THE SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH AND INITIATIVES FOR SUSTAINABLE TECHNOLOGIES AND INSTITUTIONS (SRISTI):
A Case Study

FINAL REPORT

Leanne Burton, Research Officer
Policy and Planning, IDRC
April, 2003
Executive Summary

This study is an evaluation of the public policy influence of the Society for Research and Initiatives for Sustainable Technologies and Institutions (SRISTI). The evaluation is part of a set of case studies commissioned by IDRC’s Evaluation Unit as part of a larger study which looks at the influence of IDRC-supported research on public policy, in the countries where it works.

IDRC has been working with SRISTI (an Indian-based non-governmental organization) since the early 1990s, providing core support for institutional strengthening, and a range of activities related to the preservation and valuation of traditional knowledge and practices related to natural resource management.

The case study combined extensive desk research of relevant documentation with a series of in-depth interviews with actors related to SRISTI and its work. This included villagers, academics, NGO workers, SRISTI staff and those from offspring organizations, IDRC staff, and government officials.

Policy influence in this case has been largely intermediate: expanding policy capacities, through improving the knowledge and information of certain actors, and broadening policy horizons through (for example) establishing networks and other opportunities for learning. SRISTI has also had modest success in affecting policy regimes, by contributing to policy formulation in the areas of finance and biodiversity.

Among the facilitating factors which have contributed to policy influence are: SRISTI’s timing and fit with current thinking about innovation and the commercialization and protection of knowledge; its history of groundwork and verified examples of traditional innovation; and the entrepreneurial nature of its leader Professor Anil Gupta. SRISTI’s challenges now are to develop mechanisms for sustainability, and to entrench some of its activities and – ultimately – to realize its vision in the policy sphere, to ensure widespread and permanent support for the protection and valuation of indigenous knowledge in the country.
1. Introduction

1.1 General

One of IDRC’s strategic goals as outlined in the current Corporate Strategy and Program Framework (2000-05) states that: “IDRC will foster and support the production, dissemination, and application of research results leading to policies and technologies to enhance the lives of people in developing countries” (IDRC, 2000, p.vi).

In 2001 the Evaluation Unit initiated a strategic evaluation of the influence of IDRC-supported research on public policy in the countries where it works. A series of case studies across regions and program areas were planned, to help build a corporate picture of the Centre’s experience in this field. The case studies are intended to answer questions such as what constitutes public policy influence in IDRC’s experience, how has IDRC-supported research influenced public policy, and what factors have either contributed to, or inhibited the process.

The evaluation is a learning exercise for IDRC and its partners, and is intended to inform planning and performance assessment at the project, program, and corporate levels of the organization.

1.2 The Case

This case study considers the policy influence of the Society for Research and Initiatives for Sustainable Technologies and Institutions (SRISTI) – an NGO which IDRC has supported since 1992, based in Ahmedabad in the Indian state of Gujarat.

SRISTI is based on the Gandhian notion of “inverting the pyramid” – recognizing the breadth and value of grassroots skills and knowledge. This it has encapsulated into its own “honey bee philosophy” – just as a bee moves amongst flowers collecting and distributing pollen, doing good and not harm, so too does SRISTI endeavour to move amongst local innovators, documenting and disseminating their knowledge and innovations in local languages, and ensuring that part of any benefit accrues to the originator.

Over the years SRISTI has broadened its mandate to include work on experimentation, marketing, and distribution, and through a combination of networking and targeted communication strategies, has built up a diverse range of partners, including state and central government officials, and multilateral organizations. The organization continues to challenge the status quo (i.e. areas rich in biodiversity remaining poor economically), and to seek ways of encouraging collaboration between formal and informal science, both nationally and internationally.

1.3 Methodology

The method of analysis for this case followed closely the terms of reference provided for the studies. The consultant reviewed IDRC project documents, and throughout the study collected a variety of reports, pamphlets, and other official documents from SRISTI and other organizations and individuals visited.

The consultant also visited Ahmedabad, and conducted roughly two-dozen interviews with people affiliated with SRISTI, its offspring organizations GIAN and NIF, and other partner groups as well (e.g. Gujarat Institute of Development Research). An effort was made to meet not only with project implementers, but also with beneficiaries, IDRC staff associated with the project, policy
makers, and partners. A list of people interviewed is provided in Annex Three. The evaluation has been written up as a case study, to provide readers with a rich array of information, as well as personal accounts of events as they happened.

2. Context

2.1 A Third Agricultural Revolution

SRISTI’s effort to reassert the value of traditional knowledge is in many ways a response to the negative effects of the Green Revolution, particularly as it relates to traditional seed and crop varieties, herbal pesticides, and organic farming.

The Green Revolution of the 1960s was an agricultural program which responded to rapid population growth, food shortages, and poverty with high-yielding crop varieties, increased irrigation, and the expanded use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, together with (supposed) better agricultural policies (International Food Policy Research Institute, 2002, para.2). Despite its achievements, the Green Revolution has led to “second generation challenges” such as disparities in agricultural growth, food insecurity, decreasing diversity, stagnant or declining productivity in certain crops, growing ecological imbalances and unsustainable agricultural practices.

This scenario has played itself out in India. The Green Revolution in the country was achieved through the continued expansion of farmland, double-cropping, intensive irrigation, and hybrid seeds. Although for the first time India was able to produce enough food to feed itself, new agricultural policies mainly benefited large commercial producers who could afford to buy fertilizer and other inputs in large quantities, hold out for best prices, and access government-subsidized credit. In addition it was usually these large growers that had optimal access to irrigation. Today the land in India

“...is increasingly unable to support this burden of intensive agriculture. Crop yields – and water resources – are declining alarmingly, and some parts are close to becoming barren. Many farmers are heavily in debt from their investments in new equipment and reliance on chemicals, and rural unemployment is increasing. These are ominous signs of a deteriorating farm economy” (Sharma, 2000, para.4).

The Indian Government is now preparing for a third agricultural revolution, still seen as the most viable engine of growth in the country (the sector employs roughly 80 percent of the Indian workforce). In its 10th five-year plan (which will take effect in April 2003) the Government has planned a series of reforms aimed at generating 50 million new jobs over the next five years. Much of the emphasis is on improving the productivity of the agricultural sector, by focusing on commercial agriculture linked with downstream agricultural industries and exports. Emphasis will be on creating jobs in sectors that can stimulate growth (e.g. cotton), provide self-sufficiency (e.g. oilseeds, dairy), and protect the environment (e.g. wasteland development).

2.2 Intellectual Property Rights and Biodiversity

SRISTI’s mandate is very much focused on the protection of natural resources through the valuation and protection of traditional knowledge and farmers’ rights. Over the last 20 years or so, intellectual property rights (IPRs) – particularly as they relate to biological resources – has been the subject of passionate global debate. In 1980 the United States Supreme Court ruled that a
human-made microorganism genetically engineered to improve its ability to degrade crude oil could be considered a patentable product, because it was not a naturally occurring composition. Prior to this it was widely recognized that living organisms and cells were products of nature and not patentable (Jerome, 1998). Recognizing the economic potential of patenting biological resources, pharmaceutical companies have become increasingly interested in their collection and use.

“With the legal infrastructure supporting the approval of patents on genetically engineered microorganisms, man-made copies of nature were now considered to be legitimate vehicles for the accumulation of capital and thus biological resources became serious candidates for pharmaceutical research and development” (Jerome, 1998, p.38).

In 1983 governments at the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations adopted the International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (IU). The IU posited that genetic resources for food and agriculture were the “common heritage of mankind” and tried to balance biotechnology products and farmers’ varieties and wild material; the interests of developed and developing countries; and the rights of breeders and farmers. Northern governments refused to make it legally-binding, and so the IU was reduced to a voluntary undertaking. The International Undertaking attempted to recognize and reward farmers’ innovation; however there has been much debate over its effectiveness.

In 1992 governments adopted the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which “…brought genetic resources under [the] jurisdiction of national governments and linked access to these resources with the fair and equitable sharing of benefits accrued from them” (GRAIN, 2002, para.3). Countries were encouraged to develop their own strategies for promoting the conservation and sustainable use of their resources. Because the Convention ran counter to the earlier International Undertaking, FAO member states decided to harmonize the two. This process took seven years, and resulted in a new International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in 2001.

In the meantime, the World Trade Organization was established in 1995 and took over administration of the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). The TRIPS agreement is central to the global trading system, and requires all WTO members to grant IPRs on plant varieties, making private control over genetic resources “…the rule, not the exception, and seriously threaten[ing] any exchange of germplasm as well as the inherent rights of local communities, particularly in developing countries” (GRAIN, 2001, para.4). The 2001 Treaty attempts to address issues of access and benefit-sharing, however it is criticized by some for not being the strong international instrument that many had hoped would curb further privatization of biological resources and protect the rights of communities and farmers in developing countries. There is no dispute resolution mechanism and although farmers’ rights are recognized, protection depends on national law. It remains to be seen whether this latest Treaty will contribute to the promotion of global food security and the sustainable management of biodiversity.

On a more positive note,

“…the emergence of IPR and indigenous peoples as an object of study has opened up a new arena for indigenous and environmental activism. …the attention that has been focused on IPR as a possible forum for compensating indigenous peoples has generated discussion about alternative, and potentially more viable systems of compensation for indigenous peoples’ knowledge and resources” (Jerome, 1998, p.41).
India is one of the few countries to have drafted national legislation for the protection of plant varieties and farmers’ rights. In 2001 the Indian Parliament passed a Plant Variety Protection and Farmers’ Rights Bill. This legislation protects farmers’ rights to save, resow, exchange, and sell seed and produce. This is especially important for farmers in India, since the farming community is the largest seed producer, providing roughly 87 percent of the country’s annual requirement (Dr. Suman Sahai, 2001, para.10).

2.3 Knowledge, Science, Technology, and Innovation

Although in many ways SRISTI is a response to the problems and challenges of rural poverty in India, it is also a product of its time, in terms of fitting within changing paradigms of knowledge, science and technology, and innovation.

The end of the 20th century saw

…an explosive growth in the generation and utilization of knowledge of all types, particularly of the results of scientific research. This has led to: (i) the emergence of the “knowledge society”; (ii) the transformation of scientific research; (iii) highly complex and systemic innovation processes; (iv) a change in the structure of productive activities and a transition towards a new techno-economic paradigm; and (v) the acknowledgement of the importance of traditional knowledge, techniques and production (Sagasti, 2002, p.31).

The rising costs of basic and applied research, accompanied by increasing opportunities for the commercial exploitation of knowledge have given rise to major shifts in the institutional setting for knowledge generation and utilization. As well,

in each and every area of human inquiry our knowledge is advancing with such speed that it is nearly impossible to provide an accurate picture of the breadth and intensity of the changes under way (Sagasti, 2002, p.39).

This has in some ways prompted a questioning of the privileged place of science, and by some the reassertion of a place for traditional knowledge and practices, particularly in developing countries.

It has been estimated that more than three fourth of the world’s population relies on indigenous knowledge to meet their medical needs, and at least half relies on traditional knowledge and techniques for crops and food supplies” (Sagasti, 2002, p.60).

A large part of SRISTI’s effort to reassert the value of traditional knowledge and local creativity has been its attempts to link the formal and informal science communities in India, in an effort to foster mutual understanding and respect, as well as mutual benefit.

The scientific community in India (as elsewhere) has resisted these challenges to modern science, and any attempts at linking science with business, and formal science with informal science. National agricultural institutions do not, for the most part, recognize farmers’ knowledge. Although there is great scope for synergy (the reductionist approach of formal science can complement farmers’ holistic view, and vice versa) right now the institutional mechanisms for bringing the two groups together still do not exist.
3. The Honey Bee Network and SRISTI

SRISTI grew out of an informal network (Honey Bee) of academics, farmers, scientists, and others who wanted to stem the erosion of traditional knowledge in India, and to document and share local innovation. The Honey Bee network (formed in 1989) also sought to link formal and informal science; the two were seen as complementary – traditional knowledge having the potential to expand the frontiers of science, which could itself enhance or build upon local creativity.

At the heart of the Honey Bee endeavour was the desire to improve the socio-economic conditions of knowledge-rich but resource-poor farmers and other rural dwellers. Integral to its strategy was the belief that innovators should be acknowledged and if possible rewarded for their creativity. Out of this notion eventually grew a series of strategies for monetary and non-monetary incentives and rewards. More recently this has also incorporated work on intellectual property rights and prior informed consent.

As the Honey Bee Network grew, there was a need to institutionalize – and thereby consolidate – its work. Core support from IDRC, and a three-year, USD$150,000 fellowship from the Pew Charitable Trust made this transition possible, and so the Society for Research and Initiatives for Sustainable Technologies and Institutions (SRISTI) was established and registered as a formal organization in 1993. SRISTI is based at the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (IIMA), a factor which has helped to secure its reputation as a legitimate and leading NGO in the country.

3.1 Mandate

SRISTI’s mandate has changed over time only insofar as it has expanded to incorporate many new concepts and ideas. At the conceptual level, the organization seeks to:

(a) link informal and formal science and knowledge systems,
(b) catalyze social change in biodiversity-rich areas,
(c) become an international centre of excellence for documenting, disseminating, and adding value to indigenous innovations,
(d) establish decentralized entrepreneurial networks,
(e) develop institutional mechanisms for protecting the intellectual property rights of innovators in developing countries,
(f) eventually devolve ownership of the organization to innovators themselves.

Putting this into practice, SRISTI has progressed over time to experimenting and adding value to innovations, as well as designing, producing, marketing, and delivering. It has gained access to venture capital to support the scaling up of products and services, and is endeavouring to set up an International Network for Sustainable Technology Applications and Registrations (INSTAR) to secure intellectual property rights protection for small innovators. SRISTI has also generated both material and non-material incentive models for recognizing and rewarding local creativity. For example, SRISTI tries to encourage – at a minimum – local communities to recognize and honour the creative and innovative amongst them.
3.2 Activities

SRISTI has intentionally remained a small organization, making it necessary to rely on a variety of networks and communication strategies to carry out its activities.

*Documentation and dissemination* have been central to SRISTI’s work from the beginning. Relying on a network of undergraduate and postgraduate students, field workers, and innovators, as well as competitions, agricultural fairs, etc. SRISTI has built up a set of electronic databases of more than ten thousand innovations and examples of traditional knowledge and practices. Multimedia and multilingual tools (including the Honey Bee Newsletter, published in six local languages) ensure that this information is accessible to a range of audiences, locally, nationally, and internationally.

The organization is engaged in a wide range of activities related to the conservation of biodiversity in India. SRISTI has endeavoured to develop sustainable technologies and natural products in different ways. In collaboration with scientists from agricultural universities it has developed simple on-farm experiments to validate traditional practices. It has set up two labs, one for herbal pesticides and one for natural products, to conduct further research on those which have market potential. Various studies have been or are being conducted on issues such as soil microbial diversity, pesticidal residues in soils, and the green market climate.

SRISTI set up an experimental *venture promotion fund* in 1993, to support research required for manufacturing and marketing innovations on a large scale (SRISTI, 1999). Several of the projects supported through the fund were highlighted at a 1997 International Conference on Creativity and Innovations at Grassroots (ICCIG). Representatives of the Government of Gujarat that had been invited to the conference agreed to set up a permanent venture promotion fund for small innovators, calling it the Gujarat Grassroots Augmentation Innovation Network (GIAN). GIAN was established in the same year, and has taken over responsibility for scaling up innovations through commercial and non-commercial channels.

The NGO has also developed several schemes for *rewarding innovators*, including small trust funds managed by community innovators (see Table 1 below). In 1994 SRISTI set up the SRISTI SANMAN Award, given to 10 or 15 outstanding innovators each year.
### Table One – Rewarding Innovators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awards</td>
<td>• Trust funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fellowships</td>
<td>• Revolving funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Patent rights</td>
<td>• Venture capital support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• License fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Material</td>
<td>Honouring individuals through conferring:</td>
<td>Changes in educational curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Titles</td>
<td>Favourable policy environment for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invitations to serve as guest speakers</td>
<td>conservation practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public congratulation</td>
<td>Eco-friendly products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technology transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SRISTI has proposed to set up an International Network for Sustainable Technology Applications and Registrations (INSTAR), to help small innovators secure IPR protection. Already in some cases SRISTI has filed patents on behalf of local innovators, at both the national and international levels. SRISTI has also developed a set of Ethical Guidelines for Accessing and Exploration of Biodiversity.

The organization has also tried to incorporate indigenous knowledge into education curricula, and to teach students (at all levels) and teachers the value of traditional knowledge. SRISTI holds biodiversity contests for school children, and awards monthly fellowships to outstanding participants. It organizes workshops for innovative primary school teachers and supports summer training in common property resource management for teachers and NGO workers. As noted earlier, SRISTI also relies heavily on undergraduate and postgraduate level students to act as researchers or “scouts”. During school holidays, students are sent out to conduct field research, identifying local innovators and documenting their creative knowledge and practices. Post-secondary students are also encouraged to write their theses on different aspects of indigenous knowledge systems.

On the subject of networking, SRISTI has endeavoured over the years to provide training, as well as technical, methodological, and institutional support to members of the Honey Bee Network (SRISTI, 1999). The organization has an electronic database of about 20,000 documents on topics related to natural sciences, indigenous knowledge systems, economics, etc. It has also begun work with the World Bank on InfoDev, an electronic database which combines networking with touchscreen, multilingual kiosks. SRISTI organizes meetings at the village, regional, state, and national levels, and special sessions at various international and national conferences, such as the Indian Science Congress, where local innovators are awarded on the same platform as formal scientists.

In recent years SRISTI has paid particular attention to women’s knowledge and practices, especially in fields dominated by females, such as family and animal health; the collection and conservation of natural resources such as water, fuel, and fodder; and dairy farming. It has issued challenges to its Network membership to develop innovative solutions for reducing the drudgery and (sometimes) risks associated with women’s work, and in collaboration with the Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) has distributed several technologies to this end, including a modified water pulley designed by a local farmer.
At the national level, SRISTI’s appeal to several like-minded government officials prompted the Department of Science and Technology to establish the National Innovation Foundation (NIF) in 2000, with Rs.200 million of operating capital. NIF is closely linked with SRISTI and GIAN, and serves to scale up the work of these two organizations. It acts as a national register of grassroots innovation and traditional knowledge, and helps to develop and market innovations, linking innovators with formal science and technology.

SRISTI has also organized or participated in various workshops and consultations on topics such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. SRISTI and the IIMA organized a joint consultation with the World Intellectual Property Organization and farmers on IPR protection in 1998. SRISTI supported a national workshop and consultation with Indian stakeholders to assist the national Ministry of Environment and Forests in developing a new policy for accessing and conserving biological resources. It also contributed to a number of position papers for national and international conferences.

4. IDRC’s Involvement

4.1 General

IDRC’s relationship with Professor Anil Gupta and SRISTI began in 1992, when two of the Centre’s program officers (Yianna Lambrou of the Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) division, and Gisèle Morin-Labatut of the Information Sciences and Systems (ISS) division) met with SRISTI staff to discuss a draft proposal they had been invited to submit.

At that time, the ENR division had identified indigenous knowledge as one component of its biodiversity theme, with emphasis on supporting networks and research that “…examine mechanisms which reduce the accelerating erosion of indigenous knowledge through both the strengthening and adaptation of social and cultural institutions, and the development of information systems that capture and systematize knowledge before it is irreversibly lost” (IDRC, 1993, p.iii). SRISTI’s efforts to document and disseminate local knowledge and innovation in Gujarat fit well within this framework.

As well, SRISTI’s work corresponded with the ISS division’s Development Communication Program, which stressed the principles of access, participation and self-management, and also communication amongst researchers and local communities. The work of ISS reflected “…a growing recognition of the importance of systematizing information originating at the local level, of making it available to other local communities, and of putting before the international community the issue of respect for local intellectual property rights” (IDRC, 1993, p.iv).

In terms of IDRC’s national and regional priorities, SRISTI’s endeavours corresponded with the Centre’s plan to facilitate the development of multidisciplinary, community-driven approaches to natural resource management.
4.2 Objectives and Outcomes

4.2.1 Phase One (1993-1996)

IDRC agreed to program (core) support for SRISTI, to enable the new NGO to transition from a volunteer-based network of researchers and activists into a more structured and permanent organization. Because the nature of its objectives were medium- to long-term, these were not easily reconciled with IDRC’s usual short-term, project support. The Centre’s prior experience with the IIMA (which was the recipient institution for this project) had shown it to be both competent and reliable, and so core support was deemed appropriate.

In addition to the broad objective of consolidating the new organization, this first phase had four key objectives: to strengthen the capacity of grassroots innovators to (1) protect their intellectual property rights, (2) experiment to add value to their knowledge, (3) evolve entrepreneurial ability to generate returns from this knowledge, and (4) enrich their cultural and institutional basis for dealing with nature (IDRC, 1993).

To achieve these objectives, the NGO delineated a series of program activities, including comparative research in documenting biodiversity; documentation of local knowledge and innovation; market research, product development, and testing; research and legal support to assist innovators in protecting their IPRs; network and communication activities; database development; education and training.

By the end of phase one in 1996, SRISTI was recognized as an innovative leader. More than 5000 innovative practices had been documented and disseminated, in six Indian languages, through tools such as the Honey Bee Newsletter. Over 1000 groups had become members of the Honey Bee Network, including many farmers.

During the first three years of IDRC support SRISTI had focused on experimentation and value-addition, providing an institutional framework for farmers to experiment on their own and attempting to link innovators with institutions that could assist in product development. As well, SRISTI sought to find ways of ensuring that benefits accrued to the originator.

4.2.2 Phase Two (1997-2000)

This second phase continued to build on SRISTI’s early work, with a particular focus on strengthening intermediate and later stages of the innovation development process (i.e. experimentation and value-addition, as well as providing both material and non-material incentives to innovators). SRISTI had expanded its scope to include not only farmers but others working with natural resources, and those involved in rural production and cottage enterprises.

Other additions to its mandate:
(a) generate interest amongst young people in local knowledge and ethics;
(b) document and disseminate institutional (as well as technological) innovations;
(c) pay particular attention to women’s knowledge;
(d) establish systems for certifying organic products and protecting consumers;
(e) assist the central and state governments in operationalizing the provisions of international treaties (CBD, GATT) and amending the Plant Varieties Act to protect the interests of innovators and farmers.
By the end of this phase, SRISTI had documented an additional 8000 local innovations and had validated or improved several, including herbal pesticides and veterinary and human plant-based medicines. SRISTI had developed and tested various reward and compensation schemes, and had struck a royalty-sharing agreement with a private company interested in three veterinary drugs. During this second phase SRISTI and the Government of Gujarat also established GIAN, to assist in scaling up grassroots innovations. With the national government, SRISTI set up NIF, to scale out its state-level activities to the nation.

4.2.3 Phase Three (2000-present)

At the end of phase two, IDRC hired a consultant to do an external review of the project. A proposal for phase three was then developed with SRISTI, to address some of the limitations and gaps from the two earlier phases. IDRC wanted to ensure that the objectives of the previous phase (many of which were just getting started at the end of phase two) came to fruition. Also, because the program until now had been limited in its attempts to target women and in its analysis of gender-based innovations, phase three focused particularly on women.

The main objective of this phase (which is still ongoing) is “…to identify the creative and innovative ways in which women have tried to cope with various stresses individually or collectively and through technological or institutional solutions in order to conserve biodiversity and sustainably manage natural resources” (IDRC, 2000, p.2). SRISTI is working closely with SEWA to implement the program activities of this phase. To improve project monitoring, IDRC and SRISTI have listed specific output targets.

5. Public Policy Influence

5.1 Research and Public Policy in India

Increasingly in India policy making is becoming a bureaucratic function, while governance and administration tasks are shifting to politicians (typically only major policy will go to politicians for sanction). There has also been a deliberate effort in the country to depersonalize policy making – more and more policies are developed by committees, which will usually include a research contingent (A.K. Gupta, personal communication, November 19, 20, 23, 2002).

There are several formal mechanisms through which research may influence public policy in India, one of the most notable being the discussion committees which precede the development of the country’s five year plans by the national Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is a combination of academics and bureaucrats (roughly 80 percent) and political members (roughly 20 percent). When particular issues arise (e.g. WTO TRIPS commitments) the government will sometimes establish ad hoc committees to review current policy or to help develop new policy.

Considerable influence is also wielded by India’s government research institutions, the majority of which are focused on natural and “hard” sciences. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) is the preeminent research body in the country, with over 40 laboratories covering a wide range of scientific and industrial disciplines. In the social sciences there are very few government research organizations – the Indian Institutes of Management, the Indian Statistical Institute, the Indian Council of Philosophy Research, the Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, and the Centre for Development Studies. Consequently there is much less socially-relevant research produced within the inner circle of the policy sphere. Often what
research there is is at the conceptual level, with less attention given to the operational policy level and even less to the implemention level.

The government relies on these institutions for most of its policy research, and for the most part civil society organizations are minor actors on the policy-making stage, particularly in social science fields where the policy goals of civil society groups often conflict with the interests of policy-makers and other members of the elite ruling class.

An NGO may increase its chances of influencing policy if it is strategic and – equally important – if it is persistent.

While “most research does not influence public policy, if there is a focused research area that an organization is willing to pursue over a period of time then this will have a better chance of influencing policy. Even influencing the opposition or lobby groups is influencing policy. …Organizations must [also] be aware of issues relevant to the government and ensure that their work is relevant to this. The government has obligations to respond to issues and problems” (S. Chokkakula, personal communication, November 24, 2002).

Having identified an issue and developed alternative solutions which it pursues over the long-term, an organization may find itself with an opportunity to influence policy – a “policy window”. Although it is difficult to know for certain when a policy window will open, an organization that has followed the government’s action on a particular issue and has prepared palatable policy options for the government to utilize, will have a greater chance of influencing policy than an organization which has not done its homework.

Often research institutions do not produce relevant research and often present information without empirical evidence to back it up (K. Patel, personal communication, November 25, 2002).

One of the often-cited reasons for SRISTI’s success has been its years of groundwork, documenting the traditional knowledge and practices of the grassroots and working with innovators to improve and disseminate their innovations.

The external context is also a relevant factor to consider when studying policy influence in India, and it is something which varies with each issue. Sometimes policy is driven by need, but often it is totally influenced by donor agendas. Often it is these factors which necessitate a government response that prompts the government to consider alternative action. As one person noted

  government research organizations inform public policy, while non-governmental research organizations build a knowledge base of alternatives. …Documenting and creating knowledge is the background work to influencing policy. When the government wants or needs to draw on these alternative models they are there (S. Chokkakula, personal communication, November 24, 2002).

In addition, the variety of actors in a policy community view issues/problems and responses/solutions differently. Regardless of whether they all support a particular action or policy, they may have different reasons for doing so and different views on what is important (S. Saxena, personal communication, November 19, 2002).
Some policy changes occur because policy makers have different ideas. Sometimes policy makers operate with imperfect information, and sometimes policy is developed because there is pressure to pursue certain policies (e.g. pressure to encourage farmers to grow “improved” varieties because they are seen as better) (K. Patel, personal communication, November 25, 2002).

5.2 The Policy Community

Paul Pross’ (1992) “policy community” concept is a useful point of departure for this section. Within any area of policy (e.g. agriculture) there are sub-government actors (politicians, departments, strong interest groups, and relevant international organisations) and an attentive public (less influential politicians and departments, smaller interest groups, journalists, academics, and citizens). Both groups are interested in and able to exert some influence on policy.

SRISTI’s activities extend across several policy areas, including agriculture, rural development, forests, education, animal husbandry, economics, and intellectual property. One’s ability to map out each of these policy communities is somewhat complicated by the fact that in each area SRISTI also operates within several different jurisdictions (often simultaneously) – state, national, regional, and international.

Across areas, some of the key actors (individuals and institutions) include:

Sub-government actors

- The President of India (A.P.J. Abdul Kalam) – in December 2002 President Kalam opened the National Innovation Foundation’s second annual awards ceremony

- National Government Ministries, particularly Science and Technology (Minister Joshi), Agriculture, Rural Development, Finance (former-Minister Sinha; current Advisor to the Minister V. Kelkar), Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services, Environment and Forests, Planning Commission (Chairman K.C. Pant), Education, Water Resources, and Human Resource Development

- National Research Institutions, most notably the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Dr. Mashelkar) and the Indian Council for Agricultural Research

- State Research Institutions such as the Gujarat Institute of Development Research (Dr. Iyengar)

- Regional Policy-making Bodies such as the South Asia Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and Regional Networks such as the South Asia Network for Food, Ecology and Culture (SANFEC)

- International Organizations, including the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Commonwealth Science Council (CSC), UNCTAD, and UNESCO

Attentive Public actors

- National NGOs such as the Swaminathan Foundation, the Foundation for the Revitalization of Local Health Traditions (FRLHT), Kalpavriksh, VIKSAT, Navdanya,
the Pharmaceutical Education and Research Development Centre (PERD) and Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA)

- **The Media** – the power of the media to disseminate information and alter public opinion is undisputed. SRISTI has had considerable success over the years in leveraging television, print, voice, and electronic tools to spread information and share its vision

- **State Universities**, including Gujarat University, Maharaja Sayaji Rao University, Sadar Patel University, Gujarat Agricultural University; also the University Grants Commission (should UGC be in sub-government?)

- **State and Regional NGOs** such as BAIF and the Aga Khan Rural Support Program (AKRSP)

- **National and State Educational Institutions**, including the Indian Institutes of Technology, Indian Institutes of Management, and the gram vidyapiths

- **Civil Society** networks such as the Honey Bee Network, and a myriad of small village/farmer groupings

SRISTI’s reliance on networks means that it has strong connections to many of the sub-government and attentive public actors on this list. To a very large extent, much of the policy influence that SRISTI has achieved over the years has been through these networks – introducing new ideas and concepts and stimulating discussion around these, for example.

### 5.3 Intent

Using Lindquist’s typology of policy influence as a starting point, two things are immediately clear from studying documents and speaking with stakeholders related to this case: (1) SRISTI has always included policy influence (broadly defined) among its objectives but as a means rather than an end, and (2) its efforts to influence policy have become broader and more explicit over time.

“The Honey Bee Network was born with the aim of uncovering the creative potential of grassroots people. To expand the space for local creativity and accelerate interaction between creative grassroots innovators and scientists, academics, policy makers and civil society…” (SRISTI, 2000, p.1).

SRISTI’s long-term vision is to reassert the value of indigenous knowledge, and to reward and protect it within India and globally.\(^1\) Policy influence is a means to this end, although over time SRISTI has come to see it as a key component for achieving its vision. Its approach has not, however, been to try to directly influence policy. Rather the organization has targeted civil society and tried to build capacity (through networks) and influence public opinion, knowing that over time this would likely serve to influence public policy.

Through its work with local innovators over the years SRISTI has come to realize that policy impacts are important (K. Patel, personal communication, November 25, 2002).

---

\(^1\) IDRC’s aim is to effect change at the national level – a recognition of the importance of informal science in natural resource management. (Liz Fajber, 2002)
SRISTI has recognized the importance of compatible public policy if one wants to effect widespread, sustainable change in a country. Although it has adopted a grassroots approach to development, it has also targeted different levels of government to garner support for its work. Most of its objectives, by their very nature, have public policy implications. Its desire to link formal and informal science systems requires a fundamental shift in thinking within the scientific community, which is part of the larger established order. Its goal of catalyzing social change in biodiversity-rich areas has state and national implications for the agricultural industry, the education system, and economic support systems for micro entrepreneurs. Its work on intellectual property rights and patents must eventually be sanctioned by the Indian government if indigenous knowledge and innovation are to be guaranteed protection within the country and internationally.

Fundamentally, SRISTI has pursued its vision with persistence and flexibility. Its strategy has evolved considerably over time, to incorporate new ideas and methodologies, change courses when necessary, and appeal to different actors in different policy areas. Professor Gupta has described the approach as one that is “persistent, proactive, patient, and participatory” (A.K. Gupta, personal communication, November 19, 20, 23, 2002).

5.4 Mechanisms

SRISTI’s early work documenting traditional knowledge, practices and innovations became the foundation for all its other activities. Now more than a decade later, SRISTI has a wealth of documented information that it is able to package for different audiences.

Groundwork has been key to the influence of policy-makers – documentation, providing evidence of the creative thinking happening at the grassroots level, and scientifically validating this knowledge. Until now this was not brought to the policy-makers attention (V. Sherry Chand, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

SRISTI’s strategy was to develop empirical examples and then approach policy-makers. Roughly 95 percent of NGOs aren’t able to influence top level policy. The 5 percent that are have empirical examples (K. Patel, personal communication, November 25, 2002).

As its work expanded to include experimentation and value-addition, SRISTI began to think of more ways to involve the scientific community, inviting scientists to witness on-farm experimentation and innovation, and to experiment with grassroots innovations themselves. As SRISTI thought about prototyping and marketing it began to reach out to the business community, inviting design firms to help develop technological innovations for example. Its more recent focus on IPRs and patents have added to its connections with international organizations and foreign companies. Professor Gupta in particular is a prolific writer and well known in international natural resource management (and other) circles. He has participated in several international conferences on a variety of topics, and collaborated with organizations like the World Intellectual Property Rights Organization (WIPO). SRISTI’s work has become increasingly proactive, and as its activities have expanded along thematic or issue lines, they have also expanded in scope (state, national, international).

As an organization SRISTI has intentionally remained small, and has built up a series of networks to share information, foster collaboration, and impart its vision. Over time the organization has become increasingly sophisticated in its conceptualization of a strategy, and as it has expanded its work into areas such as intellectual property protection and incentive and reward schemes, the organization has broadened its networks to embrace more of the policy community. SRISTI hosts a range of meetings from the village to the international level, and promotes dialogue through its
website and through events such as agricultural fairs and shodh yatras. A shodh yatra is a “voyage of discovery” - a group of people walk from village to village for several days, searching out innovators, honouring local knowledge experts, and sharing information about the organization and its vision.

Creative communication has been a central part of its strategy, starting with the Honey Bee Newsletter. The Newsletter combines a wealth of technical and cultural information with the human appeal of personal stories, humour, and challenges to the reader, and continues to be a dynamic tool for reaching a variety of audiences. SRISTI has developed a range of communication tools geared toward different target groups, their particular interests and information needs (for example interactive village kiosks, compilations of its databases on CD-ROM, various written materials, videos, posters, etc.). It has capitalized on multimedia facilities, and has been proactive in its attempts to reach policy officials. For example, SRISTI set up a network of contacts (including state government representatives) to discuss indigenous innovation and related issues, and to encourage the government to respond. It invited government representatives to its International Conference on Creativity and Innovation at the Grassroots (ICCIG) in 1997, and held follow up meetings with government officials. As a result the government established the Gujarat Innovation Augmentation Network (GIAN), with a core fund of Rs.10 million.

SRISTI works simultaneously at all levels of government. It has been able to identify issues requiring central government attention, those possible to address at lower levels, and has then pursued both courses simultaneously. By ensuring that there is a national element to its work, SRISTI makes the point that what is possible in one state is possible in all states of India (Dr. S. Iyengar, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

However SRISTI’s philosophy and vision have always represented an alternative to the mindset of those who wield power in India (be it political, economic, or scientific), and for that reason the organization has had to be both realistic in what it can achieve over a certain time, and strategic in its approach. The organization operates under the assumptions of Carol Weiss’ enlightenment model, which theorizes “…knowledge gained through research can enlighten or broaden the existing knowledge base of policy makers which, over time, can create a gradual shift of conceptual thinking and, therefore, the policies which support that conceptual thinking” (S. Neilson, 2001, 10).

As Professor Gupta (personal communication, November 19, 20, 23, 2002) noted, policy influence may be achieved through

“influencing policy makers thinking and actions directly, by creating examples of what we think is desirable, and through experimentation. Through pedagogy we can also influence students who might influence policy in the future. We can invest in individuals who may influence policy. How we share our research can influence policy.”

SRISTI relies heavily on student networks to scout and document local innovation, and it has endeavoured to incorporate indigenous knowledge and an appreciation for the same into school curricula. Higher level students are encouraged to write papers on different aspects on indigenous knowledge systems, and the organization regularly visits university and gram vidyapith campuses to share information on itself and its work. Most of SRISTI’s staff and volunteers are young, and several have since gone on to pursue higher education and careers in related fields; this has been encouraged by Professor Gupta.
Part of SRISTI’s strategy now is to ensure the sustainability of its initiatives, by transferring as many as possible into structured (and government-financed) institutions, such as GIAN and NIF. The organization also continues to push the envelope and to use its successes as the basis for further action. Part of its vision is to establish a global innovation foundation, and it continues to push other parts of its original plan, such as setting up a micro venture fund, and helping to create a relationship of mutual respect and understanding between the formal and informal science communities in India.

5.5 Types of Policy Influence

The analysis of policy influence in this section is based on Evert Lindquist’s (2001) typology of policy influence as presented in his paper “Discerning Policy Influence: Framework for a Strategic Evaluation of IDRC-Supported Research”. Lindquist delineates three types of policy influence, outlined in Table 2 below.

**Table 2 – Types of Policy Influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanding Policy Capacities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the knowledge/data of certain actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting recipients to develop innovative ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving capabilities to communicate ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new talent for research and analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadening Policy Horizons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities for networking/learning within the jurisdiction or with colleagues elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing new concepts to frame debates, putting ideas on the agenda, or stimulating public debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating researchers and others who take up new positions with broader understanding of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating quiet dialogue among decision-makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affecting Policy Regimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification of existing programs or policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental re-design of programs or policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evert Lindquist, 2001

This typology provides a broad basis for defining what one means by “policy influence” and as Lindquist (2001) notes in his paper, the first two items (Expanding Policy Capacities and Broadening Policy Horizons) should perhaps more appropriately be termed “intermediate policy influence.”

This model is useful because it recognizes the complex and dynamic nature of the policy process; policy influence is not a static point in time but rather an ongoing evolution of problem/issue assessment by policy and decision makers, followed by their response (which may at times be no response at all), and the implications of that. As well, because policy influence does not occur in a vacuum, external factors (including competing interests) may affect outcomes in unpredictable ways. Policy influence is almost never direct or immediate – rather policy research and other information will usually percolate throughout the policy environment for a while, with new information constantly being introduced and old information challenged as policy-makers and
other actors decide how to respond. Lindquist’s typology captures some of the subtleties of policy influence, and also hints at the importance of timing, strategic targeting, persistence, and building a critical mass of support and information.

Section 5.6 will present some of the observable successes with respect to policy influence, in this case. This is not an exhaustive list – which might prove elusive in any event, given the complexities of the policy-making process – but rather a sample of key examples of where SRISTI has had an influence on public policy in India and to a lesser extent internationally.

5.6 Policy Influence in This Case

This section will consider each of Lindquist’s applicable types of policy influence in turn, with some description of how each of these has occurred and at which political level (village, state, national, international). Where appropriate the paper will expand upon the language used in Lindquist’s typology.

5.6.1 Expanding Policy Capacities

Improving the knowledge and information of certain actors

As mentioned earlier, SRISTI’s ten plus years of groundwork have been the foundation for all its other activities. The organization has documented over 10,000 grassroots innovations and traditional practices, and has packaged this information into a variety of formats for different audiences. Its primary audience is local communities – farmers, other innovators, students and children – SRISTI makes an effort to share information with communities in their own language. The NGO has leveraged the media to spread information both nationally and internationally, and it has appealed to different actors (political, academic, NGO), inviting them to participate in meetings and to collaborate in the work that SRISTI is doing.

It is impossible to know how much of this information is being absorbed by the various actors, however it is fair to say that there is evidence of some filtering through, as later sections will attest. SRISTI has put forward an agenda, with information to support it, and it is this framing of the information that makes it useful and useable for policy-makers.

SRISTI has generated awareness, and has given an institutional shape to its concepts (S.K. Shelat, personal communication, November 25, 2002).

Several government officials have made positive reference to SRISTI in talks that they have given at various fora. When asked whether he had been influenced by SRISTI’s work, Dr. Mashelkar replied

I have been, very greatly. I’ve spoken about the work of SRISTI and NIF, and the need to connect the two parts of the iceberg [formal and informal science] at international meetings, whereas eight to ten years ago this would have never been discussed (Dr. R.A. Mashelkar, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

SRISTI itself has gained considerable knowledge over the past decade. The organization uncovered for itself as well as others the wealth of indigenous knowledge and practices in the country, an exploratory activity which is ongoing. Several staff expressed their new appreciation for the sophistication of knowledge at the grassroots, and many talked about how the work had changed their personal outlook.
I plan to maintain my links to this project and continue related work when I return to the public sector. I am hoping to develop a model for rapid uptake of innovations with market potential (faster processing of the design, and prototyping) (J. Khuntia, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

My involvement has increased my awareness of and respect for local innovation. It has also strengthened my ethical beliefs (D. Vyas, personal communication, November 20, 2002).

My ethical beliefs have also been strengthened. In addition, I have learned the importance of precision and detail (H. Patel, personal communication, November 20, 2002).

I have worked with rural women for a long time but I am now beginning to appreciate how women do things differently and why. Previously SEWA’s focus was on women’s access to resources; now we are also considering how women use these resources differently and why. There is more critical analysis (R. Nanavaty, personal communication, November 23, 2002).

The next three examples of expanding policy capacities applies particularly to SRISTI itself, making it a more effective policy actor over time.

**Developing innovative ideas**

Over time the organization has developed several new and innovative ideas, and it continues to work with its original concepts as well, testing and expanding them. One of its creative outputs is its typology of innovations, which characterizes an innovation as a change or a new development in either materials, methods, or products. SRISTI has also done innovative work on biodiversity with its *Suggested Ethical Guidelines for Accessing and Exploring Biodiversity*; and on IPR protection with a *Prior Informed Consent* form for innovators and efforts to establish an international patent registration system.

**Improving capabilities to communicate ideas**

SRISTI has expanded its communication strategy and now works with a variety of media and other tools to gather and disseminate information. The organization has recognized the importance of tailoring communication to suit the needs and circumstances of the audience. For illiterate villagers it has developed interactive, picture-based computer kiosks, and for those that do read and write it communicates in their local language. SRISTI has learned the power of a story, and will often use these to impress upon more remote audiences the human face of its work. On several occasions it has encouraged local innovators themselves to present their work and ideas at meetings, both in India and abroad.

**Developing new talent for research and analysis**

As it has expanded its work to include scientific and technical experimentation of innovations and practices, SRISTI has brought in trained staff and established the Sadhbav Sristi Sanshodhan Laboratory and its own herbal lab. The former is a collaborative initiative with the SADBHAV foundation to provide value addition to local knowledge and green technologies. The latter is an in-house lab which experiments with herbal pesticides.
5.6.2 Broadening Policy Horizons

Government-Sanctioned “Space” to Work

The government’s financial contributions to our activities indicates influence, as does the set up of both GIAN and NIF. We cannot make direct links of attribution to SRISTI but we can see that government thinking has evolved (K.M. Gopakumar, personal communication, November 19, 2002).

State Level
In 1997 the Government of Gujarat created the Gujarat Grassroots Innovation Augmentation Network (GIAN). This was the culmination of several meetings between SRISTI and a number of government representatives; as well SRISTI had invited the government to its International Conference for Creativity and Innovations at the Grassroots (ICCIG) that year, where the concept of a venture fund was discussed. The Chief Secretary S.K. Shelat announced an initial fund of Rs.10 million to establish GIAN as “…a knowledge hub connecting grassroots innovators to financial resources and entrepreneurial spirits that would facilitate the commercialization of the innovations” (GIAN, 1999, p.4). GIAN is a registered trust with a twelve-member Board, including several state government officials.

GIAN acts as a go-between for innovators and government/business institutions, to facilitate the disbursement of resources to assist local entrepreneurs. Among its activities, the Network has signed agreements with several entrepreneurial promotion schemes which fall under the national Ministry of Science and Technology; it has established relationships with several educational institutions, NGOs, research and training institutions, and various government officials in an effort to find ways of collaborating and in the case of government to ensure that its activities are in step with those of the government. GIAN has also held several workshops for innovators on industrial ecology, IPRs, etc. and facilitated their participation at various state fairs and exhibitions. It has mobilized resources (financial, technical, administrative) for more than a dozen innovations, at various stages of the development and marketing process.

There are plans to create at least three other GIANs in various parts of the country; the Department of Science and Technology in Kerala, for example, is interested in supporting the establishment of GIAN South. Future GIANs will depend on how much money is committed from state governments in the area.

National Level
At the national level, the Ministry of Science and Technology established the National Innovation Foundation (NIF) in 2000 as an autonomous society under the chairpersonship of Dr. R.A. Mashelkar (Executive Director CSIR). NIF is in many ways a scaled-up/national version of SRISTI; broadly speaking its objectives are to help India become a global leader in sustainable technology, by providing appropriate support to grassroots innovators to develop and market their creations, and by fostering linkages between formal and informal science/knowledge systems.

SRISTI and NIF have a close working relationship, facilitated by the secondment of one SRISTI staff member to NIF, and the central role played by Professor Gupta in both organizations. During its first month of operation, those responsible for NIF met with members of the Planning Commission, to seek guidance and support. Deputy Chairman K.C. Pant wrote to India’s 28 Chief Ministers, requesting that they support the national campaign (rather than scouting for innovators across the country, NIF holds annual innovation competitions). NIF was also invited to a pre-budget meeting with the Finance Minister, “…to present its views on the policy changes required
to make India innovative and [to] augment grassroots innovations. …Suggestions have been made for setting up [a] micro venture and incubation fund to scale up the grassroots innovations” (Making India Innovative, 2002, p.9). In the 2002 budget speech, the Finance Minister announced the creation of such a fund.

More can be said about both GIAN and NIF, however the key point to make here is that several members of the state and national governments have been receptive to SRISTI’s ideas and vision, and have responded in a concrete way. At both levels the government has provided resources to create a “space” for SRISTI to continue its work. Support for SRISTI (and now for GIAN and NIF) has not made it into the government mainstream, and it is impossible to predict whether either government will go further in providing additional support, or in adopting any of SRISTI’s goals as policy goals, however there has clearly been intermediate policy influence, and the door has been left open for future possibilities.

Related to this is Lindquist’s concept of policy influence as the introduction of new ideas.

*Introducing new concepts to frame debates, putting ideas on the agenda, or stimulating public debate*

SRISTI’s policy impact has been at the level of ideas. Fortunately there are a few people in the sub-government (e.g. Dr. Mashelkar) who appreciate these ideas. … The response to SRISTI…has been uneven, largely due to different mindsets. SRISTI has made attempts across the board to engage those inside and outside the policy process; those who have been exposed to (and are receptive to) its thinking and “global ideas” have come forward (V. Sherry Chand, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

Several key officials at both the state and national levels have expressed their support for SRISTI’s work, and the impact that it has had on them personally.

I personally believe in India’s advantage in terms of grassroots innovation. Years ago I saw and was impressed with Professor Gupta’s work, and was drawn into it (Dr. R.A. Mashelkar, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

At the state level the Ministry of Agriculture in Gujarat is following SRISTI’s practice of rewarding innovators. During an introductory meeting the Ministry invited SRISTI to come up with a solution for a pressing agricultural problem.

At the national level, Professor Gupta has been invited to draft paragraphs and documents for the Minister of Finance and others in government. He was also part of the committee that drafted India’s biodiversity bill.

At the international level, the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) is now conducting research on some of the herbal pesticides which SRISTI helped to identify.

Also at the international level, the Commonwealth Science Council (CSC) has been greatly influenced by SRISTI’s work, and is drawing up a new agenda with grassroots innovation as a key component. The CSC invited SRISTI to its Ministerial Gathering in June 2002, and as a result is establishing a Commonwealth Innovation Network.
In 2002 the United Kingdom launched the Honey Bee UK chapter. The CSC has offered to provide voluntary support for some of the innovations.

Establishing Networks and Other Opportunities for Learning

National Level
As mentioned earlier, a key part of SRISTI’s strategy has been its reliance on a variety of networks, to spread information and to foster learning and collaboration. Although some of its communication efforts are web-based, the majority of its partners do not have web access, and so face-to-face meetings are held regularly. Members of the Honey Bee Network (farmers, other innovators, academics, NGO workers, etc.) may subscribe to the newsletter, and receive quarterly updates on SRISTI’s activities, past and upcoming meetings, etc.

SRISTI encourages networking between the formal and informal science communities; progress on this front has been slow but the work has begun to bear fruit in several ways. NIF now has Memoranda of Understanding with the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and the Indian Council of Scientific Research. As well, for the past three years grassroots innovators have participated in the Indian Science Congress, where they are rewarded on the same platform as formal scientists.

5.6.3 Affecting Policy Regimes

Contribution to Policy Formulation
SRISTI (and its offspring GIAN and NIF) have had some small successes in influencing the development or articulation of particular policies in India; this has been an indirect result of its (and particularly of Professor Gupta’s) reputation in these policy areas, rather than the result of lobbying on its part. As noted earlier, NIF was invited to a pre-budget meeting with the Finance Minister to present its views on how to support innovation in the country. Professor Gupta provided draft text to be included in the Minister’s 2002 budget speech, which included an announcement the creation of a venture capital fund for grassroots innovators.

SRISTI also contributed to the development of India’s Biodiversity Bill, passed in 2002.

5.7 Facilitating Factors

Section 2 on Context referred to several factors which undoubtedly facilitated SRISTI’s work and its efforts to influence policy. As the government searches for ways to revitalize the agriculture sector, SRISTI’s years of field work demonstrating and validating traditional knowledge and innovation provide a potentially effective development strategy.

SRISTI’s concept is innovative, and this has attracted the attention of the policy-makers. SRISTI has been active throughout the 1990s, which coincided with a remarkable understanding by the national government that it has failed to develop the society. SRISTI offers a fresh perspective with a policy component, and for a government which is searching for ideas, it sees SRISTI’s potential as an effective development strategy (Dr. S. Iyengar, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

SRISTI has also come at the right time. India liberalized its economy in 1991 and with that came many new ideas, including innovation, the globalization of knowledge, the commercialization of scientific research, IPRs, and patenting. SRISTI’s years of field work have substantially
demonstrated and validated traditional knowledge and innovation at the grassroots, as well as the market potential and the importance of protecting India’s indigenous knowledge base. Within the central government and some of the state-owned research institutions several people have been receptive to SRISTI’s thinking and “global ideas”, people who see innovation as the engine of growth and part of a new liberal framework (V. Sherry Chand, personal communication, November 18, 2002).

Dr. Vijay Kelkar (currently serving as Advisor to the Finance Minister) is one such person. In 2001 Dr. Kelkar (then-Executive Director, South Asia for the International Monetary Fund) gave a speech at the Fourth Annual Fellows’ Lecture at the University of Pennsylvania. He lamented India’s knowledge and innovation deficit as compared to countries like Korea and Japan, and argued that India needed to strengthen its national innovation system in order to compete in the knowledge-based economy. Dr. Kelkar pointed to the need for public policy which would “…promote [the] generation and diffusion of innovation in addition to promoting competition” (V. Kelkar, 2001, p.20).

Dr. R.A. Mashelkar has also been a vocal supporter of SRISTI’s work. Dr. Mashelkar became the Director General of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in India in 1995, and since then has completely revised its corporate culture. His vision is to turn CSIR’s 40 laboratories “…into a highly focussed, goal-oriented, well-networked organization doing research as business” (A.H. Advani, 1999, p. 6). Perhaps unsurprising in a global era of budget cuts to research and development institutions, Mashelkar has endeavoured to encourage innovation and creativity while at the same time insisting on deliverability and targets (A.H. Advani, 1999, p.8).

Of SRISTI, Mashelkar noted that when most people speak of India’s contributions to society and the economy they refer only to the educated minority – the tip of the iceberg in India. He pointed out that SRISTI’s pioneering work has been in considering the rest of the iceberg, and that the major challenge now is in linking the two – linking formal and informal systems of innovation.

The persuasive personality, commitment and credibility of Professor Gupta have also been an enormous facilitating factor in this case. Professor Gupta has been and continues to be the “policy entrepreneur” of this endeavour – he has relevant expertise; political, academic, and international connections; negotiating skill; and is truly dedicated to SRISTI’s work.

6. Concluding Remarks

As noted under section 5.4, SRISTI has seen – and continues to see – policy influence as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. The organization’s primary goal is to protect and value indigenous knowledge, and over time it has come to realize that sustainable and widespread progress on this front requires policy support.

This is not to say that SRISTI has not endeavoured to involve policy makers directly in its work. From its beginnings the organization has tried to include a wide range of policy actors in its networks and activities, and it has been proactive in seeking their participation and in trying to influence mindsets with examples of its work.

The nature of SRISTI’s activities, however, is such that much of the policy influence that it has achieved has been through the introduction of ideas and information into the policy arena. The NGO has built up an impressive array of information on traditional knowledge and practices in the country; in addition it has gone further and developed schemes for validating, improving, and
marketing this information, for protecting it, and for rewarding those who have preserved it. Relying on networks and a sophisticated communication strategy, SRISTI has been able to disseminate its vision in local, national, and international fora.

SRISTI has had important intermediate policy influence in India, in two fundamental ways. First, through experience and through working with/learning from its partners, SRISTI has increased its own institutional capacity to communicate, conduct research and analyze information, and communicate with a variety of actors. It has enhanced its ability to contribute to the policy arena, making it an even more effect policy actor over time.

Second, SRISTI has enriched the policy arena for others, by introducing a wealth of new information and ideas, providing networking and learning opportunities for different policy actors (sub-government and attentive public), and educating researchers and others who have gone on to take up new positions in related areas.

Members of both the state and national governments have responded in limited ways to SRISTI’s efforts, most notably by creating space for the organization to continue to pursue its work. This is uncommon in India, and is concrete evidence of – if not widespread impact at the policy level – some impact on the thinking of policy officials, and perhaps the potential beginnings of a more meaningful government response.
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Annex One: Gender Dimensions

“Whilst NGOs, as well as government programmes...are increasingly targeting women as beneficiaries, many still lack a gender perspective: there is a tendency by focusing on women as a broad category to homogenise women’s interests across communal, class, caste and other differences. There are relatively few NGOs working with men, alongside women, from an explicitly gender perspective.” (BRIDGE, p.61)

In its early years SRISTI’s approach to women was “sahaj” (“natural”) or, put another way, gender-neutral. Women were included in all activities as a matter of course – they were not sought out particularly nor was there any intentional negative bias against them. SRISTI has practiced this both internally and externally over the years - it has had and still has several female staff and volunteers, though none were hired on specific gender-related projects.

Over time however, those associated with SRISTI came to realize that women are “unintentionally elusive” and must be sought out or be overlooked. Indian women are normally discouraged from speaking with men outside their families, and are usually too busy to come out to village meetings. Although one of SRISTI’s main methods of interacting with villagers was through its student volunteers and field workers, most of these were male, and they had difficulty communicating with the women. The organization is now trying to recruit more female field staff.

SRISTI recognized that it had been overlooking a wealth of knowledge, traditional practice, and innovation. This was also due in part to the fact that early on it had focused more on technological innovation – an area that women are not as involved in. SRISTI broadened its focus to include areas where women are prominent – health and medicine; child rearing; dairy farming; gathering of food, fuel, and fodder; etc. Women have traditionally dominated these areas.

In its first phase of work with IDRC SRISTI initiated one activity with a focus on women – assisting a series of undergraduate women from a rural college with dissertations on the animal husbandry practices of local women. Over four years more than 100 dissertations were produced, which “...served to highlight the gendered nature of certain activities and...brought into the formal curriculum areas of knowledge which had hitherto been neglected.” (SRISTI Final Report 1997, p.15)

In its second phase of work SRISTI included as one of its objectives the need “to specially focus on women’s ecological, technological and institutional knowledge systems to highlight gender aspects of creativity and advocate specific policy modulation.” (SRISTI Phase Two Proposal, 1997, p.13) The plan was to set up networks of women’s NGOs, and to use these to initiate a nation-wide search for female innovators. Other achievements in phase two – such as the creation of GIAN and NIF – are very likely a key reason why this work did not progress during that period.

Concerted effort is, however, being made in phase three to focus on women, their knowledge and innovations. This phase (still ongoing) is entitled “Women, Wisdom, and Wellbeing: Local Knowledge and Value Addition of Biodiverse Resources of Women in India.” The goals of the phase are to: (1) develop and implement new methods of documenting and assessing women’s knowledge and innovations, (2) foster technological and institutional solutions to validate, add value to, and scale up technologies which are gender-sensitive, and (3) promote improved dialogue and networking between formal and informal, male and female scientists. (Phase Three Appraisal, 2000, p.1) SRISTI is tailoring many of its activities to target women, and working with
women’s NGOs like SEWA to launch state-wide searches for female innovators (as planned in phase two).

In its interim technical report submitted to IDRC in 2002, SRISTI outlined its progress to date. By targeting female innovators the organization has been able to document several hundred traditional practices and innovations in Gujarat. It has supported further thesis work on women’s knowledge; conducted interviews to document women’s knowledge of vegetative crops, less well-known uncultivated foods, medicinal plants, livestock management, human health, etc.; organized women-only village meetings (at one such meeting a water pulley was displayed and discussed, and later modified based on the women’s suggestions); assisted one woman in submitting a project proposal to the Techno-preneurship Promotion Program (TePP) under the federal Department of Science and Technology; etc. There is currently a local female innovator sitting on SRISTI’s Board, and members of SEWA on the Boards of GIAN and NIF.

As noted by the current IDRC Program Officer Liz Fajber, it is encouraging to see some of the reflections of SRISTI staff on gender-related issues and on the challenges of reaching and involving women.

In terms of policy intent and influence, while some of SRISTI’s activities have gendered elements (documentation includes women’s knowledge and practices, for example) there does not seem to have been policy influence specifically on gendered issues. In recent years the organization has become more gender sensitive, and over time appears to be tailoring more of its activities to focus on women. SRISTI has adopted gender-sensitive research methods, and through the National Innovation Foundation is planning a competition just for female innovators. Activities of this nature will help to increase the profile of its gendered work, and as with many of its efforts, will add to the body of information in this policy area. It remains to be seen whether there will be policy impact on this front; from an internal perspective SRISTI must remain vigilant in its efforts to promote women’s issues and a gendered perspective. In time this will hopefully enrich the discourse about traditional knowledge and natural resource management, and popular understanding of how women use resources differently.
**Annex Two: Tombstone Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: Indigenous Knowledge and Innovation Network (Phase One)</th>
<th>Country: India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project Number:** 0051 / 93-0013 | **Internal Funding Value:** CAD$247,170  
**Parallel Funding Value:** CAD$83,709  
**CAP/RAP Values:** |
| **Date of Approval:** November 3, 1993  
**Duration:** 30 months | **Recipient Institution:** Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (IIMA)  
**Recipient Type:** University |
| **Beneficiary Institution:** SRISTI  
**Beneficiary Type:** NGO | **Policy Domain:** Natural resource management, poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods |
| **Intent of Policy Influence:** | **Use of Research:** Problem solving, knowledge generation, enlightenment |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: Generating Incentives for Sustainable Natural Resource Management (Phase Two)</th>
<th>Country: India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project Number:** 3267 | **Internal Funding Value:** CAD$253,971  
**Parallel Funding Value:** CAD$200,000  
**CAP/RAP Values:** |
| **Date of Approval:** March 6, 1997  
**Duration:** 24 months | **Recipient Institution:** Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (IIMA)  
**Recipient Type:** University |
| **Beneficiary Institution:** SRISTI  
**Beneficiary Type:** NGO | **Policy Domain:** Natural resource management, poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods |
<p>| <strong>Intent of Policy Influence:</strong> | <strong>Use of Research:</strong> Problem solving, knowledge generation, enlightenment |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Gender, Knowledge and Innovations of Biodiversity in India (Phase Three)</th>
<th><strong>Country:</strong> India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Number:</strong> 100421</td>
<td><strong>Internal Funding Value:</strong> CAD$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Approval:</strong> ?</td>
<td><strong>CAP/RAP Values:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong> 36 months</td>
<td><strong>Recipient Institution:</strong> Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad (IIMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary Institution:</strong> SRISTI</td>
<td><strong>Recipient Type:</strong> University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary Type:</strong> NGO</td>
<td><strong>Policy Domain:</strong> Natural resource management, poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intent of Policy Influence:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use of Research:</strong> Problem solving, knowledge generation, enlightenment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex Three: List of Interviewees

Bhatt, Ela. SEWA and Board of NIF

Chaudhri, Malatiben. Dairy farmer and SRISTI Board member

Chokkakula, Srinivas. formerly SRISTI now with the Env’t Planning Collaborative

Fajber, Liz. Program Officer, South Asia office, IDRC

Gopakumar, K.M. Research Fellow for IPR, NIF

Gupta, Anil K. Professor IIMA, President SRISTI

Iyengar, Dr. Sudershan. Director/Professor, Gujarat Indtitute of Development Research and SRISTI Board member

Khuntia, Jibanananda. National Coordinator R&D and Value-Addition, NIF

Vyas, Dhaval. Herbal Lab Staff Member, SRISTI

Mashelkar, Dr. R.A. Director, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research

Nanavaty, Reema. SEWA and Board of GIAN of Guelph

Pandit, Jaygopal. Director Gram-Seva Mandir in Nardipur

Pastakia, Astad. IIMA Fellow and NRM consultant

Patel, Hema. Editorial Team of Honey Bee, SRISTI

Patel, Kirit. co-founder of Honey Bee and SRISTI and currently PhD candidate at the University

Patel, Mahesh. Project Manager, GIAN

Patel, Ramesh. Editorial Team of Honey Bee, SRISTI

Rohit, Pravin Hirabhai. Field Worker, SRISTI

Sahu, R.K. CEO, GIAN

Saxena, Sanjeev. Chief Innovation Officer, NIF

Shelat, S.K. Ex-Chief Secretary Government of Gujarat and current advisor to the Chief Minister of Gujarat

Sherry Chand, Vijaya. Professor, IIMA

Shukla, Chelbhai. President GIAN
Sinha, Riya. National Coordinator Scouting and Documentation, NIF

Sumara, Karimbai. Herbalist
Annex Four: Terms of Reference

A. Background

Many IDRC project and program objectives reflect the expectation that the research supported will influence public policy at the national and local levels. Within projects and programs, the Centre staff promote various means of linking research to public policy, and research supported is often reported to have enhanced decisionmakers’ awareness of policy options or to have been otherwise taken into account in policy processes. If the Centre is going to increase (and improve the performance of) its portfolio of projects with this mandate, the Centre needs to address what it means by “policy influence”. Initial discussions with Centre staff, and reviews of the literature and other relevant Centre documents point to three key questions: (1) what constitutes public policy influence in IDRC’s experience; (2) to what degrees, and in what ways, has IDRC-supported research influenced public policy; and (3) what factors and conditions have facilitated or inhibited the public policy influence potential of IDRC-supported research. This will serve two main purposes: first, it will provide learning at the program level which can enhance the design of projects and programs to address policy issues where that is a key objective; second, it will provide an opportunity for corporate level learning which will provide input to the strategic planning process, providing feedback on performance, and feeding the design of the next corporate program framework.

The cases studies will form one important set of data in improving the Centre’s capacity to support research which “will foster and support the production, dissemination and application of research results leading to policies and technologies that enhance the lives of people in developing countries.” (from IDRC program directions 2000-2005, p.16). Attached are three documents which provide the background to the overall study: 1. Study Overview; 2. Framework Paper by E. Lindquist; and 3. Literature Review by S. Neilson.

The focus of case studies will be on the development of rich case studies that explore not only the IDRC work undertaken but also the changing context in which the work was carried out and the processes that were used. It is anticipated that the study will cover a range of stories to include cases where policy outcomes may be perceived as either positive or negative (i.e., research leads to “good” policymaking or “bad” policymaking). The cases will present detailed stories of the policy influence process. The story will be developed through: (1) A review of documents including project design documents, monitoring documents (inter alia, technical reports, trip reports, correspondence) and project reports; and where they can be located; (2) Interviews with project leaders and project participants; (3) Interviews with those said to have been influenced; and (4) Interviews with relevant IDRC staff (e.g. responsible PO’s).

B. TORs

As part of building a corporate response to the three key questions outlined above, the consultant will prepare the following case study (ies): __insert project name(s) and number(s)__

Preliminary tombstone data and instructions for file access are enclosed.

In order to prepare the case study, the consultant is expected to have reviewed project documents prior to any interviews and to know the role of the interviewee in the project. Interviews should normally move out from those most directly affiliated with the project to those purported to have been affected by or to have used the results in some way. Because there is inherent bias in interviewees to present findings in the best possible light, triangulation of data sources is crucial. Every effort should be made to ensure that interviews are conducted with representatives of at
least three of the main groups involved: project implementors, beneficiaries, POs, policy makers and where applicable related project participants (other funded or departmental studies which have been linked to the project). The consultant will normally have an opportunity for follow-up visits for data verification or further data collection where warranted.

The consultant will collect data in three key areas:

1. **about what led to the project**

   – **How did you get involved in [area of exploration] in the first place?**
   
   *This has to do with clarifying the role of the interviewee as a leader, a respondent to an issue that was raised, as someone who has seen this field for a long time, as a policy maker, researcher, funder, etc.*. In the case of interviewing a PO, this might be expressed in terms of response to a proposal, in terms of project development with regards to how policy influence may or may not have been incorporated into the proposal, in terms of their leadership in a research field; in the case of a researcher, this might be raised in terms of a problematique in their country, in terms of fall-out of their previous research, in terms of a dialogue with a PO, in terms of a proposal they have been floating for a long time seeking funding, etc. In the case of a purported beneficiary, their involvement might be much later in hearing the results and connecting them with an issue in their Ministry, Department or Organization.

2. **about the project**

   – **When it was started, what did [the project] intend to achieve?**
   
   Here one knows the objectives already, it is a discussion starter with the interviewee; they can be prompted as appropriate with the project objectives. One should identify the nature of the project as characterized by the interview, in terms of capacity building objectives, the policy influence objectives if any, the overall intent of the activity. This should also include the researcher’s understanding of policy influence in terms what that means, what that entails (assumptions, hypotheses re: influencing policy). If any areas of objectives are left out, they should be introduced by the interviewer.

   – **What happened?**
   
   What was accomplished (were project objectives met, changed, completely revised, not met, but good things happened, not met but bad things happened; nothing happened, etc.) Here the interviewer is expected to move the interview towards policy related influence, but without closing off areas of activity which might have led to policy influence later. Where there is policy influence identified (as there should be in all cases), the interviewer needs to probe who was influenced, including their positions at the time of influence and their current positions if known, and in what ways. This could include (but is not limited to) the following:

**People inside the policy process:**
(1) policy workers (those in the front line of policy recommendation and development)
(2) policy decision makers (those in charge of policy decisions: political and bureaucratic)

**People outside the policy process:**
(1) those who directly influence policy makers
(2) those who indirectly influence policy makers
The interviewee should give an indication of what indicators they are using to determine if there has been policy influence and how they define it. This will be a crucial data set in defining policy influence. Types of policy influence (after Lindquist) include (but are not limited to):

– Expanding policy capacities
  *Improving the knowledge / data of certain actors*
  *Supporting recipients to develop innovative ideas*
  *Improving capabilities to communicate ideas*
  *Developing new talent for research and analysis*

- Broadening of policy horizons
  *Providing opportunities for networking / learning within the jurisdiction or with colleagues elsewhere*
  *Introducing new concepts to frame debates, putting ideas on the agenda, or stimulating public debate*
  *Educating researchers and others who take up new positions with broader understanding of issues*
  *Stimulating quiet dialogue among decision makers and among or with researchers*

– Affecting policy regimes
  *Modification of existing programs or policies*
  *Fundamental re-design of programs and policies*

The consultant will identify behavioural change associated with these three types of influence and any additional types of influence which do not appear to fit this categorization will also be named.

Capacity building is a critical dimension of policy influence. By capacity building, we refer to the process by which individuals, groups, organizations and institutions strengthen their ability to carry out their functions and achieve the desired results over time (Peter Morgan 1997). This refers therefore to the capabilities of individuals, organizations, institutions, and to the strengthening of relationships among them.

– Why did it happen?
This is crucial as it deals with the relationship between the context and the project. Type of governance regime in the country is a critical factor for consideration. Perceptions about why should vary among interviewees and the discussion will build from interview to interview on a project. What were the contextual factors and what were the capacity factors within the project team? What favoured/inhibited progress? Who did what? Here, one should be identifying the key influences both within the project and in its enabling environment which caused the project to develop as it did. Dissemination strategies should also be explored.

3. about what happened after the project

Depending on the age of the project, it is crucial here to explore what is perceived to have been influenced by the project, when that influence occurred and whether or not the policy change or change in mind set (if any type of change actually happened) endured. Here it is important to come back to outcomes and outputs of the project which may have appeared to have no policy linkage during the time of the project, but which may have had some later.
External factors are key to consider here: what changed, what remained constant in the political, legislative, economic, technical and social environments related to the project’s work?

Tracing organizations and individual project members is critical: where did they go? What did they go on to do?

Tracing beneficiaries is also key: what was their role in sustaining the change (if any); what was their role in introducing new changes? Where did they go and what did they go on to do?

We are particularly interested in the role of the PO and IDRC generally in these processes: what is the perceived role (by project participants, by beneficiaries, by other related individuals and groups)?

Dissemination strategies should be reviewed.

**Gender**

Gender dimensions are discussed here, but relate to all stages of the activity - planning, implementation and post project. Gender should be considered with regards to tracing of project implementation team members as well as beneficiaries: were both men and women involved in the policy influence process and in what ways? How was this perceived by policy makers and by researchers (contributing inhibiting, neutral factor)? Was analysis gender sensitive or gender neutral at all stage of the policy influence process:

- problem definition
- definition of goals and beneficiaries
- definition of research agenda
- definition of research policy interface and linkages
- formulation of policy options
- choice of preferred options

(Where applicable, implementation, M&E, policy revision processes)

Each area should cover the opening question first, followed by questions and discussions to elicit information related to the three main questions of the study

**C. Tombstone Data**

In addition to the case elements outlined, for purposes of data analysis, the consultant will include in each case the following information (items 1*-7* to be provided by the Centre):

1. Project name*
2. Project Number*
3. Dollar value*
4. Project start date (right term?)*
5. Project duration (until legal Closure)*
6. Name of recipient institution(s)*
7. CAP/RAP break (Centre-administered portion of funds, vs recipient administered portion of funds)*
8. Intent of policy influence: while it may be clear from the objectives whether or not policy influence was intended in a given activity, other aspects of the project document may require review in order to determine the intent vis-a-vis policy influence.
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9. Type of project recipient:
   Research Centre
   University
   NGO
   INGO
   Government Department
     a. International
     b. National
     c. Provincial
     d. Local
   Government Specialized agency
     a. International
     b. National
     c. Provincial
     d. Local
   UN agency
   Other multilateral agency
   Consultant (individual or organization)

10. Type of project beneficiary identified (if not same as recipient):
    Research Centre
    University
    NGO
    INGO
    Government Department
    Government Specialized agency
    UN agency
    Other multilateral agency
    Consultant (individual or organization)

11. Type of use identified for the research (per Carol Weiss):
    problem solving
    knowledge generation
    enlightenment
    political
    tactical
    interactive
    intellectual

12. Policy area (wide open category in terms of what area of policy is intended to or is
    influenced), e.g.,
    – policies for ICTs in schools

D. Process

The consultant will participate in a meeting with the evaluation unit and other consultants on the
study. The purpose of the meeting is to: consult about the TORs and ensure as much consistency
as possible across sites; and present the consultants with the view of the project as a whole and
the role of the case studies in the evaluation.
On completion and write up of the case study, the consultant will, at the invitation of the Centre, participate in a regional-level analysis of the cases in the region. Other participants would include other consultants, some of the project leaders (possibly from the studies involved, or other related projects in the region), regional POs, RD, 1 or 2 “experts” from the region, and a member of the evaluation team.

The consultant will make a brief presentation, describing the case and indicating preliminary findings. The consultant may be asked to facilitate the data analysis or may be asked to be an active participant in the process.

Following the workshops, the team may determine that it is advantageous to follow up the findings with further data collection in the field, either for the introduction of new respondents or to gather data in areas not yet addressed in the case.

Upon completion of the case studies, and the development of a regional analysis, the Unit may invite the consultant to participate in a preliminary global analysis of the data. On the basis of these documents, the consultants will be reconvened with the evaluation team for further analysis of the findings.

E. Products

The consultant will work with the Centre to identify and locate the appropriate individuals to be interviewed. The consultant may also have to search out individuals who are no longer known to the Centre but who were central to the project.

Based on the TORs and reading the project file, the consultant will develop interview guides for interviews with project leaders and participants, program officers, beneficiaries and others reached in the implementation and follow up to the project. These interview guides will be shared with and approved by the Centre.

The consultant will submit trip reports for all travel related to the project. These trip reports should include the names and coordinates of all interviewees as well as any preliminary findings which might be of relevance to other consultants carrying out case work elsewhere.

The consultant will submit copies of all interviews conducted as they are written up. The consultant will provide a draft report to the Centre for its comment.

Based on feedback, the consultant will revise the report for use at a regional or Ottawa consultation.

Based on the findings of the consultation, further revisions will be incorporated into a final report.

References:

Peter Morgan, 1997. The design and use of capacity development indicators. Paper prepared for CIDA.