them with an overload of technological options with little or no change in the institutional arrangements that can get them access to these technologies (and their locally suitable adaptations), finance and other infrastructure facilities necessary to make the technologies work, the scale (volume) of produce needed for operating the mutual trust and norms required for collectively acquiring or sharing any of these technologies or market processes (like bargaining with the local collection agent/middleman for a better price, storage facilities to wait for the lean season to begin) etc. The project was initiated with a view to understand the local systems of produce collection, processing and marketing, so as to bring both the technological and institutional arrangements that will ensure better livelihood options for these tribal villages. The project purpose is to learn

from action research, the development processes required for increasing the economic benefit of poor tribal community through improved quality and better market linkages of NTFP by a coalition of diverse institutions. The project consists of four partners:

a. the Mahatama Gandhi Institute of Rural Development (MGSIRD hereafter)
b. the NGO Tarun Sanskar
c. the Tropical Forest Research Institute (TFRI) and
d. Livelihood Solutions Pvt Limited

The main features of the case are described below:

Partner selection - The team went through a wider search for potential partners and narrowed down their choice to the above 4. Each partner brought specific skills into the coalition. The coalition selected 4 SHGs of women tribal producers to work with. These SHGs had a tremendous influence on the technical and institutional processes adopted by the coalition and in a sense the SHGs became the fifth partner in this coalition.

The partner selection process reveals processes of seeking (a) complementing competencies/skills (b) enabling organisational environment/work cultures, (c) enthusiasm and commitment from individuals, (d) contacts from previous positive professional/personal associations, (e) flexibility, and (f) clear definition of roles. Those with strong overriding interest, technological determinism and unable to cope up with a coalition mode of working were discarded in the initial stages.

Partner roles (envisaged and performed)- Though specific roles were identified for each of the partners, during implementation most of these roles were performed collectively and there have been changes in roles and responsibilities. This hasn't led to any kind complaints as the coalition realised the need for changing roles and responsibilities to meet the project goals. Almost all possible decisions were taken by the coalition collectively after discussing several options. This include, decision on the commodities to intervene (keeping in view the pro-poor criterion), the possible technological interventions, operationalising working capital support to groups, the kind of capacity development interventions needed etc,.

Institutional changes. The partners also performed new roles which they have never performed earlier to meet the evolving demands of the project. This include:

a. long period of hand holding and regular interaction of the TFRI scientists with the SHGs;
b. MGSIRD for the first time imparting training to illiterate tribal women (than training only officers and development workers);
c. negotiation among SHGs, banks and Tarun Sanskar on developing better mechanisms to manage funds earmarked for SHGs.

Pro-poor focus- There are several features in this project that ensured pro-poorness. This include:

d. identification of the right kind of commodity that effectively interacted with several points in the livelihood system of tribal households (mahua and lac),
e. selection of SHGs of poor tribal women engaged in NTFP and their ability to influence the coalition as a group,
f. decision to focus on enhancing livelihood options and giving maximum control over the produce and decision making to the tribal households than focussing on best technological options (such as industrial use of mahua)
g. identification of interventions to prevent distress sale and thereby realise better prices

h. willingness of the coalition to listen, understand, empathise and support the perspectives of the tribal SHGs (demand for capacity development related to management .

Learning- The coalition leant the nuances of working in a coalition especially when the organisations they represent have major differences in work culture. Apart from this there have been learnings related to the continued and diverse support (technological, marketing and institutional) required for making technologies accessible and utilisable by the end user and this has led to many of the institutional changes described earlier. Similarly the coalition realised the need to learn from past interventions (that have failed, for instance, lac) and have interacted with personnel involved in the failed intervention. The coalition also used the services of others like MP Vigyan Sabha to train the SHGs on processing activities. The major institutional lesson learnt within this coalition is that its own ways of working is an important output in itself and this was reinforced by the explicit demand made by the CPHP to develop its own institutional history.

The project experience also revealed that a. working on one technology or a group of NTFP technologies had to go hand-in-hand with continuous internal assessments of these technologies and the marketing strategies; b. the need for hand holding in any technological interventions; and c. the need for wider capacity development among all the actors.

Coalition management : The coalition experience reveal that the following practices are important for managing a coalition effectively. This include:
a. regular meeting, and open communication among all partners
b. spell out rules of operation and responsibilities of each partner- activity wise, so that the coalition is founded on a common understanding or roles and accountabilities
c. openly acknowledge and encourage changes in behaviour/norms observed among coalition members
d. encourage internal debate and evaluation-reconsider decision made or activities implemented regularly
e. create and encourage active interest from a wider network of actors-build social relationships in the context, so that local social/political support is maintained.

Case 2: Integrating Markets, Products and Partners: An action research to explore and develop a management system for linking tribal community to markets through value addition

The project primarily emerged out of the experience and conviction of the International Development Enterprise, India [IDE(I)] an NGO on the appropriateness of the coalition approach in linking the poor to new technologies and markets. IDE(I) since a decade has been promoting low-cost and affordable irrigation technology to the small and marginal farmers of Orissa. By 2002, IDE has completed a DFID-CPHP funded project on developing a packaging system for tomato in Himachal Pradesh and was looking for opportunities to replicate this model in another project area and with new project partners. IDE(I) has been working with Centre for Community Development (CCD), another NGO of Gajapathi District of Orissa mainly to promote the *Kisan Bandhu* Pumps. Gajpathi, though one of the backward tribal districts of Orissa, has a good production of horticultural products, but absence of value addition options, technical expertise and lack of linkages with high value markets have been forcing the farmers of this district (and also few more districts of Orissa) to sell their produce at very low prices. CCD has been articulating this problem for the last 5 years with several organisations, but hasn't got enough support to address this. Through past interactions with CCD, IDE(I) was aware of this problem. When the CPHP-SA office approached IDE(I) to submit relevant project proposal for funding in 2002, the IDE(I) decided to address this

broader livelihood issue of lack of value addition and marketing opportunities of tribal farmers in Orissa by developing a coalition with CCD and OUAT.

IDE(I) had been working with OUAT for R and D and trials of its irrigation technology. CCD had also been facilitating OUAT in the field trials of the prototype low-cost processing machines (dal processing) designed by OUAT. All these partners knew each other before and had a good working relationship and coming together to work on a new initiative has been a pleasant opportunity for all the partners.

A case study on this initiative was conducted by the ILAC team to understand primarily the processes employed in this project and the institutional lessons it generate and to understand how each of these organisations innovated and how the routines and habits helped or hindered this coalition in achieving its goals. The findings of this case study challenges the traditional approach of compartmentalising problems of producers into research and extension issues (gaps) and addressing the same separately in a sequential mode. In contrast this project, developed and arrangement that could successfully integrate the different activities from the beginning by selecting the right kind of partners.

The main features of the case are described below:

Partner selection: During the project design phase, there was a clear and defined need for partners who could contribute the following elements to the project and subsequently a coalition was formed with the following partners.

a. A managing partner that had prior experience of working with Crop Post Harvest interventions and had marketing skills -IDE(I)
b. a grassroots level NGO that could mobilise resources and address the needs of the community of the area (CCD)
c. A technical institution with a credible Crop Post Harvest Department, that could conduct trials, appraise technology and transfer it to the poor tribal community- Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology (OUAT)

Prior association among all coalition members really helped. Each partner brought three distinct skills. Though conceived as a coalition of three partners, during the project phase the project interacted and worked with a number of other organisations/ actors such as SHG federations, agro-processing companies such as Orissa Marketing Federation (OMFED), Aaren Foods, Mamta Agro-foods, manufacturers of processing and packaging equipment, Government and funding agencies such as DST, CAPART etc. Some of them could have been formally brought into the project to strengthen the coalition. Coalitions thus should have a provision to co-opt new partners and should strive to bring new partners during the project phase, if it is found useful to meet the wider project goals.

Coalition management: Formal establishment of a steering committee to guide the project, frequent meetings among the partners, joint search for solutions irrespective of the specific partner roles, posting of a field officer of the Managing Partner in the project site, use of mobile phones to be in regular touch with each other all facilitated the project partners to share observations, reduce mis-understandings (likely if communication channels are weak) and gain a common perspective. Apart from OUAT's technical skills, what matters most was (a) its willingness to use the networks provided by the project to test and adapt its technologies in the field conditions and (b) the ability of the project team to accept limitations and look for new site specific technologies. Similarly CCD's presence, its networks with the SHGs and its influence in the local area facilitated the project interventions. Local partners are thus important

in similar projects. IDE(I)'s experience and ability in managing coalition projects and its strong market skills facilitated the project to try and experiment with different market partners and lead the project successfully.

Enabling policy environment. OUAT's adoption of ICAR contract research provided the right kind of incentives to scientists, adequate provision of operational funds and more importantly the enabling environment for partnerships to flourish. The experience from this project has been reported to be influencing other scientists and departments within OUAT to pro-actively search for coalition projects that too specifically with non-research partners.

Institutional changes. With the right kind of links and relationships by the CCD and the informed by the success of these interventions, other public sector organisations such as OMFED and officials of the state Government expressed keen interest in this project. For instance, OMFED was willing to change its norms regarding procurement and payment for SHGs. Similarly the senior officials of the Government of Orissa have asked the project coalition to examine possibilities of replicating this project experience in other districts of the state. Scientists of the OUAT were more than willing to work even on holidays and explore all possible kinds of flexible interpretation of financial and administrative rules possible by the university administration for the smooth implementation of the project.

Learning There has been continuous learning in this project. This include looking for new ways of managing emerging issues such as hygienic production, development of new products, taking wider portfolio of products than originally envisaged, exploring the possibility of establishment of a processing centre, working with several new processing agencies etc indicate the kind of continuous learning that has been happening in this project. To make better impacts projects like these need a longer duration, say 3-4 years. Currently the average time available under CPHP for these kinds of projects is only 2 years.

Case 3 Exploring Marketing Opportunities through a Research, Industry and Users Coalition: Sorghum Poultry Feed

The project grew out of a long-standing partnership between certain scientists at the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics and the private sector. Production and consumption of sorghum has declined in the last thirty years but it remains important to poorer producers in mixed farming systems. Earlier ICRISAT research established that there would be a greater demand for rainy season sorghum in animal feed, especially for poultry, if producers reservations could be overcome and links between stakeholders created. In 2002, in response to the CPHP call for proposals, ICRISAT scientists took the initiative of forming a coalition project involving Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University (ANGRAU), the Federation of Farmers Associations (FFA), the Andhra Pradesh Poultry Federation (APPF), and Janaki feeds (a private poultry feed manufacturer) to address this important issue.

The major features emerging from this case study are as follows.

Partners- This coalition in a sense brought together the different pieces of expertise that is necessary for making rainy season sorghum as an acceptable feed by the poultry industry and farmers. This include, sorghum scientists, poultry scientists, the feed manufactures, the sorghum farmers and poultry growers. Working in such a wider coalition of actors (ICRISAT, ANGRAU, FFA, APPF, Janaki Feeds etc) from varied organisations and institutional culture has been a challenging and totally new

experience for all the actors. All the partners belong to the same state, talk the same language and are also geographically closely located.

Learning- While this has been a totally new learning for the actors, the actors realised that this allowed them to achieve their objectives more successfully than they could have done if working separately. The methodology of the research was designed collaboratively, As a result, scientists carried out repeat experiments on poultry, at the request of poultry farmers and feed manufactures, which greatly increased their confidence in the evidence. It is unlikely that if the scientists had been working in isolation, the poultry farmers and feed manufactures would have been less satisfied with the methods.

Coalition management The coalition established a project secretariat at ICRISAT to maintain links among partners, share information, facilitate reporting and act as a resource centre for the coalition. To oversee feeding trials, the research team formed a steering committee headed by the representative of the feed industry. Selection of credible and legitimate representatives of stakeholders, clarity and appropriateness of roles agreed jointly at the beginning of the project, informal networking and contacts, regular face-to-face meetings, financial accountability, transparent and consensual management, collective planning, innovation and learning, trust on competence of each actors have all contributed to the performance of the sorghum coalition.

New behaviour- The creation of new links between these stakeholder organisations allowed private sector feed manufactures to buy direct from farmers; facilitated collective bargaining and marketing by farmers; and enabled jointly directed research through a Steering Committee.

Non-CPHP cases

Case 4: Institutional innovations in herbal medicine sector-a case study of FRLHT

The paper explores a non-governmental initiative in the medicinal plant sector from the perspective of understanding innovative processes and their institutional contexts. The Foundation for the Revitalisation of Local health Traditions (FRLHT) is a leading organisation in the medicinal plant sector in India. It was formed in recognition of;

a. the requirement of taking up a major effort at the national scale for strengthening the material, human and knowledge base of traditional medicine.
b. The need for involvement of government agencies such as the forest department in a big way in this effort since they are currently the major custodians of the bio-resources which form the essential material base for traditional medicine,
c. The need to establish links with like minded organisations exploring alternative paradigms of development, particularly in the area of Science and Technology not only in India, but also in other parts of the world.

In 1993, FRLHT launched a major programme for the conservation of medicinal plant resources in India. This was a joint effort involving FRLHT, Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Government of India and the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). This programme was initiated in three southern states of Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Karnataka. In 1999, the programme on situ conservation of medicinal plants was extended to the states of Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra through the support of UNDP-MoEF project. In 2000, it established a community owned enterprise for procuring and selling medicinal plants, called as Gram Mooligai Company primarily to improve the livelihoods of rural poor engaged in collection and cultivation of medicinal plants.

The case study describes the genesis of FRLHT, its various programme components, partnerships and internalisation, networking, pro-poor commercial enterprise development etc. The main findings are as follows.

- FRLHT since its inception in 1993, has innovated on several strategies and this was facilitated by an organisational culture of discussion and debate. Staff from all levels participated in these decisions.
- FRLHT has been working in partnership with three state governments in their conservation programmes. These partnerships were facilitated by bringing the representatives of the state government, especailly its forest officers on deputation to FRLHT.
- It could mobilise the support of donors, state forest department, local communities, NGOs and other stakeholders in their conservation programmes. Getting support from the different organisations with varying and sometimes conflicting philosophy, approach and objectives have not been easy. But FRLHT succeeded in this effort to a large extent. It could appreciating the divergent views and evolve consensus and this contributed to the success.
- It could successfully raise funding from a number of Departments/Ministries of the Government of India and international agencies for their programme.
- It experimented with several funding mechanisms such as block grants, to performance related grants etc in supporting NGOs.
- There has been a continuous evaluation of existing programmes and developing new proposals to meet the new challenges and many of the new programmes such as establishing a testing laboratory, developing a network, bringing out a magazine all emerged in response to emerging needs.
- FRLHT devised strategies to sustain its activities even before the original DANIDA funding came to an end and have been successful in this regard.
- The pro-poor emphasis of FRLHT is clearly reflected in its concern for providing a better deal to the supplier of medicinal herbs, the poor and this led to the establishment of the community based enterprise the Gram Moolika Company Limited (GMCL).

Case 5: Diffusion of energy efficient devices in non-formal industries by TIDE

Technology Informatics Design Endeavour (TIDE), Bangalore has been implementing an Indo-Canadian Environment Facility (ICEF) supported project to promote efficient biomass utilisation technologies in non-formal industries in various states of the country. Since 1999, entrepreneurs developed under the project have disseminated improved biomass utilisation technologies in the states of Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. A distinct feature of the activities is that most of the devices are being sold to end users on a cost-plus basis resulting in entrepreneurs emerging viable and self-sustaining. The project has guided the development of support mechanisms such as linkages with local community organisations, governmental agencies and producer-owned co-operatives. The project has adopted an approach of extended training where the entrepreneurs were initially taken in as trainees under the project, provided training in marketing-production-maintenance of the improved devices and supported to establish independent self-sustaining enterprises. In Kerala, TIDE has intervened in the following sectors/applications, namely, Ayurvedic medicine preparation, coconut drying, drying cardamom, pepper, nutmeg and fish, water heating, cooking stoves, rubber vulcanizing and rubber smoking.

According to TIDE, “the project has been successful in developing effective technology delivery mechanisms for dissemination of efficient biofuel utilisation

technologies. The project has demonstrated that technically robust devices accompanied by suitable managerial mechanisms can result in development of sustainable modes of technology delivery in rural areas. TIDE firmly believes that technology dissemination needs adaptation and apart from technical efficiency, user requirement is also important in identifying, adapting and promoting technologies.

The ILAC team has interacted with the TIDE management and field staff and a few of us have also visited its field locations in Kerala. We also facilitated collaboration of TIDE with the Central Plantation Crops Research Institute (CPCRI) and the State poverty Eradication Mission, Kerala (*Kudumbasree*) by initiating a joint meeting. This has led to the following activities.

a. TIDE, NCAP and CPCRI jointly organised a capacity development workshop on rural marketing skills at Kasaragode (28-29 October 2004).
b. TIDE and Kudumabsree are collaborating at Kasaragod in a project that is experimenting with establishment of a processing and marketing system for processed cashew by women SHGs.
c. TIDE and CPCRI are partnering in several activities related to improving the efficiency of the coconut chips dryer and TIDE is supporting the women groups initiated by the CPCRI in accessing new markets for coconut chips.

The major lessons that emerge from the TIDE case study are as follows.

- Entrepreneurs trained by TIDE have established themselves independently and are setting up dryers for different purposes. These entrepreneurs advertise their services and those interested contact them through letters and telephone calls. TIDE provides these entrepreneurs help (if necessary) in design in case they need it. But such calls for assistance are very rare.
- TIDE uses the existing pool of knowledge to create new applications or technologies. In this process, TIDE scans for new technological insights and builds new applications from them based on applied and adaptive research.
- TIDE trains entrepreneurs in technical, business and marketing (entrepreneurship development programme of any organisation normally covers all these topics) skills by taking them as apprentices first and this helps them to obtain a hands-on experience and in establishing successfully.
- TIDE view technology as a process and the entrepreneurs create customised applications depending on the client's requirement and available infrastructure. This is in contrast to the public sector approach wherein devices are created and demonstrations are conducted to promote them.
- In addition to developing new applications from existing pool of knowledge or prototypes/designs, TIDE has facilitated establishment of entrepreneurs who promote the technologies as a viable business activity. The training is here for creation of capacity of entrepreneurs in setting up new need based designs and not simply training on use of a technology or how to produce/multiply one application/device.
- TIDE also facilitates entrepreneurs by exposing them to new business opportunities and new partners or development agencies so that these entrepreneurs could expand their business opportunities.
- As the capacity of the system to diffuse technologies based on a sound business principle is created, the whole intervention becomes sustainable and project/donor dependency could be avoided.
- TIDE could evolve its own approach to technology delivery primarily because of the freedom given by the Donor (ICEF). Apart from the broad deliverables, the TIDE has to deliver, the ICEF has given complete freedom to TIDE to experiment and evolve own strategies.

- TIDE values the importance of institutional history and the need for better process reporting. Though the TIDE team have been learning lessons from its failures and successes through regular reflections by the staff and reinvent new strategies, these processes are not properly documented. But TIDE is eager to have the ILAC team synthesise these lessons for them.

Case 6: Lac sector

Collection and cultivation of lac is one of major source of livelihood for the majority of tribal population in the states of Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal. Though India has been the most important producer and exporter of lac in the 50's and 60's, the production and export of over the years have declined in the later decade mainly due to the collapse of the then main domestic lac consuming industry (the audio record industry) and decline in prices. Currently indian lac faces stiff competition from other countries such as Thailand. Several efforts to expand and improve the cultivation of lac in India were initiated since the beginning of the 20th century. Establishment of the Indian Lac Research Institute (ILRI) in 1927, establishment of about 200 brood lac farms in lac producing states contributed to increased production of quality lac. However by mid-60s the production and export of lac started declining and even the importance given to lac at the policy level also started waning. Collection of lac, which was one of the important supplementary sources of livelihood of the millions of poor tribal producers in forest areas, got affected with the decline in forest areas. Though several technologies to scientifically cultivate lac were produced through research, these were not adopted in most cases, due to lack of organised attempts to understand the complexities of the lac sector and development of integrated initiatives to address the system weaknesses.

Several organisations exist in India to address the different aspects of lac. This include: research institutions under ICAR (Indian Lac Research Institute, Ranchi (ILRI), CSIR (National Chemical Laboratory, Pune, (NCL), ICFRE (Institute of Forest Productivity, Ranchi, (IFP), Tropical Forest Research Institute, Jabalpur (TFRI); organisations working for marketing of tribal products (Tribal Co-operative Marketing Federation (TRIFED), Jharkhand State Co-operative Large Adivasi Multiple Society (JASCOLAMPS); Central government Ministries (Environment & Forests, Commerce); state government departments (related to forests, tribal welfare); export promotion council (Shellac Export Promotion Council, SEPC); and NGOs working in tribal areas (eg: Professional Assistance for Development Action) However, in practice they remain functionally disconnected and the opportunities for achieving the synergy thus remain unexploited. Our interaction with many of these actors in the lac innovation system has revealed the lack of even a shared understanding on the constraints and opportunities in lac cultivation in the country. Several factors currently constrain a meaningful interaction of these different agencies and this needs to be understood and addressed.

Development of new applications of lac is emerging and there is every reasons to believe that the demand for lac is going to increase in future. Provision of better technical support and marketing opportunities to lac producers can potentially improve the livelihoods of millions of poor tribal producers in states such as Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, West Bengal, North Eastern States, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh. It is quite unfortunate that this opportunity is not getting currently, the adequate attention it deserves. Most of the poor tribals have low agricultural and entrepreneurial skills. Some efforts to procure lac directly from the farmers through producers co-operatives have not been very successful. This sector also suffers from lack of an effective political support and policy guidance.

The team visited Ranchi, Khunti, Kolkatta and interacted with the Directors and staff of the following organisations

a. Indian Lac Research Institute, Ranchi
b. Institute of Forest Productivity, Ranchi
c. Tajna Shella
d. PRADAN
e. BASIX
f. Shellac Export Promotion Council, Kolkatta

The CPHP SA programme has a plan to organise a lac sector dialogue inviting all the stakeholders to address the problem of disconnect in this sector. However this didn't happen. However we have used the case study on lac to illustrate the lack of appropriate institutional arrangements during the Capacity Development Workshop at ICRISAT. The salient points that emerge from this case are as follows.

- There exists weak, non-existent and hostile relationships among the various actors
- Enterprise and science domains remain disconnected, Same is the case with the sector needs and policy
- Rigidities at research and policy level prevents development of appropriate sector interventions
- Though some of the civil society initiatives seems promising, the other actors are unable to respond well to these
- Scientific community lack experience of working with the private sector and there is also a major issue of mistrust towards private sector.
- Lac sector needs more collaboration and knowledge flows
- Some of the recent collaborative efforts initiated by ILRI and PRADAN seems promising, but these kinds of institutional innovations are not acknowledged even by the research system

Implications for ILAC

The above case studies were done with the primary objective of synthesising principles for institutional learning and pro-poor innovation. The three CPHP interventions were designed as coalition projects with an explicit poverty focus. Two other cases are about two organisations, namely TIDE and FRLHT, that had innovated institutionally. While the former innovated on developing innovative technology delivery system of fuel efficient dryers, the later successfully initiated a series of programmes to promote conservation of medicinal plants and preserving local health traditions. The final case study is on the lac sector, where lack of institutional innovations have resulted in a consistent decline in lac production, lac exports and livelihood conditions of the poor tribes who deal in collection of lac.

The concept of institutional learning concerns the process through which new ways of working emerges. It concerns 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. (eg: how has our research approach changed in response to the need to improve the poverty relevance of our work and what else need to change? What can we learn from activities that didn't have expected outcomes?) Developing post-harvest innovation capability depends primarily on how the capacity for institutional learning and change could be promoted among the actors in the innovation system.

We used the evidence from these case studies to answer the following sets of questions.

a. How organisations engage in institutional learning?
b. How these can be promoted?
c. What policy advice we could provide to others, individuals and organisations interested to strengthening post-harvest innovation capability?

Synthesis of principles of institutional learning and change and pro-poor post-harvest innovation

Action research projects set with an explicit pro-poor orientation (such as the CPHP cases) were found to select commodities that the poor grow (rainfed sorghum, mahua, lac, fruits) or interventions that would support the poor and work with the groups of the poor. But having a project focusing on the poor need not necessarily lead to pro-poor institutional learning and change. But the three CPHP cases have potentially contributed to pro-poor institutional learning and change because of the coalition approach adopted in these projects. All these projects worked with the poor, namely the tribal horticultural producers in Orissa, the tribals dealing in mahua and lac and those small farmers growing sorghum. Two projects worked directly with the SHGs of the poor (Jablapur, Orissa) especially with poor women as members. This helped these projects to bring their perspectives into the project design/interventions. In the case of sorghum project, the producer interests were represented formally through the inclusion of Farmers Federation in the coalition. NGOs who have a pro-poor orientation namely Tarun Sanskar and CCD were part of the Jabalpur and Orissa projects respectively. Inclusion of these stakeholders forced the three coalitions to continuously assess their interventions for pro-poorness. SHGs of the poor in Jabalpur and Orissa have indeed influenced the nature of interventions to a large extent. This has forced the partners to break boundaries and seek new behaviour. All the partners have experienced the demand for new behaviour to meet the evolving requirements of the project.

The need to improve the hygiene in processing when it is done at the village level, forced OUAT to improve their training programme with respect to hygiene. The limitations of the climate on new drying method made researchers to think of alternatives to sun drying fruits. When the Orissa colaition realized the difficulties of engaging the private sector with procurement of processed fruit products, they started exploring with the public sector OMFED to procure their products. OMFED agreed to procure the products and it even relaxed some of its norms related to payment to the SHGs, keeping in view the economic status of the groups involved in this enterprise. Similarly the search for technical options that can benefit the poor tribals forced the Jabalpur team to ignore the sophisticated technical options for value addition of mahua. The coalition realised through interactions with the SHGs that what the poor need is (a). Institutional arrangements to prevent distress sale and (b). a facility to process and store clean mahua. Similarly when the industry representative in the sorghum coalition demanded a different feeding trial to meet the industry need, the coalition undertook another feeding trial.

The three CPHP coalition projects have all taken new paths during the project period when faced with new challenges, insights and demands by the stakeholders. While the nature of the coalition demanded this, the project could do so because of the inherent flexibility given by the donor. Apart from the broad deliverables of the action research, the donor hasn't demanded a specific pathway or experiment to deliver the output. This is due to the (a) innovation system idea/framework that the CPHP programme management has adopted partly because of the influence from the insights that has emanated from the previous project (R7502) and (ii) the donor's willing investment and encouragement of an intense and well debated two stage

process (Concept note and project memorandum) of project preparation involving all coalition members. The demand from the CPHP (donor) for institutional outputs (made right at the very outset) and the two writeshops organised to think through and analyse "why" and "how" the project made decisions, document the changes, and anlyse these lessons learnt.

Similar is the case with the TIDE, where it could innovate on strategies for technology delivery with the confidence and support of the donor, ICEF. Based on his previous experience of working with the Karnataka State Council for Science and Technology (KSCST) Dr.Rajagopal, the Director TIDE was quite convinced on the need for an alternate approach to technology promotion. TIDE could successfully demonstrate that technically robust devices accompanied by suitable managerial mechanisms can result in development of sustainable modes of technology delivery in rural area. TIDE incorporated a good understanding of the market, the user requirement and a local physical/material resources as well as and weak as cultural contexts as important factors for identifying, adapting and promoting technologies. It could convince the donor that developing entrepreneurs who can adapt broad technical applications (fuel efficient dryers) to meet the individual needs is the most suitable approach to promote them.

In the case of FRLHT, Mr. Darshan Shankar facilitated the evolution and growth of the organization, by bringing his experience of working with the poor tribals in Maharashtra. The poor have limited access to the modern systems of medicine for a number of reason. While this is the case, their rich traditional knowledge on herbal health care was going out of practice and FRLHT initiated strategies on revitalization of these practices. The realization that the poor who are engaged in collecting (and cultivating) medicinal plants are exploited by the middlemen led to the formation of the community based enterprise, the Gram Moolika Company Limited. FRLHT made several internal changes, which facilitated a better understanding of the sector and its stakeholders. These internal changes have also been due to the organisations' partnerships with other stakeholders in the sector.

In the case of lac, what we are witnessing is the lac of similar institutional innovations or explicit pro-poor strategies or evidence of learning by the various actors. Though there are a number of organizations that exist in the name of lac, the sector reveals a complete disconnect. To some extent, the Indian Lac Research Institute (ILRI) has started to realize this problem. In response to the Government of Jharkhand initiative, ILRI has have started partnering with NGOs such as PRADAN. But these kinds of productive engagement with civil society organizations were not even talked about by those involved from ILRI as they still consider these initiatives as falling outside their main mandate of “producing technologies”. The level of mistrust among the various stakeholders is another major issues that is affecting the development of partnerships and without partnerships this sector couldn’t flourish.

Institutional change is an integral part of every innovation system or successful research project, which is rarely acknowledged by even by the organisations and individuals involved in the system. The lessons learnt and the processes that lead to these lessons and changed behaviour practices are merely documented and never analysed or promoted by the actors involved. This project has documented the institutional learning and change in six cases (Three CPHP research projects conceived and implemented in a coalition mode, field level interventions by two organisations and a sector that has several actors but hasn’t yet realized its potential to emerge as a successful innovation system). How do organizations engage in institutional learning ? What is the evidence these cases inform us? We have

crystallized the following set of principles on institutional learning and change from the above cases.

1. Organisations working as part of wider coalition projects (comprising different sets of stakeholders) bring complimentary skills and different perspectives/interests to bear upon the project innovation system. Compared to the earlier routine and practices, they learn to do different things and do things differently in response to the pressures demanded by the coalition.
2. When the coalition project has an explicit pro-poor focus and has direct or indirect representation of the groups of the poor, the partners are forced to incorporate strategies to address the demands of the poor.
3. The diversity of skills or perspectives is a characteristics feature of the coalitions, They are often based on a certain degree of sameness or belonging with respect to the sector, region, etc.
4. The need for negotiating strategies among the coalition members forces the organizations to reflect back on the processes so far adopted and future plans and this contributes to institutional learning and change within these organizations.
5. Continuous reflection on strategies by the staff and management through formal mechanisms for discussion on organizational matters can facilitate institutional learning and change (eg. FRLHT).
6. Even the culture of informal discussions by the various project teams can also lead to institutional learning (eg: TIDE)
7. Donors (and other social/civil contacts) can enable institutional learning by demanding institutional outputs/communications strategies for the same.

How these can be promoted?

1. Enabling environment within the organization that results from adoption of policies that facilitate coalition formation lead to wider adoption of this approach (eg: adoption of contract research principles by the OUAT).
2. Developing a stakeholder inventory of each sector with the complementary skills and expertise that each actor possesses (eg: lac)
3. Conscious organizational strategies to understand and appreciate the other stakeholder's capacities and constraints. Generating activities that provide a hands-on learning about each other and the wider social context (eg: facilitated institutional learning and change exercise as discussed later in this document) .
4. Donor's encouragement for organisations to innovate on different ways of working (eg. ICEF, DFID-CPHP)
5. Encourage staff to report on processes that lead to successful and non-successful interventions, results etc (eg; FRLHT and TIDE).
6. Conscious strategy to influence project design and investing time and money for facilitating the development of coalition projects (eg: CPHP, ILAC on IIM-A project proposal developed as discussed later in this document).

Lessons from the Interactive Policy Research approach

1. *Cafeteria approach*- Use of case studies, networking, capacity development programmes and facilitated institutional learning and change exercises simultaneously can better influence policies and practices that promote Institutional Learning and Change.
2. *Costs*- This would involve investing more human and financial resources, but the pay-offs are much higher in terms of opportunities to learn and understand the learning processes used by others. This provides a better

platform to influence policy and build a critical mass of advocates for institutional learning.

3. *Conscious search for opportunities* - Looking for opportunities (conferences etc), personal contacts, historical linkages etc to engage with rural development bureaucracy and the research management actors can enhance the conviction and ownership of the interactive policy research process. Organizations vary in their capacity to become partners in this exercise and therefore those following the interactive policy research approach should be able to take these frustrations in their stride.
4. *Targetted training programmes*- There is an increasing demand from different kinds of actors for designing and implementing targeted capacity development programmes for different kinds of audience, focusing on operationalising innovations system approaches.

2.1 A series of workshops and facilitated capacity development exercises using case study materials generated from CPHP projects and others on institutional learning and change and the use of systems concept in post-harvest innovation

A capacity development workshop on rural innovations was organised by the ILAC project.

Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations with special emphasis on post harvest sector, ICRISAT (22-29 November 2004)

The programme was organised in collaboration with the following organisations

a. Centre for Research on Innovations and Science Policy (CRISP), Hyderabad
b. National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research (NCAP), New Delhi
c. National Institute for Science Technology and Development Studies (NISTADS), New Delhi
d. International Livestock Research Institute, South Asia Region, Hyderabad

The workshop was facilitated by the following resource persons.

a. Norman Clark (Kabarak University, Kenya)
b. Andy Hall (UNU-INTECH)
c. Rasheed Sulaiman V (NCAP)
d. Rajeswari Raina (NISTADS) and
e. Shambu Prasad, CRISP

20 participants representing various organisations attended this workshop (The list of participants is given in Annexure X)

The programme had two main components

a. Concepts and principles (3 days) This component had an interactive approach whereby key concepts and principles are introduced through case studies and group discussions followed by conceptual sessions. The main thrust of these sessions was to explain the importance of institutional arrangements, partnerships and learning and to bring together analytical approaches and tools used in the innovation systems framework.

b. Case studies as diagnostic tools (5 days) This component of the programme focussed on the application of this approach. These sessions concentrated on the use of case studies as a diagnostic tool for defining more effective innovation arrangements. It included sessions on constructing a case study, involving a classroom case study

exercise. For the classroom case study candidates presented an intervention their organisation is currently tackling. It also included a live case study exercise whereby small groups of candidates visited five organisations in and around Hyderabad. Each group developed a case study on the innovation system around that organisation and this was presented back to the rest of the course for discussion.

The programme details are given in Annexure IV e.

Facilitated Institutional Learning and Change exercise

Since we know that capacity development also involved institutional learning and change and since we know that this is achieved by "learning by doing", the project decided to experiment with two pilot case study organisations relevant to post-harvest. The first organisation identified was the Central Institute of Post-harvest Engineering and Technology (CIPHET) located at Ludhiana. The second organisation was the training organisation, the Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) of the Central Plantation Crops Research Institute (CPCRI) located at Kasaragode.

a. Linking CIPHET with a poverty reduction initiative

Director, CIPHET and three scientists of the All India Co-ordinated Programme on Post Harvest Technology had participated earlier in the CPHP project workshop at HP in April 2002. The group has been aware about the kind of work we have been doing and have expressed interest in collaborating with our efforts. To explore possibilities for experimenting with a facilitated ILAC exercise, we visited CIPHET and had a good interaction with the Director and his senior Colleagues in August 2003. As Guru Naik had already established good links with the District Poverty Initiative Programme (DPIP) in Rewa, Madhya Pradesh and they are keen to have interventions related to post-harvest to reduce poverty, we thought it would be a good idea to link both CIPHET and DPIP on a joint activity and thereby enable development of partnerships. The Director, CIPHET expressed his willingness to become a part of this arrangement and have urged us to facilitate the development of interactions. Since then we have been trying to get a meeting organised between CIPHET and DPIP, Madhya Pradesh. However, transfer of key officers/bureaucrats of DPIP identified to collaborate with the project adversely affected our plans. Since the initial contacts made in DPIP in Rewa, MP were strong the project, the project kept the attempt going with DPIP- discussing and trying other contacts in M.P. and also contacting the World Bank office in Delhi (managing the DPIP). It was through these interactions that the team learnt about the bureaucratic overload and routine administrative approach to poverty reduction in DPIP.

As the DFID (India) work took shape in M.P. with the initiation of the MPRLP, the ILAC team met and discussed the ILAC agenda with the CEO of MPRLP. The proceedings of this meeting are given in Annexure Ivb.

The MPRLP and CIPHET are keen to work together on post-harvest innovations in tribal areas/products. The Director of CIPHET agrees that this would bring to CIPHET the much-needed opportunity for learning and institutional change. Since the MPRLP has just begun work, it was decided that the ‘Learning Forum’ constituted under the MPRLP could host a meeting between the two potential ‘poverty reduction’ partners, bring more locally relevant post-harvest/other infrastructural/service partners, and devise strategies for working together. An important lesson for the project concerned the capacity to decide when to give up one track/line of investigation that was not working. Perhaps the project should have pursued this objective of facilitated capacity development with more than one poverty eradication programme (as it did later) instead of focusing on one.

b. Developing partnerships between CPCRI and TIDE

Another strategy we have identified for exploring ILAC in our project had been to experiment ILAC ideas in an extension environment in an interactive policy research mode. We explored the ILAC ideas with the Krishi Vigyan Kendra (Farm Science Centre) of CPCRI, Kasargode. While interacting with the KVK staff and some of the women groups that were trained by the KVK, we learnt about the limitations of the training on post harvest technologies offered by the KVK. The KVK has trained several women (and members of women's groups such as those involved in Kudumbasree) in the preparation of value added products and home scale fruit preservation. There have been few success stories of production and marketing following these training's, but most of them due to the relatively high entrepreneurial characteristics of individuals involved and is not the case with the large number of participants trained. The trained rural women and entrepreneurs thus find it difficult to explore existing markets or to create new markets for their products. Unfortunately the KVK has no expertise on rural marketing and due to this skills related to marketing products were absent in the training programmes offered by the KVK. Partnering with other organisations having these skills was not considered seriously by the KVK. The need for strengthening the content related to marketing in entrepreneurship training programmes has been recognised by the KVK. One of the recommendations of the Scientific Advisory Committee (held on 26 October 2003) was that the "training schedule shall include marketing aspects which could be of immense help to the women SHGs and farmers".

We decided to use this opportunity to explore ILAC ideas in an Interactive Policy Research mode. The idea was to organise a capacity development workshop on "rural market skills on rural value added products" mainly with the expertise of TIDE at the CPCRI. The idea was to use this workshop as a platform for developing partnerships (mainly between CPCRI, TIDE and Kudumabsree) and also strengthen the capacity of different individuals and organizations involved in marketing of rural value added products. More specifically, it focuses on strengthening the capacity of the Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK-CPCRI) with skills for marketing of rural value added products. The workshop was organised on 27-28 October 2004 at the CPCRI. This workshop focussed on experience sharing and learning about marketing and entrepreneurship development. The participants included KVK faculty, Kudumbasree officers, TIDE staff, ISED staff, women entrepreneurs and ILAC researchers from NCAP and NISTADS.

TIDE, the NGO having the necessary skills and experience was contacted to lead this workshop and they agreed to our request. TIDE is the ideal partner organization identified now, given TIDE's vast and varied experience with several post- harvest technologies and processes of market development, and the recent initiatives being undertaken by TIDE in Kasargode District. Other organizations that have partnered in this exercise are as follows:

Kudumbasree- State Poverty Eradication Mission, Kerala (Kudumbasree) is an organization with a mission to develop rural enterprises as a means to eliminating poverty in Kerala. It has been struggling with questions on marketing rural value added products for the last few years in Kerala with varying levels of success.

Institute for Small Enterprises and Development (ISED), is an important facilitator of small enterprises and they have agreed to share with the participants some of its experiences and lessons learnt.

As facilitators of rural entrepreneurship in Kerala, both TIDE, Kudumbasree and ISED have hands on experience with exploring rural markets and finding new markets for products produced by their trained rural women entrepreneurs. For TIDE in particular and also for ISED, this turned out to be an opportunity for actively partnering with an organization like CPCRI, which has rich scientific skills for technology development. Groups of women entrepreneurs also presented their perceptions and experiences on post-harvest technology development, transfer and utilization, as well as processes that enabled them to successfully market these value added products. ILAC researchers facilitated this workshop. Programme details and proceedings of this workshop are given in Annexure Ivd.

2.2 Development of a database of individuals and organisations that have participated in project capacity building exercises and others with a similar viewpoint

2.3 Identifying and interacting with other (contending/different view point) practice and policy coalitions to learn what keeps them going, and explore possible pro-poor changes/innovations in such coalition

2.4 The creation of a community of practice of individuals and organisations that have participated in project capacity building exercises and others with a similar viewpoint by facilitating communication, holding meetings and other networking activities

The project tried to develop a community of practice in the post harvest innovation system comprising scientists, research managers, extension specialists, rural development administrators, the NGOs, the processors, equipment manufacturers, the farmers and farm women who are all involved in different aspects of the post harvest sector. The need for networking among these different stakeholders was considered important by this coalition, as it is an important means to influence actors in research and policy systems. We initiated this activity first by collecting the names and addresses of all those involved with the All India Co-ordinated Research Project on Post Harvest Technology (ICAR) and those involved with the post-harvest research at the Centre Food Technology Research Institute (CSIR). A database with the contact details of all these individuals was developed during the initial stages of our work. This database was also used for identifying participants for the Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations organised at ICRISAT (22-29 Nov 2004).

The two workshops we organised as part of this project at ICRISAT and CPCRI helped the team to network with a large number of other organisations. The Compact Disc of presentations made in these above workshops were circulated to a larger audience primarily to widen the network. Through this process new organisations such as Aga Khan Foundation, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Institute of Rural Management, Anand, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubneswar have expressed their interest to collaborate with the ILAC project in several activities.

We also attempted a review on different networking practices adopted by different organisations and while reviewing the different networks we realised the need for an expert advice to guide us in developing a communication and networking strategy. We identified Dr.Emma Crewe as a consultant to help us with this exercise. Dr. Crewe is currently interacting with us to understand our work and perspectives and is also doing review of similar networks to develop a strategy document.

3.1 Process documentation by the project team and joint evaluation efforts with partners to collect and synthesis process lessons about conducting interactive policy research on post-harvest innovation systems

Institutional output of the ILAC project given in Annexure Vib.

Promoting ILAC approaches

Facilitating project proposal development and undertaking institutional analysis

The faculty of the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, especially Professsor Girja Sharan while trying to develop a project proposal for the development of a small supply chain for fresh fruits and vegetables in Ahmedabad approached CPHP -SA for possible funding and advice. Prof. Sharan was a part of the earlier CPHP funded project on developing a new packing technology for tomatoes in HP and was aware about our work. Prof. Sharan sent his proposal for our comments and we made several useful comments to Prof. Sharan on how the innovation system thinking could be potentially used to improve his project proposal and as a research tem team interested in applying and promoting ILAC agenda, how we would like to see this proposal as some kind of an action research with the possibility of doing a case study for this project. Prof. Sharan could appreciate our comments and he has revised his proposal embracing the Innovation Systems framework (Revised proposal given in Annexure IIIa) and we have done a case study on this ongoing work. The findings are as follows.

- The IIM (A)'s Centre for Management in Agriculture developed its project on "Study and Demonstration of a Small Modern Supply Chain for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables in the Ahmedabad Area" with the involvement of the ILAC team.
- This venture, the Clean 'n Fresh Vegetable Chain, involves several actors who are actively involved in an active learning process. The coalition includes private sector partners, vendors, technicians, consumers, NGOs, other academics in the Centre, etc. Though technically this project may be seen as one that ensures supply of clean and graded vegetables (using a Vegetable Treatment Unit- VTU), the project has been conceived and developed as a small experiment in applying the innovation systems approach. There are several new actors and new partnerships among old actors, revealing new ways of working among all the actors involved.
- The team building and relationship building skills of the research team (CMA) as well as its capacity for critical reflection and learning made this possible. There are lessons the team has learnt from its negotiations with partners, and this has led to trust among the partners. The team was willing to learn from its past experiences and draw lessons from earlier enterprises in the field.
- This venture goes beyond the conventional disciplinary boundaries – and the project did face resistance within the CMA. But the team managed to convince key decision makers within IIM and the administration of IIM, gaining support to go ahead with the project. The innovation systems approach has helped the project team develop a flexible and evolutionary approach to meeting the goals – this involved seeking new partners, new markets/ sources of vegetables, new design for the VTU, addressing consumer demands emerging from the field survey, etc.
- Public sector organizations like CMA (IIM-A) can work on innovative interventions like this using an innovation systems framework because they have a certain organizational flexibility and evaluation practices that encourage such pro-active and adaptable interventions in the field. This case and the inability to involve GAU shows that this is not the case with all public sector research organizations. The case brings crucial questions about organizational cultures that encourage learning processes.

Influencing other networks

The ILAC team, especially Rajeswari Raina had been closely working with the ResNet SA (a network for interactive research on water in South Asia), a part of CapNet South Asia. Through her interactions with this network, the ResNet-SA has decided to promote a coalition approach to proposal development and research management. For the call for short concept notes for Research Projects (2005) the ResNet-SA has clearly mentioned that the research projects should understand and explore the institutional context (the rules/norms that govern each partner and other non-partner stakeholders) of their research and development activities. The institutional context of the research projects can be explored at the project formulation stage, when the ResNet CG will facilitate interaction of project coalitions with experts in institutional analysis, While promised research outputs are a sufficient condition, proposed research process outputs form a necessary condition that ensures the uptake/translation of these lessons/principles to other contexts/coalitions/networks (CapNet log frame and ResNet call for proposals are given in the Annexure IIIc).

Presentation made by the ILAC team

The ILAC team has made the following presentations to promote to promote Innovation System and ILAC ideas to a wider audience. The details are as follows. The powerpoint presentations are given in Annexure VI d.

Date	Topic	Presenter	Venue and audience
22/11/03	Lac and Livelihoods-A case for interactive policy research	Rasheed Sulaiman V	Staff Research Council meeting, NCAP, New Delhi
14/12/04	Innovation Systems and Agricultural Development	Rasheed Sulaiman V	UGC Orientation Course on Science and Economics for University Teachers, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi
21/12/04	Innovation Systems-Applying the systems concept to agricultural Innovation	Rasheed Sulaiman V	NCAP training programme on Quantitative Techniques for Agricultural Policy Research, NCAP, New Delhi
10/2/04	Innovation Systems-Applying the systems concept to agricultural Innovation	Rasheed Sulaiman V	National Training Program on *Agricultural Research Prioritization and Impact Assessment, 4-13Feb 2004,* NCAP, New Delhi
22/11/04	Case study of lac	Rasheed Sulaiman V	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
23/11/04	Agricultural Research and Extension	Rasheed Sulaiman V	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
22/5/05	Rural Innovation Systems: Enabling Policies and Practices	Rajeswari Raina	NISTADS, New Delhi – NISTADS Tuesday Lecture Series
20/1/05	Institutional Learning and Change: Facilitating Capacities for Agricultural Innovation Systems in	Rajeswari Raina	UNU-Institute for New Technology, Maastricht

	India		
18/12/04	From Technology Development and Dissemination to Learning Approaches	Rajeswari Raina	IRMA, Anand, Gujarat- *Workshop on Institutional Alternatives and Governance Issues in Agriculture*, at the Institute for Rural Management, Anand (IRMA) at the *25th Anniversary Symposium on Governance in Development*,
23/11/04	Recent Developments in Agricultural Research Policy in India	Rajeswari Raina	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
24/11/04	Why learning matters- Some illustrative cases	Rajeswari Raina	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
10/02/04	Impact Assessment of NRM research: Opportunities for institutional learning	Rajeswari Raina	National Training Program on *Agricultural Research Prioritization and Impact Assessment, 4-13Feb 2004,* NCAP, New Delhi
22/9/04	Institutional and Policy requirements for facilitating conservation agriculture	Rajeswari Raina	*National Conference on Conservation Agriculture-Conserving Resources, Enhancing Productivity,* organized by (CASA) (RWC-IGP), at NASC, New Delhi, 22nd -23rd September 2004
7/4/04	The agri-biotechnology triple helix: An Innovation Systems analysis of Partnerships	Rajeswari Raina	Conference on *Biotechnology and Development: Ensuring Access, Cooperation and Capacity Building in the Asian Region*, , at the RIS, New Delhi
13/4/04	Institutional reform in knowledge for Integrated Water Management - Groundwater Lessons from Haryana	Rajeswari S. Raina	*Workshop on Sustainable Groundwater Management in North-West India*, at the Indian National Science Academy, New Delhi
5/11/03	Confronting complexity: The evolution of Soil Science research in India, 1980-2001	Rajeswari Raina	*Symposium on Trends in Soil Science* at the Annual Convention of the Indian Society of Soil Science, C.S.A. U.A.T. Kanpur,
23/11/04	Agricultural Innovation System	Andy Hall	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
23/11/04	Role of partnerships	Andy Hall	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
24/11/04	Diagnostic Case studies using the Innovation systems framework	Andy Hall	Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
22/11/04	Why institutional	Norman Clark	Capacity Development

	arrangements matter- An introduction		Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.
22/11/04	Case study of tomato boxes		Capacity Development Workshop on Rural Innovations at ICRISAT, Patancheru.

Section F Project effectiveness

This section of the evaluation report uses the rating criteria for the purpose and your outputs previously used in your annual reports.

	Rating
Project Goal	2
Project Purpose	2
Project Outputs 1.	1
2.	2
3.	1

1= completely achieved
2= largely achieved
3= partially achieved
4= achieved only to a very limited extent
X= too early to judge the extent of achievement (avoid using this rating for purpose and outputs)

Outputs (5 pages)

What were the research outputs achieved by the project as defined by the value of their respective OVIs? Were all the anticipated outputs achieved and if not what were the reasons? Your assessment of outputs should be presented as tables or graphs rather than lengthy writing, and provided in as quantitative a form as far as is possible.

For projects aimed at developing a device, material or process, and considering the status of the assumptions that link the outputs to the purpose, please specify:

a. What further market studies need to be done?
b. How the outputs have been made available to intended users?
c. What further stages will be needed to develop, test and establish manufacture of a product by the relevant partners?
d. How and by whom, will the further stages be carried out and paid for?
e. Have they developed plans to undertake this work? If yes, what are they? If not, why?

Outputs	OVI	Achievements by value of OVI
1. Principles and procedures involved in strengthening pro-poor post-harvest innovation systems developed and promoted.	1.1 By March 2005, principles of institutional learning and other institutional mechanisms that lead to pro-poor post-harvest innovation synthesised from CPHP projects and other case studies. 1.2 From March 2004 to	Case studies on 3 CPHP projects and 3 Non-CPHP interventions conducted and principles synthesised. One Book "Innovations in Innovation" containing chapters on Institutional Learning and Change published. One NCAP Policy brief on Institutional Learning and Change – a review of concepts and principles (in press)

	March 2005, training and dissemination materials prepared and used in workshops and used to facilitate capacity development and learning in partner organisations	Case study materials used in the Capacity Development Programme and other workshops and meetings (All Powerpoint presentation materials developed out of this work are given in the Annexure) These presentation materials are widely circulated to participants and others from India and abroad (All the powerpoint presentations are given in the Annexure VI d)
2. The capacity of post-harvest sector stakeholders to apply, develop and promote systems perspectives on pro-poor post-harvest innovation strengthened and sustained.	2.1 By March 2005 Enhanced systems perspectives on pro-poor innovation reflected in attitudes and skills of selected sector stakeholders. 2.2 From March 2004 to March 2005 mutual support systems in combination with enhanced skills and perspectives reflected in changing roles and capacities of sector stakeholders. 2.3. By March 2005 sector stakeholders apply, develop and promote systems perspectives on pro-poor post-harvest innovation	The lLAC team has been interacting with several individuals and organisations as part of case study visits, capacity development programme, participation in workshops, giving lectures and influencing other research programmes and networks. Evidence of influence from several of them are available and these are given in the Annex
3. Process insights on interactive innovation policy research approaches involving capacity development and networking of post-harvest sector stakeholders, documented, analysed and promoted.	3.1 At quarterly intervals throughout every year, the project's coalition reflects on constraints, achievements and lessons learnt and documents these lessons. 3.2 Institutional (rules / norms) and organizational arrangements for poverty focused post-harvest innovation identified and actors briefed /aligned for the uptake of these innovations. Identification and	The institutional output of this coalition (Annexure) provides a detailed account of the process insights on the interactive innovation policy research Our work on facilitated capacity development with two sets of organisational clusters namely a.CPCRI-TIDE-State Poverty Eradication Mission (Kudumbasree) & b.CIPHET-MPRLP

	documentation of entitlements of the poor to innovation and policy processes and outcomes. 3.3 By March 2005 number of process insights synthesised and promoted. Including, compendium of case studies, principles and approaches to post-harvest innovation.	The process insights are being synthesised and promoted. A compendium of case studies is currently being prepared and is planned as a book by June 2005.

Were all the anticipated outputs achieved and if not what were the reasons?

Yes, to some extent. The project had a limited time frame – it started late – in July 2003 and then there was very little time to complete the work and to do the writing and editing required. Thus --there has been a delay in publishing the number of journal articles the coalition has promised to deliver during the project period. We have decided to focus our energies and time on getting the activities going (case study visits, preparing draft notes, prepare more training materials, organise workshops, widen professional contacts in post-harvest etc) during the project phase to maximise impact. Converting these outputs to journal formats need time and currently we are engaged with this exercise.

Purpose (2 pages)
Based on the values of your purpose level OVIs, to what extent was the purpose achieved? In other words, to what degree have partners/other users adopted the research outputs or have the results of the research been validated as potentially effective at farmer/processor/trader level?

The project level purpose stated in the logical framework of the project is as follows:

"Pro-poor institutional learning and change in post-harvest innovation systems strengthened, including new ways of achieving this, through (a) interactive policy research and (b) the development of a coalition of sector stakeholders adopted"

(Note) The term interactive policy research refers to policy research undertaken within an action research framework that involves formal research, capacity development (training and facilitated institutional learning) as well as interaction with and development of a community of practice among policy and implementation stakeholders.

The OVIs were as follows:

1. Within two years of the completion of the project pro-poor criteria widely used in decision making processes associated with post-harvest innovation
2. Active networks of practitioners using and promoting pro-poor post-harvest innovation system approaches
3. Within 2 years of completion of the project, post harvest innovation policy research increasingly use interactive methods that include capacity development and networking

Our work on Institutional Learning and Change has started to impact the wider debate surrounding reforming agricultural R and D and that too especially the post-harvest system. Some of the participants who attended the CD workshop are currently planning new initiatives where they can apply some of these ideas (Annexure V a). One of the participant has developed a proposal applying the innovation systems approach for interventions in the coconut sector. (Annexure III b). 35 persons representing various organisations attended the two CD workshops we organised as part of this project and many of them are likely to adopt pro-poor post harvest innovation approaches in their work.

There has been a demand for the copy of the book on Innovations in Innovations from several sources. As the print copies are getting exhausted we are currently supplying the entire book on Compact Discs.

In a pro-active move after a lecture by the NABARD Chairperson, emphasising the importance of learning and learning organizations in rural development, the ILAC team sent the NABARD chair, a copy of the book. The National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development (NABARD) contacted the ILAC team and requested the ILAC team to organise a capacity development workshop on rural innovations for rural banking professionals. The Chairperson asked the team to identify a State it would feel most comfortable in. The Team had a discussion with actors in Karnataka and we have now a tentative programme of collaboration with NABARD (letter and report of the meeting in Karnataka Regional Office in Annexure V c).

The Aga Khan Foundation had advertised for proposals to their 'Rural Innovation Fund' and this prompted a meeting between the ILAC team and the Aga Khan Foundation in New Delhi. (Annexure V b). The AKF officer was keen that the ILAC team build more meaningful strategic linkages with AKF, especially in areas of synthesising lessons from their work in arid-agriculture and rural development in the deccan plateau, in involvement in a course for rural innovation in one of the Universities, etc. The ILAC team has promised further interaction and involvement on these topics, as a larger coalition of innovation policy researchers based in CRISP.

We have developed a data base of individuals who are interested to pursue these ideas and are currently responding to their demand for information, mainly in the form of request for papers, contact details etc

We could successfully link the activities of CPCRI, TIDE and Kudumbasree and this has led to joint activities as follows:

a. TIDE, NCAP and CPCRI jointly organised a capacity development workshop on rural marketing skills at Kasaragode (28-29 October 2004).
b. TIDE and Kudumabsree are collaborating at Kasaragod in a project that is experimenting with establishment of a processing and marketing system for processed cashew by women SHGs.
c. TIDE and CPCRI are partnering in several activities related to improving the efficiency of the coconut chips dryer and TIDE is supporting the women groups initiated by the CPCRI in accessing new markets for coconut chips.

Goal (1 page)

What is the expected contribution of outputs to Project Goal?

Identifying the principles and procedures involved in strengthening post-harvest innovation system (output 1) and improving the capacity of the various stakeholders to apply, develop and promote these approaches (output 2) are the important means

identified by the project to enhance the capacity of the national level crop post harvest innovation systems to respond more effectively to the needs of the poor (Goal).

The project has synthesised the principles and procedures involved for this, primarily through case studies on pro-poor post harvest innovation and have experimented with approaches such as networking, training on theory and application of the innovation systems framework and facilitated institutional learning and change approaches to improve the capacity of various actors to promote these approaches. The principles and procedures emerging from these cases are being circulated widely through policy briefs and through a proposed report/compendium. This would enable a large number of actors interested in strengthening the post-harvest innovation system to read and understand these insights. The formal training on rural innovations, the database of individuals and organisations involved in post-harvest innovation and interested in applying the emerging insights would develop a momentum and wider interest in promoting these approaches. The project has every reason and evidence to believe that this is happening at the moment and would gather momentum in the days to come.

For the project, this has been an experiment for doing policy research in a different way (interactive policy process) and the processes adopted by the project and what we have learnt during this process (process insights) have been documented and analysed (Output 3). This is an important contribution for all others who are interested in doing policy research for strengthening the innovation capability in the post harvest sector and also in other sectors related to rural development. All the above project outputs would contribute to improving the capacity of the national crop post harvest innovation system to respond more effectively to the needs of the poor.

Section G – Uptake and Impact (2 pages)
Organisational Uptake (max 100 words)

What do you know about the uptake of research outputs by other intermediary institutions or projects (local, national, regional or international)? What uptake by which institutions/projects where? Give details and information sources (Who? What? Howmany? Where?)

Some outputs of the project have had an impact on different organizations –
(i) the need to distinguish between technical outputs and process/institutional outputs, and (ii) the need to be conscious of document and analyse the lessons learnt as a part of all projects and
(iii) the conscious and careful choice of partners in coalitions.

Some research organizations and intermediary organizations like NCAP, TIDE, CPCRI, CapNet India, CASA, CCD, APEDA, VFPCK etc. are a few. Among these TIDE and NCAP seems to have internalised these results into their organisational structure /activities, while CPCRI, CapNet, APEDA, CASA, CCD, VFPCK, etc have designed work plans or new projects that incorporate some of these lessons. In NCAP, the topics "Innovation Systems" and "Institutional Learning and change" have become part of the national and international-training programmes organised for agricultural economists.

End user uptake (max 100 words)
What do you know about the uptake of research outputs by end-users? Which end-users, how many and where? Give details and information sources

The end-users of the results of this project are mainly the actors in the case studies and the training programme and facilitated institutional learning and change exercise conducted by the project – which includes the three CPHP project coalitions and three

(potential) innovation clusters – the lac, herbal health care, and fuel efficient rural energy systems actors. These coalitions reveal that uptake of the lessons about learning mechanisms and role of learning processes in enabling innovation have been accepted rather unevenly among the actors. While a local NGO (the CCD or TIDE) does appreciate and demand better process documentation and analysis of lessons learnt in each of its new projects, the scientists (especially within ICRISAT, and to some extent the ICAR) show little interest in the uptake of these lessons or for facilitating learning mechanisms in their organizations. Among the scientists the argument has been that it is the management of research that needs to ask about and to learn how to facilitate institutional learning and change. Facilitating the ILAC exercise in CPCRI-TIDE, on-going ILAC attempts in CIPHET-MPRLP and proposal development activity at IIM, Ahmedabad are also evidence of end-user uptake.

Knowledge (max 100 words)
What do you know about the impact of the project on the stock of knowledge? What is the new knowledge? How significant is it? What is the evidence for this judgement?

The stock of knowledge has been enhanced by conceptualising institutional learning and change within an innovation systems framework and applying an interactive policy research to understand this process. The findings regarding learning processes and mechanisms to facilitate these have had an impact on the stock of knowledge on innovation systems and research project processes. The significance of this knowledge is evident in the appreciation/attention it has received at various forums it has been presented. Evidence also comes from AKF, the CGIAR, and NABARD requesting ILAC for specific knowledge inputs for synthesis of lessons learnt, priority setting and capacity development respectively.

Institutional (max 100 words)
What do you know about the impact on institutional capacity? What impact on which institutions and where? What change did it make to the organisations (more on intermediate organisations). Give details and information sources.

Some of the key institutions (rules/norms/ways of working/practices) in NGOs or CSOs that have been influenced by the findings of this project are (a) ways of coalition formation and evolution, (b) norms and/or practices that help monitor the pro-poor domain of activity within the project(s), (c) conscious attempts to document and promote learning mechanisms, and (d) openly acknowledge and even attempt to integrate social knowhow (market analysis) into technical project concerns. In academic and policy organizations, (NCAP, CPCRI etc) the institutional; impacts have been minimal though some projects (the vegetable retailing project in IIM (Ahmedabad), the fodder innovations project (ILRI), and the conservation agriculture project (CASA) , and some individuals have been directly influenced (as proven by their uptake of new ways of working/norms). In networks such as CapNet (India), the institutional impact has been evident in their shift from exclusive focus on 'training of trainers' for IWRM to some training complemented by 'facilitated capacity building experiments' in the field with locally relevant 'water/ natural resource coalitions'.

Policy (max 100 words)
What do you know about any impact on policy, law or regulations? What impact and where? Give details and information sources

The project duration was too short to have a direct impact on policy. But the project has contributed to enabling impacts through (i) generating conventional policy literature; (ii) networking and (iii) the development of a "community of practice". Two findings of this project have influenced method and practice in policy circles–(i) shift

from prescriptive policy research to interactive policy research, and (ii) the intra-organizational policies for partnership building. The latter is evident in some of the institutional impacts mentioned above in organizations like OUAT (the Division of Agrl./Post-Harvest Engineering), CCD, TIDE, and the interest expressed by organizations like CEC and RTF (Hyderabad) to take up such organizational policies for partnership building and effective outreach. Information about the former is available in the capacity development workshop organized in CPCRI and the discussions with MPRLP, and the latter is evident in the discussions with TIDE, CCD, etc

Poverty and livelihoods (max 100 words)
What do you know about any impact on poverty or poor people and livelihoods? What impact on how many people where? Give details and information sources.

The project gave a synthesis of and attempted to promote pro-poor institutional learning and change as a way of improving the poverty reduction effectiveness of post-harvest innovation. By enabling changes in the policies and institutional arrangements this project has an indirect impact on poverty and livelihoods. The formalization of the MoU between CPCRI and TIDE, and the attempts to bring together MPRLP and CIPHET (and enable institutional learning in CIPHET), reveal how the capacity of two public sector research organizations to address pro-poor post-harvest innovations can be improved. Two relatively direct cases of impacts on livelihoods of the poor (where the ILAC project has interacted), are evident in the Kasaragod- cashew processing unit established by TIDE, and the processes for drying and marketing explored with CCD (the Orissa CPHP coalition).

Environment (max 100 words)
What do you know about any impact on the environment? What impact and where? Give details and information sources.

Institutional learning has enabled a better understanding of the mutual dependence of livelihoods of the poor and the environment in the Orissa (fruit processing), Andhra (rainy season sorghum) and Jabalpur (NTFP) CPHP projects, the lac sector, the fuel efficient dryers/stoves case. The environmental impacts have been most pronounced in the more inclusive decision-making processes and rules/norms of research within these projects, that understand the seasonal variation in crop/commodity production and processing.

Signature Date 19 March 2005

Core Partner Livelihood Services
.
Joint Managing Partner Rasheed Sulaiman V

ANNEXES

I Copies of the stakeholder, gender, livelihoods and environmental form included with the concept note.

II Project Logical Framework

III Partner (user) organisations workplan for adopting project outputs

a. IIM Proposal
b. CPCRI Proposal
c. ResNet SA Plans

IV Copies of diaries, coalition meeting reports etc

a. Proceedings of two ILAC meetings
b. Proceedings of the communication and meeting held at MPRLP, Bhopal for organising the CIPHET-MPRLP Facilitated Institutional Leaning and Change exercise
c. Communication between TIDE and ILAC project for organising the CD workshop on Market skills for rural value added products at Kasargode
d. Programme Schedule, participant lists and Proceedings of the CD workshop on "Market skills for rural value added products" at Kasargode
e. Programme Schedule and participant list of the training programme-CD Workshop on Rural Innovations, ICRISAT
f. Note submitted during participation and discussion on CG Priority Setting Exercise for Improved production and processing systems for High Value Commodities

V Feedback on the process from Partners(s) and users (where appropriate)

a. Expression of thanks and interest in applying the learning's from the CD workshop on Rural Innovations-Mary Simon
b. Expression of interest from Aga Khan Foundation
c. Expression of interest from National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development (NABARD)

VI Tabulated description of disseminated outputs (format from green book) – same as given in the PCSS and should include all published, unpublished and data sets. If any of the reports included in this annex has not been submitted to the programme previously, please include a copy (preferably an electronic copy or if not available a hard copy)

a. Book Innovations in Innovation-Reflections on Partnership, Institutions and Learning
b. Institutional output of the ILAC project- Process insights from a policy coalition
c. Policy Brief Draft- Institutional Learning and Change- a review of concepts and principles
d. All powerpoint presentations made by the ILAC project team