

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

Chapter 1 : Shifting from Outreach to Engagement

Since , R&D partners in Uganda, Kenya and South Africa have been working with ICRA to improve the capacity for rural innovation or "Integrated Agricultural Research for Development" (IAR4D).

Strengthening sustainable food and nutrition security in Africa Yemi Akinbamijo, Prof. Mphumuzi Sukati 26 October Far too many people on the continent are unable to acquire and effectively utilize at all times the food they need for a healthy life. The result is that more than a third of African children are stunted in their growth and must face a range of physical and cognitive challenges not faced by their better-fed peers. Presented and discussed selected case studies on the status of food and nutritional security in Africa. Generated context specific actions needed to address food and nutrition insecurity in Africa. Is the Malabo Declaration helping? What key actions are needed? What role could Arab-Africa partnership play on this? Mphumuzi Sukati, FAO Regional Office for Africa What are the current nutritional challenges and capacity gaps that should be addressed in support of actions towards better nutritional security for Africa? Professor Anselimo Makokha, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya How can we effectively mobilize political action to support efforts for food security and nutritional issues in Africa: He answers following questions: What is the new business of delivery of the AOAD? Can the processing of orphan crops in North Africa create jobs? The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations FAO reaffirmed its support to date palm production and development in the Near East region, including tackling the threat of Red Palm Weevil and improving the date palm value chain. The date palm is a symbol of life in the Near East and North Africa region. It is critical to the food security of the people who depend on it thanks to its unique nutritional properties. Addressing the African affairs committee of parliament, the Egyptian agriculture minister said President Abdel Fatah al-Sisi pays particular attention to relations with Africa, noting that Egypt is now back to lead the continent after a period of marginalization. He said there are eight Egyptian model farms in eight African countries, noting that his Ministry plans to have a total of 22 farms across the continent by Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Eritrea, Tanzania, Zambia, and Congo have established pilot model farms with areas ranging between and acres. Egypt provides the necessary technology for the development of agriculture in these countries and exports seed varieties that are environmentally compatible with the climate of each country, while those countries provide infrastructure, water resources, and labour for agriculture. These projects can accommodate Egyptian workers, in addition to the possibility of providing agricultural crops cheaply to the Egyptian market Egyptian imports from COMESA countries include tea, coffee, cocoa beans, tobacco, sesame, raw leather, vegetable and aromatic extracts, and live camels.

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

Chapter 2 : Read ICRA Learning Materials

Mundie Salm Richard Hawkins Ruud Ludemann Mariana Wongtschowski Marlene Roefs (Strengthening of University Capacity for Promoting, facilitating and teaching Rural.

Actions to organise reflective learning: Organising learning teams within and across organisations around specific development issues. Explicitly facilitating learning not expecting it to happen spontaneously. Employing 3rd party professionals to facilitate the interactive and joint learning between stakeholders who differ in perspectives, types of knowledge and power. Establishing explicit knowledge management procedures within organisations, encouraging staff to interact within and between organisations as well as simply recording and circulating information. Adapting participatory research practices and processes to best fit the specific circumstances of the different stakeholders and reflect the interactive learning between these stakeholders. What do we mean by this principle? To achieve impact in terms of poverty and pro-poor development therefore, IAR4D needs to integrate analysis, action and change across these different dimensions. Actions to create a conducive environment: Organising professionals in broad interdisciplinary teams to tackle research questions related to specific development issues, within the context of multi-stakeholder partnerships. Using impact analysis frameworks that go beyond simply assessing economic returns, including participatory methods that include subjective evaluation of behaviour, organisational change and relationships, as well as social and environmental outcomes. Recognising the tradeoffs between desired economic, social and environmental outcomes in integrated action plans or activities by stakeholder partnerships. To be effective, IAR4D needs to be cognisant of, and active throughout the different levels of spatial, economic and social organisation. From an economic perspective, the different levels and typical interventions include: Focus on only one perspective or level is unlikely to have a significant impact on rural livelihoods and sustainable development. Practices that apply this principle Practices that contribute towards the integration analysis, action and change at different levels of spatial, economic and social organisation include: Actions to organise stakeholder interaction at different levels: Forming partnerships or operational linkages between research groups or organisations working at the local level, and those working at the more national or regional level. Seconding or co-opting staff from other organisations to fill in gaps where expertise is needed but lacking. Actions to integrate interventions at different levels: Developing a coherent set of integrated technological, institutional and evidence-based policy changes that jointly enable and promote innovation. Scaling up and scaling out including adaptation innovations that are piloted at local level. However, the competent IAR4D practitioner needs competencies that go beyond traditional disciplines, to include: IAR4D is about change and change processes: It also requires the development of management practices and organisational processes that facilitate interaction, and these processes should be assessed according to the satisfaction of clients and other stakeholders, not only on self- and organisational performance assessment. Some of these requirements include: As well as formal professional development degrees and short courses , individual competencies can be improved through induction programmes and mentoring for new staff or work teams, and embedding continued learning into ongoing projects and activities. This involves encouraging staff to try out new things, take risks, and rewarding them for innovative practice. It requires staff to dedicate time to reflect on experience and document lessons learned, particularly in terms of relationships with other partners. It also requires an active knowledge management policy to make sure the lessons learned are incorporated within organisational practice, and made available to other organisations. The improvement of communications, linkages, knowledge sharing and working partnerships with other stakeholders in themes of joint interest. This involves dedicating resources time, budget to joint activities. It also means producing information written, audio, video for partners, clients and users, rather than publications written for peers. Measures to facilitate partnerships with other organisations. This involves joint decision making procedures, negotiation of shared objectives and respective roles, joint monitoring and evaluation

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

activities, sharing of credit for outputs and outcomes. It also involves actively undertaking activities to build mutual trust, and ceding organisational power over agenda and activities e. Monitoring, reporting, learning, evaluation, performance assessment incentives and impact assessment systems that value multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder interaction, improved processes and outcomes. This requires systems that value change outcomes in the development practice of partners and stakeholders, rather than just knowledge products. It also requires a change of thinking, from systematic cause-effect attribution logic, to a more systemic way of monitoring and evaluating behavioural outcomes. Broadening of impact assessment criteria from the predominant emphasis on economic rate-of-return studies. More open-ended case studies, impact pathways, institutional or innovation histories and other participatory tools can assess broader livelihood outcomes, changes in practice, social networks, relationships, attitudes, etc. Linking research to policy formulation, in addition to the normal technology focus. Evidence-based policy development can be encouraged through early involvement of policymakers in the analysis of the innovation system and the existing enabling environment. In this way lessons from individual programmes and pilots can lead to policy change through interactive learning at national and regional platforms. Changing the curricula of higher education institutes, to produce graduates more suited to the demands of multi-stakeholder working and innovation systems.

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

Chapter 3 : PAEPARD: October

Strengthening interinstitutional capacity for rural innovation: experience from Uganda, Kenya and South Africa, by Richard Hawkins, Robert Booth, Colletah Chitsike, Emily Twinamasiko, Moses Tenywa, George Karanja, Thembi Ngcobo and Aart-Jan Verschoor

SK Toon virrr llijk 1 1. SK from a modelling perspective: Charles is ilgronomist and Director of 3 0 years on agricultural development problems the Center for Sustainable ilgricultural Systems. Cornelia and France, illgeria, Ivory Coast and Senegal. Deffontaines, Jacques Brossier, M. The vii and n7: He is a David Norman. Jalncs is a profc. Ilis interests a r c in I: Anri, a and senior author of the book. I cvclpocrlt Institute 0 I I in London, 11K. Wc worked n,irli her li r a day using techniques still rctgarded: SK perspectives, gender analysis and participatory methods. XIII the opportunities to technical innovation. Gender adds a little complexity for a lot of insight, while participatory process and techniques enable farming systems researchers to engage more effectively with members of farming communities. Where there is convergence, consislerlc i ;rrld agreement, o n e c a n proceed will-1 corllitlence along well-established p: Rut a t the practical level. Best practice research is generating a rich and constructive case book of the participatory methodologies essrcrltal to systemic change. I low Wet a computer-aided clctcisorl ongoing, selected fronl arnorig exprimcrllts sug-support tool. I thinking with periods of field work with the participating NGOs. In the inclusive direction in which it is evolving, FSR-E provides a franielz. SK o n his retirement. One issue h a d been taxing t h e llo;rrd of. Jiggins Ids , It raised its head again during the preparation of this book. I hope I have outflanked the controversy by referring to FSR and its applications. FSR itself is defined as a diagnostic process; a basket of methods for researchers to elicit a better understanding of farm households, family decisions and decision-making processes. Its applications use this understanding to increase the efficiency in the use of human and budgetary resources for agricultural development, including research, extension and policy formulation. These are important applications, both for those countries which rely on the traditional agricultural sector to drive their economic development, and for other countries where that sector is small in terms of population, but where a social conscience demands measures to combat rural poverty. I have tried to give the book diversity through the number and origins of its contributors, and coherence through its structure. While the application of FSR in developed country agriculture is occasionally illustrated, the book is primarily focused on FSR in its original role, with small, resource-poor farmers in developing countries. The origins of contributors are sometimes deceptive. A History of Farming Systems Research ed. Collinson Americans write about experiences in Africa, Asia and Latin America, for expatriates indeed dominate the early history of FSR, itself perhaps a factor in the resistance to change in institutions in many developing countries. Similarly, the early days of FSR are male dominated but the number of contributions in the book from women demonstrates how they have increasingly asserted themselves in agricultural development. The book is divided into five parts each with an editorial introduction and 12 chapters, each with several contributors. Part I of the book tries to capture the origins and the essence of FSR; its conceptual framework and some of the methods central to the understanding of the farming of resource-poor communities. Part II examines the application of FSR understanding to the choice and development of technology, to the planning and evaluation of extension, and to policy formulation. It also covers the essential companion to institutionalization; the training of professionals in FSR. These accounts are complemented by commentaries from professionals in agronomy, farm management and rural sociology on the interaction of these disciplines with FSR. The fifth and final part of the book turns to the future. Current practitioners discuss cutting edge methods and applications in FSR and the final chapter looks at the lessons of the past and the possibilities for the future. It sets out how FSR has moved toward its original goal "a better understanding of small farmers" and, as systems applications in agriculture proliferate, asks whether it still has a distinct role. The editorial introductions to each of the five parts outline the contributions and offer a personal commentary on the theme covered. Where appropriate, this

summarizes the evolution of that theme, highlighting both progress and unresolved issues. Crop modelling, dominated by the disciplines of physiology and agronomy, was another innovative thread, as was cropping systems research, recalled by Dick Harwood in Chapter 2 as underpinning the origins of FSR in Asia. Eagerly grasped by a variety of constituencies, the early, tight focus of FSR rapidly widened. Texts on systems and agricultural development, including those by Penning de Vries, Teng and Metselaar in , Dent and Macgregor in and CIRAD in , demonstrate the growing range of systems applications in agriculture. It has become unclear, perhaps even confusing, to practitioners, how FSR is best viewed within that spectrum. Proliferating constituencies for systems applications in agriculture, and confusion over the scope of FSR have arguably distracted from its practice and institutionalization. FSR was an innovation in the research process, emerging from field practitioners, an early effort to bridge the gap between the needs and capacities of small, resource-poor farmers and publicly funded agricultural research establishments. Early in the book, founder members of the FSR family talk about its origins. The common threads through the different accounts leave no doubt that in the s and early s the same problem was widely identified across the developing world; technologies recommended as a result of agricultural research investments were, in general, inappropriate to the priorities and circumstances of small farmers. Field practitioners recognized the importance of the problem and targeted a better understanding of small farmers and the way they make decisions, as a path to its solution. Their concern for appropriate improvements for small-scale, illiterate and resource-poor farmers was the origin of FSR and remains its foundation. But FSR has also been elaborated, and for some confounded, by the scrutiny of academics. Development theorists, often economists, have criticized the narrowness of conceptual frameworks pinned together by practitioners preoccupied by technology adoption. These originally ignored such issues as intra-household equity, population dynamics, intergenerational equity and sustainability, and the wider macro and policy linkages that these imply. A notorious example in farm management was the quest to apply linear programming to the smallfarm sector in the s. Its failure has been due to the intensive data collection efforts required, and the very high costs of bringing the results of programming to bear on farm units with such low levels of income that even major improvement would offer little return for the costs of the research and advisory process. The prolonged gestation for FSR reflects the forces governing innovation “ particularly innovation in public institutions ” in developing countries, and is itself a lesson for both governments and aid agencies. There has been great difficulty in fitting FSR into agricultural institutions. Has the timing of its introduction been inappropriate? The book examines these important ongoing issues. Indeed, the history of FSR is a case study of the dynamics of institutional innovation in developing countries. The introduction of FSR has been complicated by: Small farmers do not behave like commercial farmers. They are not organized to interact with the wider market economy, nor are they politically articulate like commercial farmers. These had attracted a set of service institutions, for example in credit and insurance, for protection against the vagaries of weather and the market. These older institutional processes, oriented to and organized for large farmers, cannot operate cost-effectively with small farmers who, in the absence of an appropriate enabling infrastructure, must manage their environment directly by their own decisions and by their activities both on and off the farm. These insights have given rise to the development of new investigative methods to manage the different circumstances of resource-poor farmers under conditions of scarce professional and financial resources. A parallel feature of the last 15 years, and one which holds great hope for the future, has been the growth of FSR professional associations. FSR associations attract people from a range of disciplines, from agronomy, ecology and plant breeding to economics, anthropology and rural sociology. The growth of these pioneering associations has received much of its impetus from the leadership of university professionals, who established an annual symposium for FSR-E in the USA in the early s. In Africa, Asia and Latin America FSR associations are moving professionals out from under the spell of developed country fora, finding their feet in their own context, and helping to bring both education and development processes into line with the needs of local people. It is good to be able to record progress towards these goals. But it is important to record that these gains remain fragile and there is a danger that governments, courted by the dynamics of growth at

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

any price, may despair of their smallholder constituencies as an engine to achieve it. Experience has widened the portfolio of interventions beyond the early emphasis on technology development. Accumulating insights into the nature of the traditional agricultural sectors of developing countries have shaped the evolution of an FSR process for their successful development and deployment. The early insights included: The scope of FSR and the strategy for promotion and institutionalization, perhaps the fundamental issues of FSR, are revisited in the final chapter. I hope this book will provide a foundation on which a second, or now perhaps a third, generation of farm systems practitioners can build. *Experimental Agriculture*, 22, 87â€” Farming Systems Research â€” a Review. World Bank Technical Paper no. World Bank, Washington D. Penning de Vries, F. Metselaar Eds , *Systems Approaches for Agricultural Development*. Macgregor Eds , Part I of the book, in two chapters, deals with the development of the FSR process in its role of understanding farming systems. They recapture the insights which convinced them that FSR could improve the relevance of conventional agricultural research to the situation of countless small farmers in the developing world. The contributions vary from personal, even anecdotal, to semi-formal. Each offers lessons and many of the issues raised from the s and s remain issues today. German, David and myself are farm economists, with Dick the only thoroughbred agronomist. Some of the most telling points made in Chapter 2 are listed in Box I. Even in the early days linkages were important and some of these commonalities can be attributed to the interactions that occurred across continents. Collinson the problem of non-adoption by small farmers. Yet much was clearly spontaneous.

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

Chapter 4 : Table of contents for Innovation Africa

Bernard Rey, Deputy Head of food security, rural development, nutrition - EuropeAid, Belgium "Strengthening the capacities needed to make multi-stakeholder partnerships for innovation in agri-chains work in practice".

ERCE What have we learned? Five years in the life of a city In the introduction to this book it was stated that five years “the length of the SWITCH project” is not a long time in the life of a city. It is here where institutions have their headquarters, policy is made, research is conducted and ideas compete most vigorously. Cities are centres of business busy-ness and rapid activity and they attract people who want to make change and get things done. Maybe they interact strap-hanging on the metro or in virtual meetings via their smartphones, or over a fast food snack at the mall. Did SWITCH make a difference where it counts, in the cities of 12 countries around the world, and influence the development of city water resources and therefore the urban environment? Or will the influence of SWITCH related research, discussions and activities soon vanish from the collective city memory? We might as well hint at the ending of this chapter now. On the one hand, it really is too early to tell. But on the other hand, we can already draw some general conclusions based on observed outcomes. For one thing, the narrative will be different in each city partly because SWITCH functioned in different ways and with different agendas, but mainly because context is everything. The city is a giant with its own history, current practice and way of thinking. It has momentum, and that means that it changes slowly and only when multiple factors pull in the same direction. SWITCH, even at its most energetic and enthusiastic and committed, is a small buzz in a large world, one that can easily be drowned out by the traffic. If there is a new culture of collaboration between planners and researchers that will show in the long term, in the form of more practical research that is better applied. If urban water management becomes more integrated and adaptive, that should result in a better quality of life maybe ten years after the end of the project. These recognised that the pace of change is not measured in a few months. Indeed many of the visions were for , or even later. But it is still fair to ask the question: Was it good practice? Should it be repeated or reinvented? This chapter makes an attempt to identify the lessons that might be, or are most likely to be, transferable and of the most value to others Figure 1. Part 2 of this book presents the activities of the SWITCH project in 12 very different cities, with an emphasis on how stakeholder engagement was developed through the learning alliances that the project established, and the demonstration projects that sought to bridge the gap between researchers and practitioners. This chapter brings together the lessons learned relating to stakeholder engagement, and its interface with other project activities, concentrating on the experiences and achievements of the cities. It is recognised that the cities and contexts covered are very different, but an attempt is made here to identify the lessons that might be, or are most likely to be, transferable and of the most value to others. The individual city chapters that follow in Part 2 of this book reveal the very different contexts. However, they also show that SWITCH teams in the cities often ran up against similar problems, and sometimes found similar solutions. Context may be critical for success or failure, but it turns out that doing the right things right is also a major factor for success. And there have been successes. Lessons learned in each of these areas provide insights into how we and others could be more effective in the implementation of programmes with similar objectives or characteristics. These lessons were partly identified through a peer review workshop held in Lodz in May to discuss the findings as assessed in each city, and also draw heavily upon the series of city assessment papers¹. The project developed learning alliances at national level focusing on policy issues and at local level linked to a demonstration project and related research. The main policy outcome was the development and official approval by government of national policy guidelines that promote safe reuse of wastewater in the country. An eco-productive park on a former desert area became a valuable resource and play area for a local community, but was prevented from re using treated wastewater for growing food by restrictive legislation. Creating a shared vision proved essential to counterbalance prevailing short term planning and construction. Outcomes were used in SWITCH planning processes, which in turn fed into formal

planning processes and public policy advocacy. Outcomes beyond the research reports and training were a reduction in the emphasis on end-of-pipe solutions in wastewater management and growing consideration of alternative technologies in new housing developments. Planning processes at municipal level and national policy consultations on the future of the Cauca river are building on SWITCH dialogue, outputs and advice. Key players that engaged throughout the project were an association of the tanners, the environmental regulator, local government, an NGO, a university and the Chamber of Commerce. Almost half of the polluting, informal small enterprises have now implemented cleaner production principles thereby removing much of their pollution. This has also led to an increase in their productivity. SWITCH supported a process of conflict resolution, capacity building and dialogue, and the regulator is now pursuing these alternatives to a punitive, legalistic and failing approach. The research supported the tanners in making changes and a follow-up project is now expanding this approach across a wider catchment area. The Municipal Parks Foundation is now committed to scaling up rainwater harvesting while participatory budgeting committees have started to implement alternative and more sustainable solutions as a result of the training and exposure SWITCH provided. Demonstrations focused on urban agriculture working with urban farmers to show wastewater irrigation can be made safer, and how urine can be collected and reused. The learning alliance conducted nine studies that focused on determining current and future water production as well as an assessment of strategies to decrease unaccounted water. It succeeded in attracting and keeping the attention of all the key actors in city government, water and sanitation utilities, an urban slum community and a research focused institute. The project ended in Alexandria on something of a cliff-hanger. Partners included the city council, the water company, the Environment Agency, the regulatory authority, consumer bodies and a professional association. Birmingham conducted research on the ability of green roofs to reduce the risk of flooding and has attracted interest from planners who want to know if this could be a win-win planning condition for developers. One outcome of engagement with development agencies was that SWITCH influenced the redevelopment plans for a major site within the city centre, reducing costs and introducing more sustainable alternatives. Sectionalisation has now been scaled up or is under study across almost half the urban area, and included in draft municipal by-laws. The project used existing multistakeholder platforms Warner, to communicate these activities especially the Municipal Water Commission. Expo Zaragoza in , which focused on sustainable water management, was an important venue for showcasing these activities. Unfortunately it proved impossible to realise intended demonstration activities. Ironically perhaps, Hamburg was the city with the most sophisticated thinking about urban water, but came closest to an early closure of the project. It was rescued by a new team and in particular by appointing a full time facilitator. There was criticism that the initial approach had been too theoretical. A successful demonstration project has partially revitalised one river corridor providing a more attractive environment for residents and future development. Further activities will be firmly embedded via the learning alliance in the city institutions that are responsible for continuing and scaling up river restoration across the city. There is an important research agenda on whether, and how far, micro-pollutants pose a risk in treated wastewater. A significant outcome through engagement with the city planning authorities was the inclusion of water issues in the strategic plan for the city, where they had been completely overlooked. Learning alliance meetings brought together research institutes, government officials and farmer cooperatives. Methods of working had to be adapted in a country where policy is very much evidence based and planning is a complicated process of bottom up influence and top down implementation. A demonstration project showed how roofwater harvesting can provide a useful source of water for urban farmers and support a shift to higher value crops and to agro-tourism. The approach proposed was new for most of the consortium members and its implications were uncertain. Everyone supported the concept of platforms for considering and learning from research and for relating demonstration projects and research to the key needs of the city. However, in practice there was a strand of opinion that project money should not be spent on this. In consequence, while learning alliances were a central component of the original work plan, learning alliances at city level were not funded fully at the outset. There was an initial assumption within

project management that SWITCH research would itself leverage stakeholder engagement and that others i. Although local stakeholders did commit significant in-kind resources over time, this proved a rather optimistic point of departure for the project. At an early stage it became clear that the project would have to directly fund learning alliance related core costs such as the facilitators. Throughout the project, more and more resources were allocated to stakeholder engagement and it gained a higher profile during the project as the nature of the activities and their relevance and benefits became clearer. Ultimately, the learning alliances became the main mechanism to integrate aspects of the project. Through the alliances findings from different areas of the urban water cycle were brought together in various ways and joint responses such as strategic plans developed. Within the consortium there were widely varying organisational and professional cultures, and many different disciplines as well as obvious differences in country culture. Within consortium organisations there were markedly different incentives for the people employed and tasked to the project. Some wanted to study and observe, and others were eager to make things happen and promote change. There was also a more subtle tension between sticking to a planned mode of project implementation with a detailed set of activities for the full duration, and a process that focused on agreed outcomes but adopted a flexible and adaptable set of activities to achieve this. The next chapter discusses these aspects in more detail. The bottom line is that there is a real risk of stakeholder engagement being included in a plan to attract the funding that goes with it, without necessarily getting the attention, resources or management commitment needed for it to be successful. The amount of investment made in learning alliances at the city level by the project was typically about a 25, per city per year once the costs of physical demonstration activities were excluded. This was used mainly to fund the facilitator and the organisation of meetings and other events, communications and the production of publications. Initially the project took a decision not to budget for these costs since it did not want to create platforms that could not be sustained after the end of the project. In the end, the project had to fund such costs if it wanted the activity to happen, and especially if stakeholder engagement was to happen in any kind of timely and integrated way with the research activities that it was intended to support. The sustainability issue is real but probably misplaced. The same argument could be made of anything a project funds, whether research or stakeholder engagement. A more important question is how to show the benefits and impacts of stakeholder engagement. It is necessary to make the case for stakeholder engagement: Stakeholder engagement should have a purpose of course, and can become devalued if it is only seen as something to do rather than a means to an end. The purpose of learning alliances may change over time, and the platforms need not go on and on. In that sense the concerns about sustainability of platforms, used as a main argument to deny initial funding, were also probably misplaced. For this, if for no other reason, the stakeholder engagement processes in the cities where they are sustained, will look quite different in the future. Integrated urban water management: IUWM is an urban version of Integrated Water Resources Management IWRM , a concept popular around the turn of the century seeking to integrate the water cycle and make water management more participatory, accountable and socially, environmentally and economically sustainable. That is, if we see a tendency for sectoral water managers to integrate their actions to some degree and involve the general public and stakeholders which also raises awareness in citizens , we should applaud that rather than highlight the shortcomings against the ideal. This might encourage cities that follow the spirit the principle , if not the letter of IUWM, to continue along their path. Following underlying principles of IWRM means pursuing equity, efficiency and sustainability in providing better services to urban dwellers. For example, treating wastewater for crop irrigation and stormwater as a resource e.

DOWNLOAD PDF STRENGTHENING INTERINSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR RURAL INNOVATION BY RICHARD HAWKINS . [ET AL.]

Chapter 5 : PAEPARD: International Conference on Agri-Chains and Sustainable Development

This approach entitled, Enabling Rural Innovation (ERI) focuses on strengthening the capacity of smallholder, resource-poor farmers to access market opportunities and actively engaging in them.

Table of contents for Innovation Africa: Bibliographic record and links to related information available from the Library of Congress catalog. Contents data are machine generated based on pre-publication provided by the publisher. Contents may have variations from the printed book or be incomplete or contain other coding. Innovation concepts and methods 2. Comparison of frameworks for studying grassroots innovation: Applying the innovation systems concept in the field: Developing the art and science of innovation systems inquiry: Strengthening social capital in agricultural innovation systems 6. An innovation system in the rangelands: Social networks and status in adoption of agricultural technologies and practices among small-scale farmers in Uganda, by Robert Mazur and Sheila Onzere 9. From participation to partnership: Policy, institutional and market-led innovation Stathers and William Riwa Local innovation processes Building institutions for endogenous development: Tabuti and Patrick Van Damme Farmer Field Schools for rural empowerment and life-long learning in integrated nutrient management: Gachini and Christy Van Beek From strangler to nourisher: Building capacity for joint innovation Strengthening interinstitutional capacity for rural innovation: Building competencies for innovation in agricultural research: Going to scale with facilitation for change: Building capacity for participatory monitoring and evaluation: Agricultural innovations -- Africa.

Chapter 6 : Switch in the city by Sandifort id - Issuu

The Conceptual Background of the Common Framework on Capacity Development for Agricultural Innovation Systems was prepared by four experts (Julia Ekong, Ataharul Chowdhury, Maria Iskandarani and Eduardo Trigo) recruited under the Tropical Agri-.

Chapter 7 : A History of Farming Systems Research (Cabi Publishing) - PDF Free Download

An EDULINK project "Strengthening of university capacity for promoting, facilitating and teaching rural innovation processes (SUCAPRI) has been conceived to address this issue through south-to-south and south-to-north.

Chapter 8 : No Access | APAARI Community

22 - 26 October KICC, Nairobi, Kenya. The RUFORUM Biennial conference overall theme was "Aligning African Universities to accelerate attainment of Africa's Agenda ".

Chapter 9 : Parallel Sessions Content / Program - calendrierdelascience.com

International Conference on Innovation Systems in West and Central Strengthening Capacity for Agricultural Innovation Systems Richard Hawkins (ICRA).