

# How to Promote Innovation in Development Cooperation: Lessons Learned

Supplement to the Main Report  
Contains Annexes 10. 4 – 10. 8

April 2009

Richard Gerster and Sonja Beeli

---

This report was commissioned by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) in Rome, Italy, to Gerster Consulting, Switzerland ([www.gersterconsulting.ch](http://www.gersterconsulting.ch)). The authors would like to acknowledge the cooperation extended by all agencies included in the survey. Comments welcome: [richard.gerster@gersterconsulting.ch](mailto:richard.gerster@gersterconsulting.ch).

# Contents

10.4	Matrix Humanist Institute for Development Cooperation (HIVOS)	3
10.5	Matrix International Development Research Centre (IDRC)	20
10.6	Matrix Irish Aid (IA)	31
10.7	Matrix United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)	42
10.8	Matrix World Bank (WB)	53

# Introductory Note

This annexe is part of the main report on “How to promote innovation in development cooperation”, mandated by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to Gerster Consulting. It contains the raw data which was used for the analysis carried out in the context of this study. One matrix was put together for each organisation, mainly with the information received during interviews and with quotations from documents consulted. It is important to note that this information is **not edited systematically**, i.e. it is repetitive and fundamental statements are not separated from side remarks or passing comments. This work was done during the process of the systematic text analysis. Furthermore the presented information does not claim to be complete (particularly in the case of IA) or fully representative (particularly in the case of the WB). While the interviewees did have a chance to comment on the notes taken, this was not done so in all cases. Also the timeframe did not allow for a systematic identification of all gaps and particularly in the case of IA and the WB only limited information was available due to time constraints. While quotes from documents are identified, this is not the case for passages from interviews.

## 10.4 Matrix Humanist Institute for Development Cooperation (HIVOS)

CBDC Community Biodiversity Development Conservation Programme

CSB Civil Society Building

ICT Information and Communication Technologies

IPR Intellectual Property Rights

MDG Millennium Development Goal

MIC Media, Information and Communication for Development

PRSP poverty reduction strategy papers

Funded in 1968, Hivos is a Dutch non-governmental organisation guided by humanist values. Hivos wants to contribute to the creation of a free, fair and sustainable world: a world in which citizens – women and men – have equal access to resources and opportunities for development. There are two main areas of its work: civil society building and sustainable economic development. Hivos' headquarters are in The Hague and it has nine field offices (four regional and five local offices) with a total of 191 staff. Together with its 800 partners it is present in 30 countries. Hivos has an annual budget of roughly 100 mio €. About 75% of Hivos' work is funded by the government.

*Note: Spelling of certain words and phrases is not consistent due to the use of quotes from various documents with differing preferences.*

<b>Definition</b>	
<p>How is innovation understood in your organisation?            → Do you think that this understanding is shared by most employees – why (not)?            → Was there an elaboration process for a shared understanding of the term?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was no shared process of elaboration for the term and it is not formally defined in any document, but there is a common understanding which is shared by all. This shared understanding relates to the importance of innovation as well as to its meaning. It is seen to refer to a new approach, how it contributed to achieving Hivos' goals/objectives as well as its mission. This is relevant at different levels, on one hand it relates to Hivos' own policies – this is also where it is most visible to other people and where it is most expressed, e.g. by introducing new themes. On the other hand it does relate to improving effectiveness – though this is a very difficult concept to measure! But innovation should not be done just for the sake of itself, it is also meant to open up spaces and windows which were closed before.</li> <li>- Many organisational aspects relating to innovation are not explicitly stated but are more implicit.</li> <li>- Looking at milestones from the past business plan you can see that they all brought something new. In Hivos, innovation is linked to being new, to creativity, entrepreneurial spirit and characteristics.</li> </ul>

<p>From your perspective, what are (internal) prerequisites for successful innovation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff – they need to feel a space and have capacity to innovate and they also need to feel appreciated and important. In addition the administration should not be too strict, otherwise it is counterproductive. A constant shouting for results and indicators has meant a tighter administration for a while (“staff time can only be used once”), but at the moment this tendency is disappearing again a little bit. Another crucial element is a management which is not afraid of trying new things and can develop and implement an adequate knowledge programme. It should also be a mirror for the staff. Hivos’ directors have definitely done the necessary work for an innovative institution.</li> <li>- One indicator, also of Hivos’ innovativeness, is that it is among the first to address certain themes or a specific angle of a theme and also stick with it. But then it is important that others follow and your themes or approaches are copied, you should not stand at the forefront for too long, otherwise some things might be wrong. You should be a leader but this also has to be recognised by others.</li> </ul>
<p>From your perspective, what are suitable indicators for innovative organisations (in international cooperation)? What should the innovative performance of an organisation in this field look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If an organisation has a large number of scaled up innovations.</li> <li>- This issue is related to the identification of new programmes or potential partner organisations. First of all, Hivos is always open to proposals – though this is probably the less successful way for a cooperation. On the website in Hivos’ virtual office (<a href="http://www.hivos.nl/virtualoffice">http://www.hivos.nl/virtualoffice</a>) there are clear guidelines and information for the submission of such proposals. But more important o the identification of new partners are the staff who is travelling around, who knows people as well as referrals by partners or other funders. When assessing potential partnerships, a mix of elements plays a role, among them trusting your instincts and having Hivos’ priorities at the back of your head (e.g. focus on rural areas, young people or gender).</li> </ul>
<p>Other issues</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>Strategic issues</b></p>	
<p>How does innovation link to your organisation’s mission and its values? Do you have an explicit innovation and/or knowledge management strategy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The knowledge sharing strategy did not work to the extent it was hoped, so about three years ago a new knowledge programme was developed. Now there is a knowledge officer in each bureau. This person establishes contacts with research institutes, follows developments with staff and partner organisations and can really focus on knowledge processes. E.g. in the sustainable production group a working relation with a British research institution was established focusing on small scale farmers and their rapidly changing contexts. The knowledge programme is now really used as a factor in innovating and planning. With the new structures in place it is felt that the quality of the programme is improving.</li> <li>- There are some KM structures and processes in place, e.g. reflective sessions or lunch meetings on specific topics, but the systems are not used effectively. They work for the reporting and documentation, but people have not internalised using them for their benefit.</li> <li>- An innovation strategy is not documented and KM is integrated into the knowledge programme (see <a href="http://www.hivos.net/">http://www.hivos.net/</a>).</li> <li>- “In Hivos’ vision, strengthening civil society is at the core of social transformation. Over the last 15 years, Hivos has defined its strategy in this respect as ‘civil society building’ (CSB). This terminology is also used in this paper. ‘Building’, though, does not mean working towards a clearly-defined end situation, or following a single, standard ‘construction plan’, and also not imposing these methods and formats from outside. The main drive is to facilitate or enable endogenous processes of association among citizens in the South and linking and mobilising support for these processes at the global and national levels.” (Hivos 2008)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “As innovation also implies room for the unforeseen, Hivos prefers to keep some space and rather indicate the main direction and contours of its strategy than going into a high level of detail. Other documents will fulfil the need of operationalisation and specification.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul>
<p>Is innovation addressed in a strategic manner in your organisation?  → How does knowledge management relate to innovation?  → How do human resource policies (particularly staff selection and capacity building) relate to innovation?  → How do country strategies, programme development, project selection and evaluation incorporate/deal with innovation?  → How are innovation, replication and scaling up linked together?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The instruments used to follow processes are: proposals, which have a 3-4 year time frame, annual reports and annual work plans. They provide insight into the partners’ plans, their ideas and are the basis of any changes. Basically the activity level can change, but the result areas should remain. Furthermore the partners are visited every year, and any exchange and discussions which take place in this context are very important. They are the basis for assessing situations and potential changes.</li> <li>- The question of how innovation is related to scaling up is difficult. They are closely related but do not overlap completely. Innovation is the start of the whole process, you need innovation before you can have scaling up. Innovation entails being able to think about areas in which you work and where you can make a difference. E.g. in the area of rice one identified difficulty was rural finance. The instruments often did not reach the farmers. So now instruments from the financial team are brought to the rice sector. Scaling up leads to policy changes, to changes in the environment. This might also be a reason why partners are sometimes afraid of scaling up and hesitant to leave the pilot phase. They often want more data and be sure of things which are unclear. Up scaling is an issue in Hivos but it is not the only issue of relevance to innovation.</li> <li>- As being innovative is a clear requirement for any Hivos staff, human resource is a key element. Spotting the market, i.e. following the developments and discussions in a field, observe the relevant stakeholders, etc., is an explicit part of working at Hivos and is done by all staff members. It is not easy for Hivos to attract this particular kind of staff, as the salaries it offers are not among the highest in the Dutch NGO scene. Other NGOs sometimes attract experienced people from the private sector. But there are other incentives such as Hivos’ image of being small, flexible and innovative.</li> <li>- It is difficult to pin anything down to documented processes, e.g. innovation is not fixed as a formal requirement in recruitment processes. It is rather a self-reinforcing structure: people know Hivos and how it works and want to join for that reason. E.g. staff who has recently joined Hivos clearly had this motivation and expressed the wish to work in an organisation where it is possible to work on one issue for a longer time and where one can take risks.</li> <li>- Human resource policies do not set very rigid goals for staff, people have targets and they are discussed, but there is a lot of room for discussion. Being very keen on targets and their fulfilment is very limiting/restricting for the willingness to experiment. There are also no individual incentives – it is really merely the appreciation and the possibility to be proud of what you have done that motivates people to do what they are doing.</li> <li>- The main orientation in strategic documents is taking place in a 4-5 year cycle contingent on the Ministry of Cooperation as key funder. In this cycle the effectiveness of the policies is evaluated. There are regular programme evaluations on the policy themes which are the most important instrument in understanding the effectiveness of what is being done. Related to the evaluations, the sectors have the possibility to organise learning studies which should also contribute to the renovation of the strategies.</li> </ul> <p>There is also an annual planning cycle and strategy week which is a very important opportunity for the presentation of new ideas and ways in which you’re thinking. Here on can bring in enthusiasm for a new direction and develop new ideas.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovation usually starts small, with an idea, with an enthusiastic person and they then have to interest and motivate other parties. Scaling up can not be done alone, one needs to join forces. In the past, Hivos was not so keen on joining forces. A precondition for convincing others to join are “evaluations” (in a very general sense, also including positive feedback, interest etc., not scientific proof) from the outside. When you have plausible arguments to copy something into a different context, you can replicate.</li> <li>- “To increase Hivos’ lobbying and linking activities, more staff time will be allocated to this task. The necessary skills and expertise of the staff need to be assessed and improved. Identifying, assessing, supporting and monitoring innovative activities is often very labour intensive. Hivos seeks to keep a balance between staff capacity invested in innovative activities and capacity needed for its ‘regular’ programme. [...] Knowledge sharing is just one component of a learning organisation. Other requirements for improving the organisations’ performance and staff capacity are personal feedback, annual reviews, and the assessment, analysis and integration of results in the policy cycle.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> <li>- “The MIC programme considers innovation as one of its guiding principles. More so, the new programme will reserve budget and capacity for specific innovative ICT initiatives. These might include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Innovation incubators’, coordinated by regional partners (e.g. Sarai (Asia), one in Africa and one in Latin America. Includes innovative projects but extending to creative research opportunities;</li> <li>• Combining new and old media towards ICT;</li> <li>• Entrepreneurship/more promotion/visibility;</li> <li>• MDG-8 (global partnership for development including transfer of knowledge and technology)</li> <li>• Innovative processes: peer assists/exchanges, tenders for inclusion, public private partnerships.” (Hivos 2005)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Are the strategic elements discussed above (particularly knowledge management and human resource) linked to adequate resources in order to support the promotion of innovation?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Have there been any changes in your organisation’s approach to innovation? What have been causes for significant developments (e.g. introduction of ICT, change in management)? Please describe.</p>	<p>- An important change took place in 2004, when the Dutch ministry changed its policy for government funding. It said that it will fund no more than 75% of an individual NGO, the rest would have to come from other sources. This had a big impact on Hivos’ culture. It became even more entrepreneurial, took more risks and was forced to explore strategic opportunism at a larger scale. Looking back it can be said that it was a positive change, as it made Hivos doing things even more in the way it was already doing them. It became more deliberate.</p>
<p>Other issues</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b><i>Institutional issues</i></b></p>	
<p>Is innovation a central part of the organisation’s identity?  → Why (not)?  → How is this expressed?  → Are new employees trained in this respect?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Within the development cooperation world, Hivos is seen as being an innovative and green NGO.</li> <li>- Innovations are expected in Hivos. These expectations are also made very clear and explicit. Furthermore, Hivos is also good at spotting and identifying other innovators.</li> <li>- There are four co-financing agencies in the Netherlands and Hivos is the smallest among them. In this context Hivos has always been the first and is perceived to be a trendsetter (see also learning from partners).</li> <li>- In the areas of Seed Capital and Social Performance Management (SPM) the partners played an important</li> </ul>

	<p>role in Hivos' innovativeness, particularly Triodos Bank. Furthermore, CGAP recommends that grants are performance based, something which has been taken up. Also work from the SEEP (Small Enterprise Education and Promotion) network has provided valuable insights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hivos is seen to be innovative in two ways: First of all it has been an early mover with respect to topics it has taken up. It was one of the first to start work on HIV/Aids, to have an arts and culture programme in a development context and also to start an ICT and media programme in 1999 – at a time when ICT just became generally known. Also it has been doing microfinance since the 1970ies. In this sense, Hivos has played an important role in mainstreaming certain topics, e.g. the issue of censorship in media is one that now other organisations, e.g. human rights and media organisations, are taking up and understanding that it is an important topic, particularly in conflict situations. Second, it is innovative in its day to day work: Innovation links to risk and Hivos is a risk taker. It is quick to start funding new organisations (does not require long track records, many annual reports, etc.) and even funding individual people. This support is often very small at the beginning, involving little money.</li> <li>- Explicit introduction of new staff to Hivos' identity has improved recently. Now there is a formal introduction into Hivos' mission and vision and the associated ideas. In this context certain attitudes, such as risk taking and pursuing one's own ideas, are pushed. So there is an explicit effort to introduce new staff into Hivos' culture.</li> <li>- New staff gets an introduction to Hivos within their first 3-5 mths. This includes general information on humanism, development policies etc. In the introduction there is also a module called "Hivos DNA". In recent years Hivos has grown considerably and there has been a rather high staff turnover.</li> <li>- "Hivos has the explicit wish to be innovative in its activities and strategies. Not for the sake of innovation itself, but because it is part of its identity, and because it is essential for a small actor that wants to make a difference and likes to have a distinct profile. Innovation is seen as a continuous process of invention, experimentation and the adoption of new themes, products and approaches as long as they fit in Hivos' overall goal and strategy. Innovation should result in new themes and activities as well as in the raising of quality standards. Innovation power and learning capacities need a culture of knowledge sharing. To create such a culture will be one of Hivos' priorities in the coming years. In the allocation of its resources Hivos has always created room and flexible opportunities for new and sometimes risky initiatives, and it will continue to do so." (Hivos 2002a)</li> <li>- "In order to be the innovative organisation it likes to be, Hivos has to maintain and further stimulate the open culture of the organisation, a decentralised decision-making structure, and thinking beyond existing lines and structures." (Hivos 2002a)</li> <li>- "On this public market, Hivos' 'unique selling points' are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• its openness, paired to its drive for quality;</li> <li>• its commitment to innovation, paired to its wish to keep room for small initiatives; [...]" (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- "Working values: [...] Hivos values the driving force and inspiration of innovation, it creates room for the new and the unknown, and takes calculated risks." (Hivos 2002a)</li> <li>- "Some key elements of Hivos' vision and strategy have proven their validity again and again. The following are the main ones: [...]"</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to support processes of change over long periods of time, with flexibility and innovation, in order to be an effective, trustworthy, accountable and inspiring donor and partner;</li> <li>• the potential and power of ideas and of committed individuals as catalysts of change.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul> <p>- “The Hivos and ICT programme has certainly contributed to the profile and to the image of Hivos as a future-oriented, innovative organisation. But the visibility of the programme sometimes remains limited. Sometimes, Hivos efforts might stand in the shadow of its strategic partner organisations, in spite of the fact that Hivos contributes to their financing. It should be assured that the Hivos contribution is made visible and is fully acknowledged. A few highly innovative and widely publicised experiments or projects could help to achieve this aim.” (Junne, Lenoir 2004)</p>
<p>Do you practice an internal culture for innovation and provide space for it? In what way?</p>	<p>- An important aspect is to do things in an iterative manner. Programmes are not thought out at the desk all the way and then implemented in exactly the planned manner. There is always room for taking up new developments and changes, e.g. if having a workshop at a particular point in time does not longer make sense, then it will not be held. This differs fundamentally from the approach of other organisations, e.g. the EU, where things are done according to plan. With this Hivos also tries to stimulate a certain flexibility with its partners. E.g. looking back on its partnership with the Dutch Telkom, one can see, where changes from the initial approach have taken place. They are documented and can be reproduced. Another good example of an iterative process is the Twaweza programme (<a href="http://www.hivos.nl/twaweza">http://www.hivos.nl/twaweza</a>). This is also a good example of the courage of other funders (among them DFID; Hewlett) and Hivos is proud that they believed in the idea.</p>
<p>How do your organisation’s structures and processes support/encourage respectively restrict innovation? (e.g. levels of (de)centralisation/delegation of responsibility/field presence; (in)formal flow of information; valuing different types of knowledge, institutionalised innovation sharing, etc.) → Does the project/programme design and cycle provide space for time and resource consuming innovation processes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are no formal measures or processes that stimulate innovation, but it is obvious that innovation is appreciated.</li> <li>- The largest limitation is that when it comes down to it there is not really much time to think and to be productive. There are many administrative requirements which just are part of the job, but they leave little time for thinking and spotting the market.</li> <li>- The biggest limit at the large scale are resources, namely limited staff and financial resources. E.g. if one wants to develop a new programme, this takes a lot of resources and cannot just be done on the side.</li> <li>- The flat, non-hierarchical organisation is conducive to innovation. Loose structures give space for innovation, but there is also a danger of losing the focus.</li> <li>- In its partnerships Hivos tries not to be too bureaucratic, e.g. it does not demand log-frames from partners or very specific formats for annual reports.</li> <li>- “Hivos supports cultural and artistic expression and communication in four different areas in the South: production; exchange; promotion, marketing and distribution; and organisational capacity building. As guiding principles for deciding what to support within these areas [...], Hivos uses four selection criteria: aesthetic quality, social commitment, accessibility and innovation. [... On Innovation:] Innovation and experimentation are crucial for a dynamic development of art and culture. Possibilities for innovation in the South depend on the development of young/new, creative talent. To foster this development, Hivos stimulates young artists to learn from experienced colleagues. Hivos also remains open to interesting and innovative initiatives, such as experiments with new media, the creative application of ICT for the arts and cultural sector, or new forms of co-operation between artists from different disciplines and/or cultural backgrounds. Hivos uses the four above-mentioned criteria to focus on initiatives that are relevant, effective, innovative and</li> </ul>

	<p>exemplary in their kind. These criteria are applied in a flexible way, depending on the type of activity. They rarely apply simultaneously. In some cases, criteria may be conflicting or mutually exclusive. [...] To safeguard the quality and orientation of the Hivos arts and culture programme, Hivos will give a high priority to both aesthetic quality and social commitment when assessing any of the supported initiatives.” (Hivos 2002b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Knowledge sharing is just one component of a learning organisation. Other requirements for improving the organisations’ performance and staff capacity are personal feedback, annual reviews, and the assessment, analysis and integration of results in the policy cycle.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul>
<p>What are incentives within your organisation (incl. human resource management) which encourage innovation, replication and scaling up?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outstanding staff – not just with respect to innovation, but e.g. also with respect to attracting a large amount of external funding – is mentioned at the end of the year in internal announcements (“employee of the year”). So the efforts that people make are appreciated.</li> </ul>
<p>Are there specific instruments to promote innovations? → For which phase/aspect of innovation are they intended (is there a sequencing of instruments)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is the sabbatical programme which means that for every five years that a staff member has worked for Hivos, (s)he can take 6 weeks of leave. This is a very interesting possibility. Staff can use the six weeks for renewing their energy, they can reflect on and invest in new themes, there are really no limitations on how the time is used.</li> <li>- The annual Hivos Plaza which works like a market: Everybody can present something they are proud of and want to share. This is also a place where many innovations and experiments are brought forward.</li> <li>- Also at the annual end-of-term review where the management sits together, it is explicitly requested that people share any successful and not so successful new approaches and innovations. However it is always much harder to find negative examples of things that did not work. Probably due human nature, that failures are often explained with external reasons.</li> <li>- There is an experimental fund (which is not institutionalised), which is supporting internal innovations: There was a call for proposals and anyone or any group from within Hivos could submit a one-page proposal to the board asking for funding to develop new topics or new ideas. When such ideas get funded, this often also means funding for new organisations (e.g. in the area of elections a Dutch research institute has become a partner).</li> <li>- For small funds (up to 10’000 or even 15’000 €) the application procedure is quite light. This gives space for innovation. For larger funds there is an organisational assessment.</li> <li>- “The Community Biodiversity Development Conservation Programme (CBDC) has been implemented for the past eight years in Asia, Latin America and Africa, focused on supporting and demonstrating the viability and importance of farmer and community led innovation in agro-biodiversity research, conservation and sustainable use.” (Wynberg 2008)</li> </ul>
<p>Other issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Each innovation needs a social carrier and it needs enough space for change. The initiator and main motor behind the programme has been Loe Schout, who as the head of the Communications Department of Hivos from the mid-1990s onwards had recognized the special potential of ICT for an organisation such as Hivos and who had proposed and realised a whole series of applications (first individual email accounts for Hivos staff, first website, first intranet) which made Hivos a front runner in this field. These initiatives were strongly supported by the director of Hivos at that time, Jaap Dijkstra, who shared the vision that the specific opportunities which ICT provided would fit very well into the activities and the philosophy of Hivos (access to</li> </ul>

	<p>information as an enabling tool, individual responsibility, organisational transparency, individual accountability, individual participation in collective decision making, ...) and realised that innovative applications should not wait until everybody realises the necessity of their introduction (when they would not be an innovation any longer)." (Junne, Lenoir 2004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Although organisations are developing innovative responses to new threats such as climate change and agrofuels, there is a danger that this takes away focus from ongoing work with farmers and producers. BDF thus needs to guard against over-investment in these emerging issues, and to ensure continuity and stability in its biodiversity portfolio investment." (Wynberg 2008)</li> </ul>
<b>Innovation process</b>	
<p>How is the innovation process understood in your organisation? Is there an agreed upon/shared model of innovation? Does it include replication and scaling up?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovation is like a new business idea, it needs a lot of investment. A lot of thought must be given to the needs of the people, to the current situation etc. Many things need to be already known at that stage of the idea. But the relationship between innovation and scaling up is a gradual one, it is not that they are two totally separate things, i.e. that innovation is one thing and scaling up another. But while innovation stands at the beginning, it should already imply scaling up. If you look at other areas: You would not develop a new car if you were not already thinking further.</li> <li>- There is not really an explicit model that is used. It starts with an idea, which is for example presented at the strategy week. If it is a bit elaborated it has to be presented to the directors at some point. They are really open and interested and if it is approved one gets time to work on it, i.e. the opportunity to take it further. At some stage it has to materialise into a programme or some other tangible result. And at some point there will be a policy paper on it. It is an organic process and in that way moves to general policies (which of course has to be formally approved). The phase between the original idea and the policy paper is not clear in the sense that there is not a strict route to follow, with prescribed formats, working groups and forms for plans and so on. There are various instruments and mixes of resource allocation that one can use. It is clear though in the sense that if you want to pursue an innovative idea, you have to make time for it in your annual plan, allocate resources to it and define an objective. And if the idea comes up when your annual plan is already up and running, you have to revise it. Again, these are not heavy bureaucratic procedures, but it is obvious that innovative ideas need to be discussed and defended as well - they can only benefit from that.</li> <li>- At the level of individual partner organisations it is much easier to be innovative, there is really a lot of room for flexibility. In a portfolio there is always an openness for a proportion of potentially unsuccessful organisations. This does not mean that organisations are selected for their potential lack of success, but there is an awareness that that this potential will not always materialise.</li> <li>- Sometimes innovation is done just for innovation's sake, which is also something which has once been criticised by Hivos' director.</li> </ul>
<p>In your experience, what factors determine the performance in innovation promotion?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p>How are resources allocated with respect to different innovation phases? → Any figures for past and future allocations for innovation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>

In what way are ICTs relevant for your processes of innovation, replication and scaling up?	-
How closely are “the users”/beneficiaries involved in innovation processes?	- It really depends on the context. When you have an idea you have to find proof/evidence that it resonates with the partners, otherwise it is a no go. So if one has an idea but no one wants to go with it, then that’s it. Depending on where the idea comes from, the beneficiaries come in at different stages of its further development. But at some point in the process they have to confirm that it is a good idea. Ultimately the success of an innovation is determined by the effect it has on the ground.
Other issues	-
<b>Partnership</b>	
How does your organisation learn from others?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the network of Co-Financing organisations in the Netherlands (Micronet), learning from each other is an important element. The approach taken in this network is that one organisation is taking the lead in a specific area and then pursues this area and shares its acquired knowledge with the other organisations. This way not each organisation has to do the work themselves. In this context the Seed Capital approach developed by Hivos has been taken up by others in the network. Hivos also has the lead in HIV/Aids and MF and in SPM and MF.</li> <li>- “Networking and exchange of knowledge, technology and experience is of vital importance for organisations to innovate and learn from each other, and for peer organisations to support and strengthen each other. Hivos will support linking and networking related to quality systems, corporate social and environmental responsibility, financial services, trade, biodiversity, genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and bio-safety, genetic resources, and pollution. Such networks should promote participation, be democratic and divers, and have clearly defined and shared goals. These networks should also provide leadership, and be responsive to their members. Hivos supports these types of activities through subsidies.” (Hivos 2004)</li> <li>- “The studies [three independent evaluations on Hivos’ civil society buiding] support the emphasis of Hivos on a partner portfolio that extends beyond traditional development NGOs and includes membership organisations and innovative specialist organisations.” (Hivos 2008)</li> </ul>
What role do your partnerships play in replicating and scaling up innovations? Does this issue influence the choice of partners (government vs. NGOs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Achieving sustainable results takes time. Long-term funding is a basic need of many partner organisations. Hivos is willing to provide such long-term funding, but not forever. At the start of an engagement Hivos explicitly states its willingness to commit itself to a period of funding, which in each particular case may be different, but has a maximum of 10 years, through subsequent contracts. The partner organisation is expected to prepare for the period after Hivos’ funding. If the relationship is still thriving after ten years, an assessment is made to judge whether there are specific reasons for prolonging the co-operation. These may be the added value of the partner organisation and its programme in the local or international context, or its role in innovating developments.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> <li>- “Hivos actively seeks co-operation with organisations outside the so-called ‘development sector’, in order to realise broad and effective alliances that can address the complex and multi-faced international problems of inequality. [...] Member-based organisations and social movements have a special place in Hivos’ partner network. They form the most direct representation of the people living in situations of poverty and exclusion and are directly addressing the problems on the ground. Their work and ideas are an indispensable basis for</li> </ul>

	<p>international co-operation at all levels and Hivos wants its policies to be rooted in their vision and experiences.” (Hivos 2002a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “CBDC’s Theory of Change is that appropriate intervention strategies are needed to enhance food security and restore ownership of seeds and other agricultural resources to farmers. These strategies should focus on farmer and community-led innovation in agro-biodiversity research, conservation and sustainable use. Based on the activities of Katleho Moho in Lesotho it can be concluded that strategies adopted to help farmers conserve landraces have been successful, including a switch towards indigenous vegetables that are better adapted to local environments. Innovative strategies have also been adopted to avoid GE contamination in local maize varieties. CBDC farmers have provided important models for other farmers to adopt in their farming practices. However, there are ongoing challenges to upscale this work, largely due to capacity constraints. Policy interventions remain challenging for an organisation such as Katleho Moho, working on the ground with farmers and often removed from the policy arena. It is thus concluded that CBDC’s Theory of Change is correct, but that innovative approaches need to be developed to bring farmer experiences more concretely and meaningfully into policy arenas.”(Wynberg 2008)</li> </ul>
How are replication and scaling up dealt with in your partnerships?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scaling up depends on Hivos’ role in a specific partnership. In most cases, Hivos is just the funder and if a project is successful, Hivos tries to give more. But this is difficult and as an individual funder scaling up is usually not achieved. But when Hivos is working with a programmatic approach, the situation is different. In this case it is easier to adopt scaling up measures. So Hivos is now trying to develop more programmatic approaches as they allow for more scaling up.</li> <li>- For ICT it is important to replicate and scale up and Hivos’ awareness in this respect is changing.</li> </ul>
Do you use any specific instruments to promote adoption?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Again this depends on the specific field or area, e.g. ICT tools are quite easy to pass on and offer to other organisations to use, e.g. the NGO in a box- approach which was developed by Tactical Tech (<a href="http://www.tacticaltech.org/">http://www.tacticaltech.org/</a>).</li> </ul>
What role does the policy dialogue you are engaged in play in promoting innovations? Any scaling up experiences?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is hard to say. It probably also depends on the field. In MF policy dialogue does not have a lot of influence, actually the innovations were first and often took place before any policies or laws were in place. What is important is sharing with others. It might be different for other areas, e.g. human rights, where policy dialogue is a necessary first step.</li> <li>- Lobbying does not automatically lead to innovation, but it does lead to changes.</li> <li>- Innovations need to be supported by partners and ideas need to be discussed with partners. This dialogue is crucial, it is unimaginable that innovation comes into being without such discussions with users and key resource persons. Hivos is really trying to involve more organisations together to elaborate policies and innovations in groups and reduce one to one exchanges.</li> <li>- Hivos does not usually work with governments. They are generally not the best resource for innovation. At the international level it is different, there it is possible to bring together very interested and innovative people. The content of discussions at the international level is important, as it provides guidance and direction to Hivos’ work. But these discussions are very often not very well connected.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All programme officers are the link to the partner organisations. They have between 15 and 25 partner organisations to manage. They are in different countries, but in similar contexts, so the programme officers really know them. Of course there are differences among the partnerships, some are more developed than</li> </ul>

	<p>others. With some, it is just funding, others have a different role to play. Hivos works not only on a one to one basis with partners, but also in larger networks or programmes, e.g. the Hivos Biogas programme is a multi-stakeholder programme i.e.. with a number of different Hivos partners as well as with government and the private sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partners are identified mainly by knowing people and networking. Programme officers meet people and get to know them. Of course there are also unsolicited proposals which lead to a cooperation, but there are hardly any tenders ! It is also a requirement that new partners are brought in by staff, as a rule, 10% of the portfolio should be renewed. Furthermore there is general rule that partnerships can not last longer than 10 years.</li> <li>- “Hivos always looks for partners that are willing to point the way, are not dogmatic and welcome innovation.” (Guijt, Woodhill 2008)</li> <li>- “The BDF objective 5 is ‘to contribute to institution and social movement building, strategic alliances, networks and coalitions that push for positive changes’. [...] Some concluding remarks on the contribution to BDF objective 5. [...] Indicator: Innovative and powerful coalitions built on priority topics. – Evidence: Positive. This has definitely been realised around the international lobby activities.” (AIDEnvironment 2008)</li> <li>- “Hivos’ network is primarily made up of organisations. However, Hivos acknowledges that inspired and inspiring individuals can make organisations tick, and that there are many inspiring individuals with good initiatives and great commitment who are not at all organisation based. Hivos supports such individuals because it recognises the innovative role they can play.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> <li>- “In principle, Hivos supports organisations for a maximum of ten years, in order to guarantee innovation of its partner portfolio. Funding beyond this period is limited to organisations that are highly effective or strategically important to achieve the Hivos development objectives. The regular renewal of its partner portfolio corresponds with Hivos’ objective to support small, innovative and starting organisations and help them to develop into strong civil society actors. Hivos supports partners that have the potential to grow and helps them diversify their resource base.” (Hivos 2008)</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	
<p>When do you consider a project/programme successful enough to start replicating/up scaling?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hivos does not make this clear distinction between innovation and scaling up, it sees it rather as a rolling process. In this sense structures can very often be limiting on processes. Hivos has instruments in place which support “rolling planning”. It goes with partners at the required speed. This openness always leaves room for innovation, it “goes with the flow”. That does not mean that anything is possible! The specific steps are documented, but not in a limiting manner (see also strategic issues).</li> <li>- When you think that there is a market; when the innovation was appreciated on the ground; when first positive results are coming in. The last aspect points to the role of monitoring. Intensive monitoring is a must, so that first results are visible before the end of a project.</li> </ul>
<p>How do you identify potential areas for replication/scaling up? What role do partnerships play in this respect?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Geographically speaking it is important to do very thorough analyses on the one hand of the potentially new context and on the other hand of the reasons of success for an innovation. Then you compare the two and see how they match and what indicators there are that the approach will also be successful in the new context. Then it is also important to find a critical mass to support the replication and scaling up, i.e. partners or other agencies or academics. So it is a combination of thinking about critical factors in the first context and how they apply to a different context and the availability of sufficient resources (in knowledge and funding) to support</li> </ul>

	<p>the replication and scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scaling up is becoming more and more important for Hivos. While its background was “small is beautiful” it has learned that big can also be beautiful and has seen that it can work. Hivos now sees an added value in up-scaling certain programmes. So it is important and relevant, but Hivos has not always lived up to the idea.</li> </ul>
How relevant is the availability of different financial instruments (grants, loans, mixed) to promote innovation, replication, scaling up?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the financial sector this is important and using different financial instruments actually relates to the process of scaling up: One begins with supporting an organisation with seed funding and then making it strong and part of the mainstream where it can access other funds. An organisation has been scaled up if it can attract commercial funding. In MF you have achieved the goal of scaling up when/if institutions have become accepted players in the capital market.</li> <li>- The key issue here is to have sufficient funding, the rest depends on the context and the process you are involved in. Generally it helps if there is a mix of financial instruments available, e.g. the seed capital is a good example of how mixed financial instruments have worked.</li> </ul>
How would you describe the impact of innovation on effectiveness and efficiency of your organisation (and its partners)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Successful innovation improves effectiveness, otherwise it is not successful. Efficiency is difficult to demonstrate as output is often very difficult to quantify. But the fact that innovation is appreciated, possible and promoted is in itself an important condition for continuously improving effectiveness. And the fact that innovation is possible invites innovation.</li> </ul>
How do you deal with varying contexts and varying external factors which are out of control for your organisation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Plant breeding has become increasingly commercialized over the last three decades. Plant breeding, agricultural biotechnology and commercial seed sales are today dominated by transnational seed and agrichemical corporations. Privatization of plant breeding in the industrialized world led to the development of “Plant Breeders’ Rights”, a system of patent-like protection that gives formal breeders private monopoly rights over the production, marketing and sale of their varieties for a period of up to 25 years. Many governments in the industrialized world adopted Plant Breeders’ Rights as a mechanism to promote innovation in plant breeding and to allow seed companies to recover their investment by collecting royalties on proprietary plant varieties.”</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With respect to the biodiversity fund the following points are important, particularly in the context of scaling up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A number of elements in the structure of the fund allow for innovation, namely the importance of doing pilots and understanding the issues and bringing them to the policy level is highlighted. This points to the importance of up-scaling. E.g. the issue of having access to seeds. One element is the acknowledgment of farmers’ capacities in selecting and developing appropriate high yielding seeds. If the pilot leads to sufficient evidence the next step is to influence national and international policy changes towards a more enabling environment. So the question is, how can poor/small scale farmers/producers’ knowledge and capacities be used and supported by national and international governments (International Seeds Treaty) and research institutes. The Biodiversity Fund addresses this upscaling issue. Linking local and global issues requires people and organisations able to do that. The people who work at the local level are not necessarily the ones who also work well at the international level and there are not many people who can do both. Hivos has acknowledged this fact. It approaches this in a programmatic way and it supports specific organisations like the organic movement with local members and a network organisation with a broad lobby agenda (IFOAM). One other example is the organisation Phytotrade (<a href="http://www.phytotradafrica.com">http://www.phytotradafrica.com</a>), an organisation also supported by</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>IFAD which addresses the gap between small producers and access to (international) markets.</p> <p>b) Hivos has made the experience that both a rights based approach and a market based approach is important in this field, however, they very often do not go well together within one specific organisation.. The rights based approach often links to national policies (e.g. land rights, access to seed, forest use). The market approach looks at quality and quantity of produce, marketing linkages etc. Hivos has tried to combine this approach for a long time and also encouraged its partners to do so. In this process it constantly asks itself whether the right instruments are in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall it is important to have an enabling environment which allows people to work together and to have open discussions, highlight specific problems and think about solutions.</li> <li>- “CBDC believes that the current decline and erosion of plant genetic resources is a result of the aggressive promotion of modern crop varieties by the seed industry. Its opinion is that insufficient attention has been given to the viability and importance of farmer and community-led innovation in agro-biodiversity research, conservation and sustainable use. There is therefore a need to develop appropriate policy, technical and socio-economic intervention strategies to enhance food security and restore ownership of the means of production to farmers. Some of the assumptions are:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Biodiversity conservation, management and sustainable utilization must be integrated into one framework. Farming communities achieve this through their innovative capacity to develop, conserve and sustainably utilize genetic resources.</li> <li>2. Bringing traditional institutions of farming communities together with formal institutional systems of innovation provides unique opportunities for collaboration and learning.” (Wynberg 2008)</li> </ol> </li> <li>- “Most of CBDC’s assumptions are correct but will need ongoing revision given the rapidly evolving issues of IPRs, farmers’ rights and seed laws. This is especially apparent in the assumption that traditional (typically not associated with IPRs) and formal (often IPR-linked) systems of innovation need to be brought together to provide opportunities for collaboration and learning.” (Wynberg 2008)</li> <li>- “In implementing its policy choices and strategies Hivos aims to be innovative and to make the most of new opportunities. Being a relatively small actor and wanting to make a difference, Hivos looks for niches in the broad field of international co-operation [...]. As a part of its programme, Hivos supports small initiatives that have the potential to act as triggers for change processes.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul>
<b>Risks and mitigation</b>	
<p>In your organisation, what is the general attitude towards risks and failures? Is your organisation a risk taker and early mover?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, also because Hivos has accepted that failure is part of the trade. If you fund 10 projects, maybe 2 go wrong. What can be improved in Hivos is systematic learning from failures. Failure is generally taking place at the individual level and getting this experience into the system and enable learning for everybody is difficult. Hivos has not yet found an ideal way of doing that.</li> <li>- Many things are done to prevent failures, e.g. risk analysis in Seed Capital before signing agreements. Also if in the process it is discovered that the organisation is failing, the grants are stopped. It should be noted though that the Seed Capital programme is not looking for the “easy” MFIs (or aspirant MFIs). It sets out very carefully an elaborate plan for upgrading the aspirant MFI to a sustainable MFI. Risks are identified, addressed and frequently monitored. We try to avoid failure, but we do this by trying to address risks, rather than avoid them.</li> <li>- But in other instances taking risk is a mandate. Our Hivos Triodos Fund must take a certain risk in order to</li> </ul>

	improve access to financing of MFIs, because HIVOS provides a guarantee with public funds.
Do you have a deliberate risk management (strategy)? If yes, how does it work, what are key elements?	-
In your experience, is there a tension between the focus on results and focus on innovation (proven solutions vs. risk taking)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formulating clear objectives and expected results helps to know what you are doing and they definitely help to clarify systematic thinking and making change processes visible, or make you realise that they are taking place. But not everything can be planned in advance; sticking to a log frame does not always lead to required results especially in lobby and advocacy work when important opportunities are missed or new insights emerge.</li> <li>- It depends on how you understand/define results. Having an innovative culture is a result in itself and having specific innovations is also an important indicator. But if results are confused with targets that have to be met, the two do not go together very well, as innovation needs time.</li> <li>- “As a professional, dedicated organisation Hivos is committed to achieving results. At the same time it knows that it will often remain difficult, and sometimes even impossible, to attribute results to the activities of one particular partner or donor. Or, indeed, to assess political and social change at all. This does not mean that in such cases there are no results. Nor does it release Hivos of its basic responsibility to make results visible or at least plausible. The reasons for sticking to a result-oriented attitude are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as a learning organisation, Hivos needs a systematic analysis of its results related to its objectives and strategies;</li> <li>• as a public organisation, Hivos wants to account for its efforts to its constituencies and financiers;</li> <li>• as an organisation dedicated to international co-operation, Hivos likes to feed the public debate with examples of success, but also with examples of dilemmas and unrealistic expectations.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- “In some cases, criteria may be conflicting or mutually exclusive. It is for instance difficult to attract a broad audience (accessibility) for a highly experimental (innovative) dance production that explores the history of corporal expression within a given cultural context.” (Hivos 2002b)</li> </ul>
How do you manage accountability towards different stakeholders?	- It is important to have a balance between (more or less) successful programmes which have already proven how they operate and bring certain results and to improve effectiveness by innovation. Accountability is more than quantifying results, it is also showing that you are a capable, learning organisation.
Looking at your organisation’s activities overall, how do you assess the ratio between successful and failed activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is very hard to say, as some innovations might not be successful at a certain point in time, but only later.</li> <li>- “As the policies of its partner organisations often follow unbeaten tracks, Hivos considers its work a success if one third of the activities effectively contributed to the established objectives, if another third holds potential to achieve them within a reasonable time and if failures and disappointments are limited to the remaining third.” (Hivos 2002a)</li> </ul>
Other issues	-
<b>Good practices</b>	
When it comes to promoting innovation as an organisation: What works? What doesn’t?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Giving space to initiative and risk; have little bureaucracy; be daring, do not let procedures stand in your way; take calculated risks and don’t be afraid.</li> <li>- Staff is the key element, they are the ones who have to do it. Of course the mission and values of an organisation are also important and you have to create a space for innovation and to provide incentives. But in</li> </ul>

	<p>the end it depends on the staff and some characteristics it has.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If there is no appreciation of innovation it will not work. That does not mean that appreciation is a sufficient condition for innovation, but definitely a necessary.</li> <li>- A culture in which innovation is appreciated is a must. This has furthermore to be sustained by the board of directors/management. They have to demonstrate their commitment by allocating resources accordingly. Then the organisation has to be willing to give time to ideas so that they can evolve and prove their value. Also it must be willing to accept that failures are an option and that they exist. So they have to be willing to take risks, be entrepreneurial and show curiosity.</li> </ul>
<p>What were the most significant innovations that you developed to accomplish your goals? In these processes, what were the greatest challenges you faced and how did you overcome them? What were your greatest lessons learned?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting Tactical Tech (see above). Hivos spotted them early and it is an organisation which is also interesting with respect to scalability.</li> <li>- Global voices online (<a href="http://globalvoicesonline.org/">http://globalvoicesonline.org/</a>), which has grown out of the oneworld-platform. It is based on citizen journalism and uses an interesting mix of technologies.</li> <li>- Co-designing and shaping the entrepreneurial programme.</li> <li>- On the ICT and media programme: The whole ICT and media programme is innovative and it has grown substantially from its initiation. The focus is now more on media. ICT are approached mainly from a strategic perspective: how can partners use ICT more effectively, i.e. do trainings and raise awareness with partners (see Star Programme document). Some specific focus points include: citizen journalism (which grew out of a platform for southern voices; see above); media and diversity (particularly in closed countries); ICT policies and just trying out new things. It has also grown because Hivos manages specific programmes, e.g. for the EU in South-Eastern Africa a programme on journalism (how journalists can use existing media) or the Tanzania media fund (which stimulates investigative journalism). The programme has many sub-programmes and is co-funding a number of activities. It is very dynamic and has more external funds than other parts of Hivos.</li> </ul>
<b>Stories</b>	
<p>Do you have any illustrative stories of success and failure of innovation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using digital video for project monitoring and evaluation: <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QA753KuGb9w">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QA753KuGb9w</a></li> <li>- <a href="http://www.myc4.org">www.myc4.org</a> - a website where you can invest for microentrepreneurs in Africa. It connects investors in the North directly with entrepreneurs in the South. They use an inversed auction, the person who bids the lowest interest wins. So while there are low interest rates, it still is sustainable and the credits are not subsidised. In this model investors make a direct investment in the enterprises. Hivos supports MyC4 developing the capacity of the local organisations which should identify and screen the small businesses, Hivos has a continuous dialogue with MyC4 concerning its orientation. They were identified through the Alliance2015 network, of which Hivos is a member.</li> <li>- Participation in the following ongoing project: Triodos Bank and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) have initiated a project called Transparency in Sustainability and Finance (TSF). The purpose of this project is to assist MFIs in sustainability management through implementation of sustainability reporting based on the GRI Guidelines. A sustainability report explains a company's social, environmental and economic aspects of performance, in the context of its commitments, strategy and management approach towards the goals of sustainable development – a principle known as Triple-Bottom Line (TBL). Currently, there are no standards</li> </ul>

	<p>for reporting on sustainability specifically designed for Microfinance. The TSF project is considering the development of a GRI sector supplement to meet the needs of the Microfinance industry for standardized sustainability reporting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While the initial plan had a clear target audience, other uses for the funds emerged, depending on the context, e.g. in Africa for setting up rotating savings groups (ROSCAs); savings and loans associations – institutions/organisations which can never access commercial funding also became customers of the Seed Capital Programme. In Latin America access to funding was never a problem, but Seed Capital could e.g. be an incentive to go into rural areas.</li> </ul> <p>With the new business plan for 2007-2010 the aim was to have 25 Seed Capital partners. However, at the moment numbers are going down rather than up. One reason for this might be that the idea was always to attract external funding, something which was not attained. So now people think that there is no money available and do not make any effort to use the money which is available. Another reason might be that people think there is no market for it and that they only consider seed capital funding in the original concept and do not expand its uses.</p> <p>Seed Capital Funding policy has been developed in cooperation with the Triodos Bank (the other partner in the Hivos Triodos Fund). However, HTF is not involved in the implementation. Hivos has not succeeded so far in linking other donor agencies to the program, although we try to. For real scaling up, this would be absolutely necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The sector [Gender] shows some bright examples of innovative, large scale use of ICT for the empowerment of women. Excellent examples are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APC Africa-women - a network of organisations and individuals that work to empower African women’s organisations to access and use ICTs,</li> <li>• the FIRE network, based in Costa Rica (Asociacion de comunicaciones Feminist Interactive Radio Endeavour), which uses the Internet to “amplify women’s voices worldwide” by spreading radio programmes which are further used by local radio stations,</li> <li>• the Community of Asian Women (CAW) which has been active in 13 Asian countries to strengthen women workers in their struggle to fight for their rights. They would have probably come as far with their ICT applications on their own, but Hivos has certainly speeded up the process.</li> <li>• The Centre for Women’s Research Sri Lanka (Cenwor) which is said to make intensive use of an interactive website, online training, digital database, mailing lists etc. to improve the situation of women in Sri Lanka (although the website has not been accessible for a while) .</li> <li>• Isis-WICCE, that uses ICT worldwide to innovatively share information to promote gender equality and redress of violations against women, to influence policy makers and civil society about gender sensitivity and self determination of women, and to provide women with a platform to deliberate and work towards a culture of peace.” (Junne, Lenoir 2004)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Can you give us an example of a successfully replicated (and/or scaled up) project or programme and identify the</p>	<p>-</p>

reasons for its success?	
<b>Sources</b>	
Written	- Documents as available on the website ( <a href="http://www.hivos.nl/eng">http://www.hivos.nl/eng</a> ) and specific reports provided by Hivos (bibliographic information is contained in annexe 10.3 of the main report).
Oral	- Interviews with Willy Douma, Jappe Kok, Paul Maasen, Leo Soldaat.

## 10.5 Matrix International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

CIDA Canadian International Development Agency  
 NGO Non-governmental organisation  
 PCR Project completion report

RPE Rural Poverty and Environment Programme  
 SDC Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation  
 WDR World Development Report

IDRC is a Crown corporation created by the Parliament of Canada in 1970 to help developing countries use science and technology to find practical, long-term solutions to the social, economic, and environmental problems they face. Its support is directed toward creating a local research community whose work will build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies. IDRC's headquarters are based in Ottawa, it has six regional offices throughout the world. It has around 450 full-time equivalent staff positions. At the end of 2007 there were 1022 active research activities. In 2007/2008 its budget amounted to some 180 mio CA\$.

*Note: Spelling of certain words and phrases is not consistent due to the use of quotes from various documents with differing preferences.*

<b>Definition</b>	
How is innovation understood in your organisation? → Do you think that this understanding is shared by most employees – why (not)? → Was there an elaboration process for a shared understanding of the term?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All work done at IDRC is supporting innovation and learning. The basic idea is to develop new ways of resolving old problems. Problems are very often tackled in a specific context. And while innovation and learning are therefore often taking place at the field level, they are also reflected at the programme level.</li> <li>- The supported programmes often deal with technical and social innovation at the same time. The two are rarely separated. Technical innovations happen in a social context, e.g. when working on plant breeding, it is important to also include the plant breeders and the farmers who both are also dealing with the plants in another, particular context.</li> <li>- The nature of research is to take risks and to work in an open ended manner. Innovation can be understood in two manners: a) when looked at it from a business perspective, in a more narrow sense, it relates to bringing something to the market successfully. This is relevant to programmes which are helping to achieve economic growth; and b) it can be understood more generally with respect to IDRC's mandate overall. In this sense it means doing or using things in places or with people who have not done or used something before. In that latter manner, yes, this understanding is shared broadly within IDRC.</li> </ul>
From your perspective, what are (internal) prerequisites for successful innovation?	-

<p>From your perspective, what are suitable indicators for innovative organisations (in international cooperation)? What should the innovative performance of an organisation in this field look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IDRC's staff is working very hard in scouting out talent, new ideas and organisations (research, NGO or any other type). The role of the staff is to support the development of new ideas and to bring a new angle to known problems. There are systems in place which document the evolution of the projects (including project completion reports). Through these mechanisms and the use of the documents a learning culture is established. As a Director one is reading all of these project documents, it is a very important part of the job. And all of this information is used to guide programming and the choice of cooperating organisations.</li> <li>- Accompanying organisations in the process of their development is a corner stone of IDRC's work. In other words, IDRC provides "grants plus making". E.g. Rimisp, the Latin American Centre for Rural Development, has been supported by IDRC since the 80ies, when it was a network of farming projects. Today, the organisation is well established (coordinated civil society input for WDR 2008 on agriculture). They were chosen on the one hand because of the good quality research that they did. A second important point was the general attitude of the organisation towards risk taking and learning, particularly learning from errors.</li> </ul>
<p>Other issues</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><b>Strategic issues</b></p>	
<p>How does innovation link to your organisation's mission and its values? Do you have an explicit innovation and/or knowledge management strategy?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Is innovation addressed in a strategic manner in your organisation?  → How does knowledge management relate to innovation?  → How do human resource policies (particularly staff selection and capacity building) relate to innovation?  → How do country strategies, programme development, project selection and evaluation incorporate/deal with innovation?  → How are innovation, replication and scaling up linked together?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IDRC's overall strategy evolves around innovation. It defines areas in which it wants to be active, in what regions and how. All the programme units establish their perspectives based on this strategy. This strategy is approved by the board. Every five years there are independent reviews and evaluations. This external review process is very rigorous.</li> <li>- Knowledge management is more about the system, keeping information and using it; innovation is more about what to do.</li> <li>- All of IDRC's staff are innovators by nature, as they are researchers, more specifically researchers for development. It is their job to identify innovations and thinkers, to find new partners.</li> </ul>
<p>Are the strategic elements discussed above (particularly knowledge management and human resource) linked to adequate resources in order to support the promotion of innovation?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Have there been any changes in your organisation's approach to innovation? What have been causes for significant developments (e.g. introduction of ICT,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evolution of innovation is always happening on a continuum. From the perspective of agriculture the early days were driven by the thinking of the green revolution, now it is more about natural resource management and linkages between sustainability and the productive imperative are stressed. Looking back one cannot specify the precise moments at which the changes took place, but they are noticeable.</li> </ul>

change in management)? Please describe.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The IDRC act (<a href="http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-58005-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html">http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-58005-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html</a>) refers to the term innovation, therefore it has been central to IDRC since its beginning some 40 years ago. However, there is also a danger when overusing the term and using it everywhere and all the time. It then tends to become only a buzz word. The bottom line is that things should be done effectively and positive outcomes should be achieved. This can refer to new approaches, but also to deepening existing approaches. It is therefore always a balance between evolution and revolution.</li> <li>- There is an annual learning forum which shapes internal discussions as well as the regular exchange of experiences with the partners in the field. Such exchanges of course contribute to a continuously developing approach.</li> </ul>
Other issues	-
<b>Institutional issues</b>	
<p>Is innovation a central part of the organisation's identity?  → Why (not)?  → How is this expressed?  → Are new employees trained in this respect?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes (see also previous answer). There is also a great openness within the organisation towards learning. There are learning sessions organised on specific issues, there are open debates, very much in the sense of academic debates, meaning that there is encouragement for debate and also an acceptance of diverging view points, including the awareness that it is not necessary to always achieve agreement.</li> <li>- There is a general mindset of new IDRC staff: They do think outside the box. They are scientists/researchers and therefore bring a certain attitude and mindset with them. IDRC is looking for people who are open to innovation – again something which scientists are.</li> <li>- New staff – can be senior or junior – needs to have a proven track record of experience with research for development. But by requirement they are researchers and bring a certain brain power and overall attitude as scientists. When they enter IDRC there is an overall orientation, then they are integrated into teams. Often there is some mentoring from a senior staff, but most of this happens at the informal level. There are some specific rules as well, e.g. the first trip will never be done by a new staff member alone. It probably takes some 6-12 mths until a new staff member is fully familiar with IDRC. Currently there is a process underway to elaborate a more guided way for the introduction of new staff in order to avoid inconsistencies.</li> </ul>
Do you practice an internal culture for innovation and provide space for it? In what way?	-
<p>How do your organisation's structures and processes support/encourage respectively restrict innovation? (e.g. levels of (de)centralisation/delegation of responsibility/field presence; (in)formal flow of information; valuing different types of knowledge, institutionalised innovation sharing, etc.)  → Does the project/programme design and cycle provide space for time and resource consuming innovation processes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teams are designed in a multidisciplinary manner which means that researchers from different disciplines work together. Within the teams therefore there is genuine interaction in order to understand what the others are doing and where they are coming from. The challenge of this set-up is, that transaction costs particularly between teams and between programmes, are higher. Seizing opportunities which might arise between teams is a challenge.</li> <li>- IDRC's regional offices contribute to the very good knowledge of the situation on the ground and the local context which the organisation has. Furthermore IDRC staff travels a lot and has international working experience. This knowledge and experience helps to have an appreciation for innovation and it also fosters an understanding of the fact that one size does not fit all.</li> <li>- Certainly IDRC's flat hierarchy also contributes to an innovative climate. The programme officers have a lot of responsibility in this flat structure. They are the core building blocks, they beat the bushes for new developments, new ideas and new approaches.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the Innovation, Policy and Science Unit there are strategic review every 6 mths. In these reviews concept notes are discussed and the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of the programming are debated as team. The next 6 mths are then spent beating the bushes with these discussions at the back of the head. About once a year all of the staff gets together in a face to face situation. Other programme units have similar processes.</li> <li>- There are some people who work in more than one team. This adds to their workload and results in some higher transaction costs, but the advantage is cross-fertilisation.</li> </ul>
What are incentives within your organisation (incl. human resource management) which encourage innovation, replication and scaling up?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The main incentive is to do good quality work, to have proper documentation in place, to disseminate results and to learn. Ultimately all the processes as well as the achievements of an individual are very well documented. There is salary increase based on a person's performance. The appraisal at the individual level is very intricate and intensive, but it is also very transparent. As a director one is reading the performance review of every staff member.</li> </ul>
Are there specific instruments to promote innovations? → For which phase/aspect of innovation are they intended (is there a sequencing of instruments)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is the small grants programme, which e.g. for gender and technology awards 20'000 US\$ to individuals without expecting very specific results. The aim of this programme is really to just help identifying promising young researchers. It has no immediate fruition.</li> <li>- The overall goal of IDRC's work is not innovation per se, but poverty alleviation. So one also needs to take a strategic approach to that and work with what is best in a given context to achieve that goal. This means that sometimes it is more about strategic decisions, while in other instances one can be more open and make use of promising opportunities based on good feelings</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is not enough cooperation and learning between organisations engaged in research and development and development agencies which invest and implement projects. Openness between the two is lacking – not due to motivated individuals but rather to organisational circumstances. For example CIDA is now working with results based management which means that any projects which are started need to show results quickly, e.g. after three years in many cases. This does not leave room for innovation in the field, the time frame is too tight. The result is that donor agencies shy away from riskier and uncertain projects and tend to engage in activities which they know will produce measurable results within the project life.</li> </ul>
<b>Innovation process</b>	
How is the innovation process understood in your organisation? Is there an agreed upon/shared model of innovation? Does it include replication and scaling up?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This depends on the programme unit. Each programme has an articulated framework with its particularities. E.g. in ecohealth there is a model of environmental degradation and how this links to the human health status and innovation is placed in this particular context.</li> <li>- Replication and scaling-up is the biggest and most critical challenge. At the moment it does not look, like anybody has figured it out – not IDRC, not IFAD and none of the other agencies.</li> <li>- It is a process that should happen naturally without being forced too much, people should show initiative themselves to take on something. It is about getting the right conditions in place (economic, social or other incentives) for people to act on their own (→ Malcom Gladwell. The Tipping Point; <a href="http://www.gladwell.com/tippingpoint/index.html">http://www.gladwell.com/tippingpoint/index.html</a>). In this respect there is some scepticism when it comes to engineering the process too much. What appears to be innovative at a small scale is often not sustainable at a large scale. Success at the small scale is often not a good predictor for success at the large scale.</li> <li>- Two points should be made when it comes to the relationship between innovation and scaling-up/replication: a) the relationship is not necessarily a good/positive one; b) where there is a positive relationship, the</li> </ul>

	economic incentives are huge. There is a danger to be over optimistic when it comes to the sustainability of replications at a large scale.
In your experience, what factors determine the performance in innovation promotion?	- Again this depends on the project. Generally questions such as the following should be asked: What have they learned? Where does it lead the organisation to? Was training provided to young researchers?
How are resources allocated with respect to different innovation phases? → Any figures for past and future allocations for innovation?	-
In what way are ICTs relevant for your processes of innovation, replication and scaling up?	-
How closely are “the users”/beneficiaries involved in innovation processes?	-
Other issues	-
<b>Partnership</b>	
How does your organisation learn from others?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning is taking place in a number of ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o programme officers are learning in their work (interaction with partners etc.), they communicate the results also within IDRC;</li> <li>o from reading the researchers’ reports;</li> <li>o from participating in workshops organised by supported (and other) groups;</li> <li>o from frequent interaction with partner and donor agencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Learning processes are part of the jobs and included in job descriptions (20%-30% is dedicated to programme development which entails a lot of interaction with other people and key actors). Learning is also institutionalised at the end of projects, namely in project completion reports (PCR) answers to specific questions such as what have you learned or what of the learned issues are relevant for IDRC need to be included. Equally trip reports and conference or workshop attendance reports include a lot of learning.</li> <li>- With respect to other donors: IDRC has a division working on donor partnerships which is cooperating with the programming divisions. There is regular exchange on different aspects of the partnership and a lot of reflection throughout the process. It brings people together who work with the same donors and discusses how best to engage with a specific partner. As many programme officers work with many different partners and do not have a lot of time to focus on one specifically, this is very valuable.</li> </ul>
What role do your partnerships play in replicating and scaling up innovations? Does this issue influence the choice of partners (government vs. NGOs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regarding the selection of partners there has been a change in recent years. For a long time IDRC has collaborated with organisations in which IDRC has established/ experienced relationships, but more recently more open calls are used. This resulted in a significant increase of newly supported organisations and also their diversity (modalities of support have changed).</li> <li>- With respect to the selection of other donor organisations as partners IDRC has become much more selective and is choosing organisations with whom true partnerships can be built.</li> <li>- Potential partnerships are discussed at an early stage also by management. Their innovative potential is not assessed in a strategic manner, but rather based on an organisation’s reputation/track record and experience, as well as revealed through discussion. Partnerships are continuously tracked, documented and discussed</li> </ul>

	<p>internally, also at management level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IDRC provides a significant amount of its funding to NGOs, as they are more agile and innovative than government or university agencies. However, in some cases the engagement of governments and universities is also crucial.</li> <li>- There is a specific partnership with IFAD on this issue and it is very valuable. Scaling up and mainstreaming research results is a concern for IDRC and partners are critical for scaling up. Also other donor agencies play a key role in mainstreaming when they use research results.</li> <li>- In research proposals partners are asked specifically about knowledge transfer (used to be addressed under communication before) and how they will use/communicate the acquired knowledge.</li> </ul>
<p>How are replication and scaling up dealt with in your partnerships?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In some cases partnerships are all about replication and scaling up. IDRC is primarily interested in identifying new ideas and in testing out new approaches. It also wants to understand how scaling up and replication processes work, which means that understanding scaling up is often a research process. If scaling up requires large investment, IDRC often looks for funding partners. IDRC is often also approached by partners who have heard or read about a particular project or idea and are interested in developing it further.</li> <li>- Initial projects generally run for 2-3 years and are possibly continued (success rates vary in the different programmatic areas, no detailed numbers given (but could be obtained); in the Rural Poverty and Environment Programme (RPE) roughly 50% lead to additional phases often with scaling up efforts, either further research or building on the obtained results).</li> </ul>
<p>Do you use any specific instruments to promote adoption?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are so called synergy grants which are used to take advantage of specific windows of opportunity to make more of an ongoing project. E.g. organising workshops, participating in conferences or preparing briefs. All things which require time and resources which are not available on short notice but which contribute to making best use of already ongoing engagements.</li> <li>- IDRC has also organised a workshop which brought together policy makers and researchers. They discussed the question: What do you need to better work together? Support for all stakeholders is important. In this respect science journalism has a key role to play in developing countries as they are the ones to bring research results to policy makers and the general public. IDRC supports various science journalists.</li> <li>- IDRC tries to promote adoption, but it is not clear, how successful that is. The challenge in research is trying to convince the government and other donors to take over (basically the government, as they will convince the other donors if they decided to do something!). But very often political considerations get in the way and the governments' priorities differ.</li> <li>- IDRC tries to engage local governments, NGOs and research institutions to come together and do research collectively. They should work collectively and having the government integrated from the beginning makes adoption more likely at the end.</li> <li>- The main point is to identify the key actors in the relevant processes and support them when needed.</li> <li>- IDRC staff are contributing intellectually to their fields: They publish in scientific journals, they write articles. And hopefully these contributions are taken up by peers, so this is one way of influencing partners. Another aspect is the policy work that partners are doing (e.g. in Bolivia, water issue). Policy work is very important to IDRC.</li> </ul>
<p>What role does the policy dialogue you are engaged in play in promoting innovations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy dialogue is often a key element in scaling up in many projects. This can be difficult, as it is a "hit and miss situation" which depends very much on specific constellations. But almost all of IDRC's projects try to</li> </ul>

Any scaling up experiences?	lead to policy dialogue. Out of the 130 projects of the RPE programme about 10% have a significant policy impact, around 75% have at least some intentions with respect to policy dialogue. IDRC tries to think about innovative ways in policy dialogue and is pilot testing ideas which have a potential for policy dialogue, e.g. trying to entice relevant people to participate throughout the research process and play an active role so that they buy into the process and its results.
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the end of a project phase there is always the option to continue working with the same organisation, this can also be seen as an indicator of a successful first phase. A significant proportion of the portfolio (probably around 40%-60%) is moved on to such a follow-up phase – but these numbers are really just a guess!</li> <li>- On the development of innovative partnerships: IDRC thinks that all stakeholders need to be involved in the research process, this includes social action groups, small scale farmers, etc. The key point is to use innovative methodology from the start to involve them and integrate their perspectives and experiences. An example of the successful results of this approach was IDRC's engagement in the water sector in Bolivia (Cochabamba; supported the same organisation that was also supported by SDC). IDRC-supported researchers provided specific information to the social movement which therefore had more information (specific models etc.) than the government. They could then share it in meetings, which led the government to request access to the same data, and in this way researchers collaborated in the policy process and had a direct impact on the water policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	
When do you consider a project/programme successful enough to start replicating/up scaling?	- IDRC does not define the potential for scaling up in terms of success of projects itself but rather judges it based on research success along with the reaction/feedback it receives from stakeholders in countries where the research was conducted. When local stakeholders express interest, this is an indication for the success.
How do you identify potential areas for replication/scaling up? What role do partnerships play in this respect?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See above: partners/local stakeholders are the key drivers for replication and scaling up. IDRC is present throughout the interaction and makes suggestions, provides ideas (also based on experiences in other regions), but the lead is usually not with IDRC.</li> <li>- Generally there is limited communications between different programs within IDRC and it does not happen very often that a project from one programme is taken up by another. This is mainly due to the internal structure and the large size of teams – with a more hierarchical structure it would be different. This is one point where the potential for innovation within the organisation is lost. For example, poor people in rural areas are very often interested in investments in health and education for their children. But no one in RPE is a health specialist and we have not pursued how it links to innovation in livelihood options like agricultural technologies. Similarly probably no one from the health programme has thought about health issues under an agricultural livelihood perspective.</li> </ul>
How relevant is the availability of different financial instruments (grants, loans, mixed) to promote innovation, replication, scaling up?	- IDRC does not get directly involved in loans. The main problem with all these instruments lies in the way they are often implemented in practice. Most of them are based on top-down management and specific performance reporting structures. This does not leave much room for local people to innovate. Very often in a project there are unforeseen impacts and benefits which are difficult to document and report and therefore difficult to formalise or quantify. The key point would be to get away from a top-down approach. A very good example of the limiting factors in this respect is the IFAD programme in the Andes, where a similar experience was made: There was a lot of room for innovation and it is clearly visible on the ground that it has an impact and is effective, but this impact is hard to document and can not be put into a report.

How would you describe the impact of innovation on effectiveness and efficiency of your organisation (and its partners)?	- Basically if IDRC is effective, there's a lot of innovation. Fresh and new ideas, innovative approaches are indicators of IDRC's effectiveness.
How do you deal with varying contexts and varying external factors which are out of control for your organisation?	<p>- Project approach documents need to clearly identify the local development context, including risks and propose appropriate management approaches, i.e. how these risks should be dealt with. IDRC is not adverse to supporting high risk projects, they just need to have appropriate risk management structures built into design. Again the example of Cochabamba, where the key risk was working with groups which had no organisational structures and with a quite young researcher. It was not realistic to give funding to this person directly, so for the first phase it was given to the International Potato Centre (CIP) with which the researcher was associated in a loose network. Then there was a set of specific milestones which were monitored and two visits per year. So the accompanying process was quite intensive. In the second phase the researcher had established his own NGO which was too young at the time to channel the funds through, so they were given to Intercooperation (Swiss NGO) sharing the overhead, so that the emerging NGO could be supported. Again there were regular milestones, less frequent reporting, but still two annual visits. For the last phase the funding was actually doubled and now directly given to the NGO.</p> <p>The same approach was used in a similar situation in Ecuador where it failed. One of two projects had many difficulties (administrative, financial) and it became clear quite early in the process (from the set milestones) that it would fail. The milestones allowed for an early intervention and moderate success. Management by milestones is now used quite frequently.</p>
Other issues	-
<b>Risks and mitigation</b>	
In your organisation, what is the general attitude towards risks and failures? Is your organisation a risk taker and early mover?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The word failure is not one often heard in IDRC. IDRC is assuming a lot of risks by working in and providing funding to developing countries, but within IDRC this is not seen as being risky. The attitude is different: such situations are seen as being possibilities for innovation and opportunities for achieving something. Therefore the mindset is different. IDRC can be seen to be a risk taker by working in neglected areas.</li> <li>- IDRC tries to identify areas which have not been researched much but which are relevant to development. Such knowledge gaps are seen as a job which can be done (namely to fill the gap with knowledge) and IDRC is generally happy to be there. The risks are that the gaps do not get filled and this is addressed in planning very carefully.</li> <li>- Yes. Staff is aware that they can take risks. The organisation is not afraid of failure and learning from failure is important.</li> <li>- Attention to risk management has become a centre piece for IDRC.</li> <li>- When projects fail, the key point is to understand why they failed and what can be learned from it. Again the PCR plays a key role. It documents the entire process and what can be learned from it. This also is also used for the assessment of new project proposals and can be used as a reason to stop one, if relevant experiences have been made on other occasions.</li> </ul>
Do you have a deliberate risk management (strategy)? If yes, how does it work, what are key elements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a balance between high and low risk projects. The balance is achieved through on-going attention and learning. The ongoing, continuous monitoring and the close relationships with the partners provide the pulse of a project.</li> <li>- A lot of time is spent on developing research proposals (generally 12-18 mths) During this process a lot of</li> </ul>

	<p>time is spent in the field, trying to develop appropriate methodologies. A lot of attention in this process is placed on assessing the context and identifying suitable approaches. Programme officers visit the partner organisations and projects several times during the process (depending on the size). Another important component is the identification of the right organisations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- During this long lead-up in planning another important element is looking at the readiness of the various stakeholders involved, e.g. policy makers and people involved. Is the issue which will be researched on their agenda? In conflict situations, for example, research can often be a tool to bring a common view to a conflict and people can become more issue based, rather than focusing on the conflict.</li> <li>- IDRC does not have a deliberate risk management strategy. It is pushing for innovation and mitigates risks by the methods used. There are various spaces in different steps along the way where different controls are in place, e.g. specific sections on risks during project appraisal and approval times. Also in dialogue with other donors there is a lot of discussion on perceived risks.</li> <li>- IDRC is in the process of formalising its risk management. It is an issue of documenting it properly and making it more formal. The information is there, it needs to be put together and set in the appropriate language and format. This process is a response to audits and the demand for documents (therefore somewhat a “top-down-process”).</li> </ul>
<p>In your experience, is there a tension between the focus on results and focus on innovation (proven solutions vs. risk taking)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are two issues relating to results: one of them is the awareness of different partners. On the one hand there are long and established partnerships with organisations which you know and of whom you know what kind of results you will get. On the other hand there are new organisations with whose work one is less familiar. A balance between the two types of partnerships is needed. The second issue is an awareness at the level of staff. Staff are the key agents in managing risks. Currently IDRC is in a situation with a lot of older, very experienced staff. In the next years there will be a hand-over to a younger generation and this change process implies a certain risk. It is important to be aware of it.</li> <li>- Strengthening research capacities of various organisations is part of IDRC’s mandate. This is why different mechanisms have been put in place to broaden the partner base (e.g. open calls).</li> </ul>
<p>How do you manage accountability towards different stakeholders?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The key instrument in balancing accountability is communication. E.g. in Canada IDRC is using staff members and makes very short and specific captions (questions) for them. This is very appealing to a Canadian audience. It frames important issues in a way they can relate to.</li> <li>- This is a challenge that more or less all donor agencies have. They have to answer to different people. However, overnight success almost never happens. Break throughs usually come after many years of work. Development needs time, 10 years, 20 years. In this context 3 or 5 years are nothing. This is what can be hard to sell, e.g. to a board</li> <li>- One point which is also very important and communicated very clearly is the fact that IDRC is standing for and supporting diversity. It can fund diametrically opposed opinions and has done so on several instances. It is important to have an open debate about the pros and cons of controversial topics.</li> <li>- IDRC is also aware of the fact that by addressing contentions issues there might be a reputational risk involved for certain audiences. Furthermore there are potentially controversial organisations with whom IDRC collaborates. So when elaborating proposals an important question to ask is what messages are sent to different constituencies when working on a specific issue or with specific partners. It is important to reflect on how potentially controversial issues relate to IDRC’s mission and identity and how the arguments can be</li> </ul>

	made to the respective constituencies.
Looking at your organisation's activities overall, how do you assess the ratio between successful and failed activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Failure that is properly documented as a learning tool is not a failure. As long as one can see that there is some learning, there is no failure. In the end it is the investments over a long term that count. And attribution to IDRC money is always difficult.</li> <li>- This is a measurement issue. Definitely there are undertakings which clearly have to be considered a failure, but it is difficult to assess this at the very general level, as indicators differentiate across sectors and programmes.</li> <li>- One example for failed actions could be research competitions when launched calls were answered very weakly or with proposals that were clearly off the mark. In these instances it could be that IDRC based its competition on the wrong assumptions or that capacities in a particular region were not there. If there is very little response, the competition is looked at very carefully and given a lot of consideration. If necessary, some measures are undertaken, e.g. capacity building in a specific region. But generally calls are only launched after much deliberation.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recently there was a working group in IDRC on risk at the project level. It will be interesting to see what is coming out of that.</li> <li>- IDRC is in the process of defining its next 5 year project cycle where risks will be dealt with in an integrated manner.</li> <li>- There is a corporate risk profile, but it is very general and broad and will probably not be useful for the benchmarking study. IDRC wants to flesh it out.</li> </ul>
<b>Good practices</b>	
When it comes to promoting innovation as an organisation: What works? What doesn't?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What works: accompanying partners, constant interaction with partners, space for learning and long-term commitment.</li> <li>- What does not work: the silver bullet approach. And short-term perspectives are always risky.</li> <li>- There is always an unpredictability of what will come (e.g. climate change!). It is therefore important to tell people to adapt to changing conditions. Invest resources where the problems are and cooperate with committed actors.</li> <li>- Walk the talk, i.e. when it comes to assessing programmes and staff performance, don't penalise risk taking; have management structures and decision making processes which support innovation; set the right rewards.</li> <li>- Do not focus on results 100%. In a programme at IDRC maybe 20-25% are results focused. Another third is more open and then there is a lot of capacity building included.</li> </ul>
What were the most significant innovations that you developed to accomplish your goals? In these processes, what were the greatest challenges you faced and how did you overcome them? What were your greatest lessons learned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remaining true to IDRC's mandate throughout its 40 years of history while at the same time adjusting to a changing context. Trying to resolve problems in a new way by doing research that is relevant for and can be used by people and which at the same time is important. In this process continuous learning is important and always thinking of how you can become better.</li> </ul>
<b>Stories</b>	
Do you have any illustrative stories of success and failure of innovation?	-
Can you give us an example of a	- The use of solar water heaters in the Middle East. Some development went into it to see that it works on its

<p>successfully replicated (and/or scaled up) project or programme and identify the reasons for its success?</p>	<p>own and economic incentives were a big part of it. The main point is that one should unblock obstacles which prevent people from using something new. Get these obstacles out of the way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a still ongoing – so the verdict is out – project on the use of grey water at the household level (i.e. diverting water used in the household which is often not very polluted to simple filtering mechanisms and then using it for irrigation of the home garden). The system works fairly well at the household level and IDRC did some research on how to bring down the costs per unit. There are incentives for the people using it, e.g. they can generate additional income by selling what they grow in the garden. There are also benefits at the level of society/larger groups: less water is used for irrigation. But replication at the national level (Jordan) is happening very slowly. Political considerations are coming into play, the government prefers to have a small number of units in various large cities, rather than a large number in one city. And there are different experiences to be made depending on whether you scale up with 500 or 2000 units.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sources</b></p>	
<p>Written</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documents as available on the website (<a href="http://www.idrc.org">http://www.idrc.org</a>) and specific reports provided by IDRC (bibliographic information is contained in annexe 10.3 of the main report).</li> </ul>
<p>Oral</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interviews with Lisa Burley, Merle Faminow, Naser Faruqui and Jean Lebel.</li> </ul>

## 10.6 Matrix Irish Aid (IA)

DAC	Development Assistance Committee	NGO	Non-governmental organisation
MAPS	Multi-Annual Programme Scheme	OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
MOPAN	Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network	SWAP	Sector Wide Approach

Irish Aid is the Government of Ireland's programme of assistance to developing countries. The country has had an official development assistance programme since 1974. Total official development assistance in 2008 is estimated to be €899 million. Irish Aid's absolute priority is on the reduction of poverty, inequality and exclusion in developing countries. Apart from the poverty focus its key working principles include a geographic focus (approx. 80% of Ireland's aid goes to Africa), untied aid, partnership, effectiveness, accountability and coherence. Irish Aid has some 184 staff members, out of which 126 work at its headquarters in Limerick, Ireland. The others work in one of its eight programme offices around the world.

*Note: Spelling of certain words and phrases is not consistent due to the use of quotes from various documents with differing preferences.*

<b>Definition</b>	
<p>How is innovation understood in your organisation?            → Do you think that this understanding is shared by most employees – why (not)?            → Was there an elaboration process for a shared understanding of the term?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An understanding and definition of what Irish Aid is about is an important aspect of understanding how it relates to innovation: For a long time, Irish Aid has been very small, worked with a project approach and was focused on NGOs. In the late 1990ies it started to grow considerably and at that time it was important to grapple and work out specific issues, particularly what it means to work with the poor. In this process the focus of Irish Aid's work became more clear and issues/processes around the theme of poverty emerged, namely social exclusion, mechanisms keeping poor people in poverty etc. An important step in this process was the elaboration of the Hunger Task Force Report which provided a clearer framework and how the key issue of hunger links to poverty.</li> <li>- Irish Aid does not have a deliberate institutional approach to innovation. There is not institutional definition since there was never a conscious decision to pick innovation and develop a systematic approach to it.</li> <li>- As there is no conscious institutional approach to innovation, there is probably also no shared understanding of it. However, a shared understanding of what you, as an organisation, want to do facilitates innovation. Finding a common goal and how this can be achieved is important. Another factor that contributes to a climate conducive to innovation is that fact that Irish Aid is constantly and critically assessing what it is doing.</li> </ul>

From your perspective, what are (internal) prerequisites for successful innovation?	- A certain level of flexibility and decentralisation to the field level. While formally Irish Aid is rather centralised (the 4-5 year country programmes or the annual budgets for example are approved at headquarter level), there is a lot of flexibility within these instruments. Also a dynamic policy environment is important. Fixed approaches are rigid and limit innovation, it is better to remain flexible. This also applies to the constant interaction with partners.
From your perspective, what are suitable indicators for innovative organisations (in international cooperation)? What should the innovative performance of an organisation in this field look like?	-
Other issues	- "Ireland is recognised by the OECD for its innovative partnerships including with the Clinton Foundation in Mozambique and Lesotho. [...] The term 'cutting edge' to describe the Irish Aid programme is not just a selective quotation from the review – it is a reality. Since the 2006 White Paper on Irish Aid which in itself was a significant policy innovation, Irish Aid has launched a humanitarian rapid response corps, has established and responded to the key report from the Hunger Task Force and has opened this new Volunteering and Information Centre. [...] The Irish Aid programme is not just innovative – we are also accountable and focused on results. [...] What we can do however is to make sure that the Irish Aid programme continues to adapt to changing needs, continues to innovate and that it is excellently managed." (Minister Peter Powers speech at the launch of the OECD Peer Review of Irish Aid, last accessed on May 20 at: <a href="http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/article.asp?article=1447">http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/article.asp?article=1447</a> )
<b>Strategic issues</b>	
How does innovation link to your organisation's mission and its values? Do you have an explicit innovation and/or knowledge management strategy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Irish Aid does not have a systematic approach to innovation, so there is no explicit strategy. Currently there is a working group in place which is elaborating a knowledge management strategy. It is assumed that with a more strategic approach to knowledge management innovation will also be institutionalised on a more formal level. Also Irish Aid is trying to build a more strategic approach to research which will also affect innovation.</li> <li>- There is a reference to innovation in the Hunger Task Force Report, namely "Support for actions to improve agricultural productivity and institutional innovation" as one of the calls of action of what Ireland should do.</li> <li>- Select references from Irish Aid's White Paper: "The key decisions that will shape Irish Aid's work in the future are outlined clearly in this document. Some are innovations and represent new focus areas for Irish Aid and some are validating and building on existing successes. It is important to realise that we are not starting with a blank slate. [...] The resources now available mean that the Government can do more and can respond to the clear wish of Irish people that Ireland be a leader and an innovator in international development, both in terms of our own official programme and in terms of influencing the international development agenda. [...] We will identify new and innovative ways to reduce vulnerability, provide social protection and build productive capacity. [...] Ireland may continue to support individual projects in the programme countries where the policy or institutional environment is not suitable for using more programmatic assistance. Projects can be invaluable as sources of innovation in development methods, through which donors can learn how people are themselves addressing the problems they face. [...] We may need to innovate and develop new ways of working in new programme countries, with a particular emphasis on political and economic governance, as well as the provision of basic services. [...] Increasingly, we are seeing the development of new and innovative</li> </ul>

	<p>partnerships for cooperation, bringing together governments, civil society, the private sector, charitable foundations and affected peoples and communities. [...] We will seek out innovative partnerships which can increase the impact and effectiveness of our development cooperation efforts. (Government of Ireland 2006)</p>
<p>Is innovation addressed in a strategic manner in your organisation?  → How does knowledge management relate to innovation?  → How do human resource policies (particularly staff selection and capacity building) relate to innovation?  → How do country strategies, programme development, project selection and evaluation incorporate/deal with innovation?  → How are innovation, replication and scaling up linked together?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One important element of Irish Aid's human resource strategy is the so-called mid-career recruitment. Irish Aid deliberately brings in people from outside of the civil service, but who have some 5-10 years of experience in development cooperation (e.g. with NGOs and international organisations). Many of these people have extensive field experience, lived in remote regions and really know the development context well. Furthermore they have management experience from the handling of projects or programmes (including budgetary experience). This is very influential for Irish Aid's thinking. Other staff are drawn from general and diplomatic services and sometimes have limited development experience but bring strong administrative skills and/or foreign policy knowledge. Connecting the development agenda to foreign policy and placing it at the heart of Ireland's foreign policy is particularly valuable. Also the above mix contributes to a different understanding within the organisation compared to other bilateral donors where staff very often has an academic understanding of all the issues involved.</li> <li>- Irish Aid is a rather young organisation and is still building its strategic approaches. It has some clear working principles, but specific guidance is still needed.</li> </ul>
<p>Are the strategic elements discussed above (particularly knowledge management and human resource) linked to adequate resources in order to support the promotion of innovation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p>Have there been any changes in your organisation's approach to innovation? What have been causes for significant developments (e.g. introduction of ICT, change in management)? Please describe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See answers to the first question.</li> <li>- While Irish Aid does not have a very strategic and formal approach to innovation, there have been some broader developments which have created an awareness of the importance of being innovative within the institution: In the mid-1990ies a move from a project based approach to a programme based approach has started (for reasons of aid effectiveness). Irish Aid stopped planning and implementing projects with a large number of expatriate staff in the respective countries. It moved quite quickly to having no technical assistance anymore and the vast majority of aid is provided through a programme based approach and in working with partners. Irish Aid was at the forefront of providing general and sectoral budget support and working with basket funds. Also at the programme level it is relying heavily on programmatic aid modalities. This new approach which somewhat started from scratch required a fundamental change of mind within the organisation. The two following observations should be made in this context: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) When policies requirements are to try out new things, one has to see what works and what does not work.</li> <li>2) In a majority of today's modalities of cooperation there is no longer direct control of the funded approaches, one therefore depends on the quality of the approaches used. These provide the key influencing aspect. A large share of these developments were based on Ireland's own experiences and reviews of specific projects, e.g. in rural development. Ireland was always at the forefront of the move towards SWAPs and was generally in the lead group in those countries where it is present, particularly in the health and education sector. It also heavily pushed the entire agenda of the Paris Declaration.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<p>Other issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "The criteria for allocation of funding in MAPS I were quite broad. It was recognised by all concerned that (a)</li> </ul>

	MAPS was so innovative that it would necessarily involve some degree of ‘learning by doing’, and (b) that one of its core characteristics of flexibility would have been negated, the more prescriptive its Guidelines were.” (Development Cooperation Ireland 2005)
<b>Institutional issues</b>	
Is innovation a central part of the organisation’s identity? → Why (not)? → How is this expressed? → Are new employees trained in this respect?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See also answers to first question.</li> <li>- Innovation as word does not come up in any Irish Aid policy or strategic documents. But qualities such as being flexible, adaptable and responsive are very important within the organisation. Irish Aid is also very interested in best practices. It is doing a lot of work in this respect with the DAC. But it is not about being innovative just for the sake of innovation., Irish Aid’s interest in innovation depends very much on its usefulness.</li> </ul>
Do you practice an internal culture for innovation and provide space for it? In what way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovation is not addressed or promoted in a specific manner. It is not a separate issue. Factors which contribute to the organisation’s overall culture are a certain openness and particularly a critical engagement with respect to what does and what does not work in ones activities. Particularly the latter, namely critically reflecting what is being done, is crucial for innovation. There are specific methods used to promote these processes, e.g. structures in programmes which connect grass root activities to the policy level in order to see whether policy changes really have the desired effects. Otherwise policy discussions remain disconnected. To this effect Irish Aid works with NGOs and has regional/local development programmes. Furthermore, Irish Aid ensures that there are mechanisms within multi-donor arrangements which check for the effects on the ground e.g. field monitoring visits, process funds for catalysing activities, studies and research. It is important to supplement national monitoring processes with qualitative information and an understanding of what works and doesn’t in the implementation environment. Government M and E systems are often not robust enough to gather sufficient information or may be very target oriented. They might not come or not be as informative as desired.</li> <li>- It is important to examine the overall goal of poverty reduction – which stands somewhere in most missions of cooperation agencies – more closely. Because the way that poverty is understood, e.g. as a technical problem or as a structural and political problem, influences the way in which you address it. And this understanding influences the kind of culture that an organisation has.</li> </ul>
How do your organisation’s structures and processes support/encourage respectively restrict innovation? (e.g. levels of (de)centralisation/delegation of responsibility/field presence; (in)formal flow of information; valuing different types of knowledge, institutionalised innovation sharing, etc.) → Does the project/programme design and cycle provide space for time and resource consuming innovation processes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The compartmentalisation of sections is certainly the biggest restriction. There is a tendency to get bound up into the work of one’s own area and to be innovative within that, but not connecting to the rest of the organisation. This limitation has been recognised and there is work on knowledge management under way. Specifically, the decentralisation process from Dublin to Limerick has had a negative effect on institutional memory as well as on the structures used for knowledge sharing – they need to be developed (again). There are efforts under way to work more in a cross-team manner, i.e. put together teams that do not reflect management structures and which cut vertically across them.</li> <li>- Learning across country programmes needs to be strengthened and there are not enough back up systems beyond some meetings (such as the thematic meetings). A lot of the communication does depend on personal relationships. But informal learning is taking place, as one can see similar approaches being adopted in different programmes. The roll out of an organisational approach to strategic planning has been particularly helpful in this regard and is an important institutional support to innovation and cross learning.</li> <li>- What is helpful is the size of Irish Aid as well as the fact that also the management is reasonably accessible.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Irish Aid is a very small organisation and communication within the organisation is easy and efficient. It is particularly easy to get information within country programmes, but it is sometimes more difficult to get it across country programmes. One way of addressing this hurdle is the organisation of regular sectoral meetings, where sectoral experts (generally local staff at the embassies who are considered to be the permanent institutional capacities as Irish staff at the embassies rotates) are brought together at the level of the organisation.</li> <li>- In programmes there is always the space and capacity for innovations to happen. And they do happen and they are expected to happen. Financial resources and time are available for this purpose.</li> <li>- A dynamic policy and practice process is important.</li> </ul>
What are incentives within your organisation (incl. human resource management) which encourage innovation, replication and scaling up?	-
Are there specific instruments to promote innovations? → For which phase/aspect of innovation are they intended (is there a sequencing of instruments)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In all country programmes there is a process fund, in the case of the HIV/Aids programme it is actually quite large (around 0.5 mio € per year). This fund can be used for trying out new approaches. It is basically an unspecified fund to do experimental work and to find out whether and how such new ideas work. It brings in innovative ideas which are evidence based.</li> <li>- “Irish Aid is working with local government to improve their approach to tourism development and has established an innovation fund to provide small grants to community-run tourism businesses, such as B&amp;Bs and township tours.” (Irish Aid 2007)</li> <li>- “Irish Aid Award for Young Social Innovators (€55,000): This award is aimed at transition year students. The 2007 award in the ‘Making Our World One World’ category was won by students from Gort Community School, Galway, for a project on tackling the stigma and discrimination surrounding HIV and AIDS.” (Irish Aid 2007)“In 2005, Irish Aid became a gold sponsor partner in the Young Social Innovators Awards and supported a special award – the Global Citizen Award. The Young Social Innovators programme was created in 2001 to develop social awareness and activism amongst young people (15-18yrs), so that they may become effective champions for social justice. Over 2,400 transition year students, throughout the country, actively participated in social action projects in 2005 as part of the Young Social Innovators programme.” (Irish Aid 2005)</li> <li>- Media Challenge Fund – Innovation first listed criteria for the selection of proposals (<a href="http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/article.asp?article=231">http://www.irishaid.gov.ie/article.asp?article=231</a>).</li> </ul>
Other issues	-
<b><i>Innovation process</i></b>	
How is the innovation process understood in your organisation? Is there an agreed upon/shared model of innovation? Does it include replication and scaling up?	-
In your experience, what factors determine the performance in innovation promotion?	-
How are resources allocated with respect to	-

different innovation phases? → Any figures for past and future allocations for innovation?	
In what way are ICTs relevant for your processes of innovation, replication and scaling up?	-
How closely are “the users”/beneficiaries involved in innovation processes?	-
Other issues	-
<b>Partnership</b>	
How does your organisation learn from others?	- Interacting with partners is a key element of Irish Aid’s way of working. As a programmatic donor they stand at the centre. There are regular exchanges with the important partners, e.g. for the NGOs there are two meetings per year during which the current issues are discussed and shared understanding developed. Also at the country level there are constant discussions with partners. Each country programme has a series of consultations and meetings to be informed.
What role do your partnerships play in replicating and scaling up innovations? Does this issue influence the choice of partners (government vs. NGOs)?	-
How are replication and scaling up dealt with in your partnerships?	- Irish Aid does not design and implement programmes. Rather it uses a cyclic approach: Together with partners it analyses the situation, then formulates a policy or strategy and then rolls out the approaches at the local and district levels. - It does try to replicate in other places as well.
Do you use any specific instruments to promote adoption?	-
What role does the policy dialogue you are engaged in play in promoting innovations? Any scaling up experiences?	- Policy dialogue is important, but Irish Aid does not want bland policy dialogue. It needs to be linked to specific goals. This is why the following points are important in the process of policy dialogue: a) Be clear about what you want to achieve. b) Produce specific positions which inform your dialogue. c) Validate these positions and the policies. They need to have substance and be verified and confirmed. - Policy dialogue which is taking place at the country level is very much shaped by the local context and therefore somewhat “easier”. It is influenced by this context and is more dynamic and decisive. The policy dialogue that Irish Aid has with NGOs (e.g. on poverty targeting, aid and development effectiveness, and Southern partnering) and UN partners is not yet consistent and systematic as it might be. - - An interesting observation has been made with respect to different opinions within other organisations, particularly bilateral donors. There can be quite a difference between what they express, e.g. at the level of the DAC and headquarters, and what their field offices say. Theoretically it would be ideal to get an agreed approach at the DAC, e.g. on the issue of social protection, which could then facilitate the discussion at country level and make it easier to get other donors on board. But in practice this does not always work. - Policy dialogue is particularly important for Irish Aid’s bilateral and NGO programmes, to a lesser extent also

	<p>for the multilateral. But being one of the leaders when it comes to the issue of aid effectiveness, Ireland has a particular interest in the quality of policies and their implementation, as this determines the quality of aid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experience of Tanzania, where Irish Aid did a joint analysis with the government on the issue of service delivery. Its quality has been an issue of discussion and it was difficult to address. In this joint study the situation was analysed, the problem identified and some short and medium term actions proposed. It was then presented at the joint forum. The effect was that there were people for and against it on both the government's and the donors' side. This was interesting because very often the situation is different, namely that the donors are on one and the government on the other side. Coordinating mechanisms in the context of aid effectiveness are often about coordinating donor positions, but the government should be on board from the beginning.</li> <li>- Policy dialogue is also very central to general budget support and Irish Aid is in the process of elaborating a policy for that.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Irish Aid has very diverse partners, almost too many (in civil society). There is a group of 30-35 partners which receive the bulk of its funding. They fall into three groups: Irish NGOs (i.e. anchored in Ireland, doing their fundraising here, having a profile in public, etc.); Irish offices of international NGOs (e.g. ActionAid, Oxfam) which have varying capacities (many of them have grown during the economic boom); international partners who are very good at something specific, mostly human rights and governance.</li> <li>- Irish Aid has a rather large NGO programme, larger than many other bilateral donors.</li> <li>- When it comes to multilateral partners, there is institutional funding at the level of headquarters (generally UN agencies receive no funds in the partner countries). There is also regular dialogue with the respective institutions, sometimes under the inclusion of people in the programme country (and based on previous consultations in that country). The rigour in picking up information to inform this dialogue need to be improved but without create additional burdens on programme country teams.</li> <li>- In the context of the OECD, Irish Aid is very active when it comes to aid effectiveness, and the poverty, gender and governance networks. At the country level Irish Aid is very engaged in donor coordination mechanisms that are in place in the respective countries. It is involved in many multi-donor instruments and often takes the chair in multi donor groups.</li> <li>- Irish Aid has also recently joined MOPAN.</li> <li>- International cooperation is all about relationships and partnerships, innovation needs to be systemic in the partners.</li> <li>- Interacting with partners is very important for Irish Aid's work. Especially the DAC with its thematic networks is a constant source of information, particularly when it comes to the use of good practices. But at the same time Irish Aid brings its own experiences into it.</li> <li>- Irish Aid also uses a programmatic approach in its cooperation with NGOs. It no longer receives project proposals for funding, but provides programmatic funding. There is a general dialogue about the organisation's strategies, policies, partnerships etc. The discussions result in clear indicators of success, but they are very often linked to the NGOs' own strategic plans. Irish Aid provides untied flexible funds. The same is true for UN organisations.</li> <li>- "The Multi-Annual Programme Scheme (MAPS) was an innovative concept, with a series of interlocking features, each representative of international best practice. [...] Some elements of this conceptual framework</li> </ul>

	<p>have been implemented in the two and a half year period since MAPS began. Whilst all agencies have made strides relative to their starting positions in 2002, the opportunities afforded by MAPS to work programmatically and creatively have not yet been maximised, and the potential of the Scheme as a force for programmatic transformation and the continual quest for best practice has not yet come to fruition. The evaluation team readily acknowledges that the objective of working with different levels of partnership in a programmatic mode is understandably a long-term process which is not realistically attainable within a three year 'pilot' phase; indeed 'MAPS I' was expected by its architects to involve a good deal of 'learning by doing' for all parties involved, and that has turned out to be the case. In the opinion of the evaluation team, there is scope for all of the MAPS NGOs to progress further and faster down the programmatic road, by constantly focusing on key features such as macro-level, strategic impact, long-term perspective, and a more refined partnership-based mode of operation. The evaluation team finding is that the movement towards realisation of the key elements indicates the validity of MAPS, both as a partnership vehicle and as a strategic funding mechanism. [...] Moreover, as the Comparative Study annexed to this report shows, the Scheme went considerably beyond that of any international analogues in relative scale and scope and, in this sense, was innovative and groundbreaking in nature. [...] MAPS, in both its design and its outworking as a partnership vehicle and strategic funding mechanism, has been innovative (in the sense of being in the forefront of international donor-NGO partnership practice) and is judged to have been a risk worth taking." (Development Cooperation Ireland 2005)</p>
<b>Implementation</b>	
When do you consider a project/programme successful enough to start replicating/up scaling?	-
How do you identify potential areas for replication/scaling up? What role do partnerships play in this respect?	- Basically the idea of replication and scaling up is informing every thing that Irish Aid is doing. The crucial question is always: how can something be absorbed by the system – if this is not an option, it is only of limited use, as its impact will remain limited. Therefore, Irish Aid is mainly interested in using resources to achieve a strategic impact rather than practical impacts. Stand-alone interventions which create islands of excellence (which are generally very resource intensive and not sustainable), create little strategic change. This is a critical issue with civil society partners: they need to address systemic issues rather than merely develop a limited intervention. The key question is how a particular change can be catalysed. More specifically: One should identify the bottle necks to the delivery of services or products to people, e.g. the poor's access to services or resources, and the encourage interventions that address/remove the identified obstacles in order to have a systemic influence.
How relevant is the availability of different financial instruments (grants, loans, mixed) to promote innovation, replication, scaling up?	-
How would you describe the impact of innovation on effectiveness and efficiency of your organisation (and its partners)?	-
How do you deal with varying contexts and	-

varying external factors which are out of control for your organisation?	
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working in the context of an aid effectiveness agenda, e.g. with a national PRSP or SWAPs the issue is about being in the system, about doing things and seeing how they work on the ground. E.g. in the health system an NGO is addressing a particular issue on nutrition. They have developed an innovative way of dealing with a specific problem. They then need a space to bring that experience into the system, to mainstream it into the government's system. People need to work within the system and understand them. There are no great leaps forward – they demand sudden injections of massive resources. But what is needed is strategically built capacities and sequenced reforms. Partners must also understand what potential failures are, in order to manage risks adequately.</li> <li>- The issue of how Irish Aid is understanding and dealing with scaling-up and replication is linked to its iterative cyclic approach, i.e. position oneself and then understanding what is valid in a certain point in time at a certain place.</li> <li>- Small scale, resource intensive situations are very difficult and risky to scale up.</li> </ul>
<b>Risks and mitigation</b>	
In your organisation, what is the general attitude towards risks and failures? Is your organisation a risk taker and early mover?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally speaking Irish Aid is not adverse to risks. Particularly if the potential benefit is considered to be high, if there are potentially important results, there is a high tendency to also risk something. But what needs to be done is to openly identify and declare the associated risks. There is an understanding that the awareness of risks implies their management. Someone who is not aware of risks cannot manage them. Accordingly reputational risks are much greater if there was no awareness thereof.</li> <li>- “There has been some reluctance to innovate within MAPS, or to put forward for MAPS funding, programmes seen by MAPS NGOs as potentially risky. Whilst Development Cooperation Ireland had indicated its openness to this (recognising the value of an NGO approach), it had not been articulated or ‘pushed’ very hard by both parties. The outcome has been that, in general, the MAPS NGOs have adopted a rather conservative stance, partly because of concerns surrounding accountability, but partly also to ensure that such an unprecedented source of stable, long-term funding would not be jeopardised in any way.” (Development Cooperation Ireland 2005)</li> </ul>
Do you have a deliberate risk management (strategy)? If yes, how does it work, what are key elements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, there is an overall risk management approach. Country programme risks are contextualised at the country level. Activities are funded together with other organisations, which means that others assess the same situation. But each country programme has a risk analysis and a corresponding management strategy.</li> </ul>
In your experience, is there a tension between the focus on results and focus on innovation (proven solutions vs. risk taking)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It depends on how results are defined. At the country level there has been a move away from micro management to broader assessments (agreement on targets). However, this is not necessarily conducive to innovation as it is somewhat of a “black box” approach, i.e. one does not see or understand what is going on on the inside. Furthermore, the government bears the entire responsibility. But when managing for development results, one looks at the entire chain from inputs to impact and what results are critical at what time. This understanding is important. E.g. in the case of Ethiopia: schools are built, but the expected increase of attendance and retention did not take place. So one needs to look at the causes of the problem: Could it be the cost of access? The quality of the schooling? Or what else? What is needed is lateral thinking. Looking at all results in the chain and what contributes to higher level impact – not just looking at the impact. A blind focus on targets does not promote innovation.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not at all. A focus on results makes you innovative. If you are clear about what you want to achieve, about the context, about getting there you are more likely to be innovative, because you continue to adjust your interventions. But this requires constant work, also from the side of your partners, in order to have as complete a picture as possible.</li> </ul>
How do you manage accountability towards different stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a variety of accountability mechanisms that Irish Aid is using, for example reports to parliament, different committees and other identified groups in the domestic arena. Or there is a fund for journalists to travel to partner countries to learn more. The challenge in this respect is to try and engage people in the complexities of development and ensuring that complex processes are not simplified.</li> <li>- In the civil society policy document downwards accountability, i.e. towards the beneficiaries is mentioned quite frequently. Those mechanisms are still quite weak.</li> <li>- Scaling up accountability is hard as some quite positive experience of accountability can become quite mechanistic when they are scaled up. Basically accountability is an issue at each step of the process, as there are continuously results to be achieved. But these mechanisms need yet to be developed. Generally there is still some way to go about being innovative in accountability.</li> </ul>
Looking at your organisation's activities overall, how do you assess the ratio between successful and failed activities?	-
Other issues	-
<b>Good practices</b>	
When it comes to promoting innovation as an organisation: What works? What doesn't?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovations need to be context based, something like action research, rather than being developed at a distance.</li> </ul>
What were the most significant innovations that you developed to accomplish your goals? In these processes, what were the greatest challenges you faced and how did you overcome them? What were your greatest lessons learned?	-
<b>Stories</b>	
Do you have any illustrative stories of success and failure of innovation?	-
Can you give us an example of a successfully replicated (and/or scaled up) project or programme and identify the reasons for its success?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) in Ethiopia which is a widely replicated approach addressing issues of production capacity and food security.</li> <li>- Work in Tanzania in the agricultural sector on district development planning was also replicated.</li> <li>- Work in the area of HIV/Aids (Irish Aid uses more than 10% of its ODA on this issue) with the Clinton Foundation focusing on service delivery in the health system and also carrying out some research.</li> </ul>
<b>Sources</b>	
Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Resources as available on Irish Aid's website (<a href="http://www.irishaid.gov.ie">http://www.irishaid.gov.ie</a>), particularly institutional reports (bibliographic information is contained in annexe 10.3 of the main report).</li> </ul>
Oral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interviews with Fionnuala Gilsean and Earnán Ó Cléirigh.</li> </ul>



## 10.7 Matrix United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM)

CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	NGO	Non-governmental organisation
GRB	Gender responsive budgeting	UN	United Nations
ILO	International Labour Organisation	UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS
KM	Knowledge Management	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
MYFF	Multi Year Funding Framework	VAW	Violence against Women

UNIFEM is the women’s fund at the United Nations. Established in 1976, it provides financial and technical assistance to innovative approaches aimed at fostering women’s empowerment and gender equality. Its headquarters are in New York City and it has various representations in some 60 countries (liaison, regional, country programme and project offices). Today the organisation’s work touches the lives of women and girls in more than 100 countries. In 2007 it received some 118 mio US\$ of contributions from governments, national committees and other donors. The precise number of staff is difficult to name as different working arrangements such as consultants are complicated to integrate into the statistics.

*Note: Spelling of certain words and phrases is not consistent due to the use of quotes from various documents with differing preferences.*

<b>Definition</b>	
<p>How is innovation understood in your organisation?            → Do you think that this understanding is shared by most employees – why (not)?            → Was there an elaboration process for a shared understanding of the term?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNIFEM held an organization wide Strategic Planning Workshop work-shop last April for the development of the strategic plan and also to help the organisation internalise the strategic plan. During this workshop a working definition of catalytic was developed<sup>1</sup>, a term which in UNIFEM is very closely related to innovation.</li> <li>- There is a shared understanding as this was a consciously created process. 2008 was the first year for which the reports relating to the new strategic plan are coming in, so these reports provided a lot of insight into the understanding of the term in the offices.</li> <li>- An important element for this process was the evaluation of MYFF, in which one of the findings was that there is mainly an implicit understanding within UNIFEM of the term catalytic. So this was one of the key motivations to start this process of developing an (explicit) understanding.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 7/8 in the strategic plan for precise formulation.

From your perspective, what are (internal) prerequisites for successful innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To develop a shared understanding and to create a plan with specific indicators.</li> </ul>
From your perspective, what are suitable indicators for innovative organisations (in international cooperation)? What should the innovative performance of an organisation in this field look like?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In UNIFEM's new strategic plan there is Outcome 8 ("Community-level initiatives generate a greater number of effective models for advancing the human rights of women and eliminating gender inequality.") which was a deliberate and conscious effort to strengthen the evaluation component of UNIFEM community-base pilot initiatives aimed at developing a knowledge base on the "How To" of achieving gender equality. It aims at strengthening UNIFEM's capacity for innovation. There are two major programmes in this Outcome. One of them is being done in cooperation with the World Bank. It deals with economic empowerment of women and is very much results based. It aims at achieving quick results. About 40% of the budget are used for evaluation (done by International Center for Research on Women, ICRW). UNIFEM has also identified specific management outputs to track replication and up-scaling, as well as to hold the organisation accountable for making substantive documentation available to encourage this.</li> <li>- UNIFEM is a demand driven organisation and in the past tended to respond to opportunities as these arose, but now it wants go be more strategic about playing a catalytic role. This is also a way of managing an organisation that is somewhat limited in its resources and therefore its ability to respond to demand from Member States.</li> <li>- The biggest indicator of success is the up taking of one's ideas by other organisations.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Most consulted stakeholders (UN, government partners, and NGOs) stated that in their view, UNIFEM's work had often been innovative. In some cases, interviewees used 'innovation' to refer to the introduction of a new topic or idea (e.g., GRB, link between HIV/AIDS and gender/VAW, gender and migration, or the connection of gender and human security). It also included cases in which UNIFEM was able to help partners take a new approach to or view of an already known issue, thus transforming their perception of a problem or topics, and in this way introducing an innovative approach to dealing with it (e.g., 'translating' CEDAW into different contexts and helping partners to apply the tool in their respective reality). It is important to note that 'new' did not always refer to 'never thought of anywhere else,' but sometimes meant, 'new in the respective context and to the players involved in the following change process.'" (Universalia 2007)</li> <li>- "Finding 9: While the role of "catalyst" is part of UNIFEM's mandate, there is no agreed-upon definition that would specify what the term signifies in relation to UNIFEM's work, or how a "catalytic" role differs from other forms of engagement. [...] Finding 11: There is room for improvement of UNIFEM's current use of the term "catalyst" in reports and other documentation." (Universalia 2007)</li> <li>- "Being a catalyst and being innovative are not the same: innovative approaches can be (and have been) utilized by UNIFEM as tools to achieve a catalytic effect (i.e., to initiate or strengthen change processes). Our hypothesis is that a certain degree of innovation or surprise may be a crucial factor for actions to have successful catalytic effect: As a catalyst, UNIFEM's interventions must add something to the situation that would otherwise not happen (e.g., bringing different players together) or that otherwise would not be known (e.g., introducing new topics/ideas/approaches)." (Universalia 2007)</li> <li>- "As outlined earlier in this report, some of the key concepts mentioned in the MYFF, in particular UNIFEM's role as a catalyst, (but also concepts such as innovation and its relation to being a catalyst, or upscaling and replication) are often used based on implicit and not necessarily shared definitions. Our consultations with</li> </ul>

	UNIFEM staff showed a range of interpretations of these terms. This limits the potential for showcasing and promoting the specific strengths and achievements of UNIFEM, and also limits the opportunities for internal analysis and learning.” (Universalialia 2007)
<b>Strategic issues</b>	
How does innovation link to your organisation’s mission and its values? Do you have an explicit innovation and/or knowledge management strategy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Strategic Plan 2008-2011 (SP) guides programming and is specific on the catalytic and innovative function.</li> <li>- “Carrying out its work, UNIFEM applies five core strategies: [...] 4. Undertaking pilot projects to test innovative approaches to women’s empowerment and gender mainstreaming.”(UNIFEM 28.07.2003)</li> <li>- The lack of a deliberate KM strategy is something which has been bemoaned for a long time. UNIFEM is currently in the process of hiring a KM specialist to work on this and is creating a computer based result tracking for reporting.</li> </ul>
<p>Is innovation addressed in a strategic manner in your organisation?</p> <p>→ How does knowledge management relate to innovation?</p> <p>→ How do human resource policies (particularly staff selection and capacity building) relate to innovation?</p> <p>→ How do country strategies, programme development, project selection and evaluation incorporate/deal with innovation?</p> <p>→ How are innovation, replication and scaling up linked together?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall yes, (as e.g. the following reference shows in the MYYF shows; it describes the second performance goal as follows: “2. Capacity of UNIFEM programs are aligned with demand and opportunities to support innovation, learning, and results at all levels.” Universalialia 2007). With respect to the specific aspects, the following can be said:</li> <li>- The relationship between KM and innovation is key. Internally, shared knowledge should be used to make sure that the wheel is not reinvented and to share good practices across the organisation which can be implemented across regions There are some processes for internal knowledge sharing in place, such as 6 month reporting in summer, when the offices present examples of effective programming (see example for up scaling at end which was identified during such a meeting). There is room for improvement with respect to the intranet and the website which could be better utilised to make documents more accessible. Externally, KM is important as it can help an organisation to become a knowledge provider. There are various platforms being developed and run by UNIFEM (e.g. on gender budgeting, HIV/AIDS; governance issues).</li> <li>- The question on human resource is more difficult to answer. It is assumed that relevant skills are built into the job description and that it is also discussed in staff appraisals, but I am not aware of additional incentives (these may exist, though).</li> <li>- In internal processes for project approval there is not explicitly stated section relating to innovation. But there is a section which requires monitoring and evaluative comments where any information relevant in this respect should be found. Again in Outcome 8 this issue is addressed more deliberately.</li> <li>- With respect to replication and scaling up UNIFEM is still trying to figure out how to manage it.</li> </ul>
Are the strategic elements discussed above (particularly knowledge management and human resource) linked to adequate resources in order to support the promotion of innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNIFEM has recently doubled its resources and as it grows it is investing more in knowledge management systems that have been identified as a priority for the organisation.</li> <li>- “In addition to performance reporting, UNIFEM hopes, by 2009, to publish Progress of the World’s Women annually, as a key vehicle for communicating lessons that UNIFEM and its partners are learning about how to support country-level innovation and progress on advancing women’s empowerment and gender equality.” (UN 2007b)</li> </ul>
Have there been any changes in your organisation’s approach to innovation? What have been causes for significant developments (e.g. introduction of ICT,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The MYFF evaluation was definitely an important step into UNIFEM’s more deliberate and strategic approach to its catalytic role. A more conscious approach is now being used and UNIFEM is also trying to build the necessary supporting management processes.</li> </ul>

change in management)? Please describe.	
Other issues	-
<b><i>Institutional issues</i></b>	
<p>Is innovation a central part of the organisation's identity?  → Why (not)?  → How is this expressed?  → Are new employees trained in this respect?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovation and innovative approaches are firmly grounded in UNIFEM's mission and mandate: "The UN General Assembly resolution 39/125 (1984) established the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and defined its role in supporting the fulfillment of commitments to gender equality. The mandate guides the Fund <i>to i) support innovative and experimental activities benefiting women in line with national and regional priorities; ii) serve as a catalyst in order to ensure the involvement of women in mainstream development activities, as often as possible at the pre-investment stage; and iii) play an innovative and catalytic role in relation to the United Nations system of development co-operation.</i>" (various documents)</li> <li>- "In numerous cases, stakeholders perceive UNIFEM as innovative in that it has introduced new topics or ideas into national or regional debates, or that it helped partners take a new approach to a known issue, transforming their perception of an issue. [...] UNIFEM's work is seen as including many innovative aspects, and as being responsive to the needs of different partners." (UN 2007b)</li> <li>- "From its earliest years, UNIFEM was an innovator. In 1979 it became the first United Nations fund to give direct support to NGOs in developing countries, and the first to provide micro-credit funds to communities. It was instrumental in the World Bank's decision to adopt a group strategy, designed with 2,500 Indian women, in its own sericulture projects. [...] Recognizing UNIFEM's years of innovation and institution-building, in 1984 the UN General Assembly called it a catalyst in the UN system, extended its mandate, and brought it into autonomous association with UNDP." (UNIFEM 2002)</li> </ul>
<p>Do you practice an internal culture for innovation and provide space for it? In what way?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In annual reviews the successes, challenges and failures are discussed, but the ability for internal communication in general needs to be strengthened. A key hindering factor in this respect has been the limited financial resources.</li> <li>- Encouraging innovation is related to the organisational culture and the people working in programming understand that. The thematic advisors also have a high level of technical expertise and they provide specific technical guidance. They are also increasingly putting in place systems that support knowledge sharing of innovative practices.</li> </ul>
<p>How do your organisation's structures and processes support/encourage respectively restrict innovation? (e.g. levels of (de)centralisation/delegation of responsibility/field presence; (in)formal flow of information; valuing different types of knowledge, institutionalised innovation sharing, etc.)  → Does the project/programme design and cycle provide space for time and resource consuming innovation processes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One advantage of UNIFEM is its flexibility and staff have noted that the exchange of ideas is quick within the organisation because of its size. UNIFEM does not have a bureaucratic structure on the scale of, for example, UNICEF – therefore good ideas are shared easily.</li> </ul>
<p>What are incentives within your organisation (incl. human resource</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are no particular incentives at the individual level and it does not seem that it is really necessary because the entire organisation is geared toward innovation, and those who work in programming have</li> </ul>

management) which encourage innovation, replication and scaling up?	internalised this.
<p>Are there specific instruments to promote innovations?  → For which phase/aspect of innovation are they intended (is there a sequencing of instruments)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women (see <a href="http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/violence_against_women/trust_fund.php">http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/violence_against_women/trust_fund.php</a>) has been set up specifically for that purpose. The Fund has grown and now makes larger and longer grants and is currently conducting and evaluation to draw out best practices. The Fund is actually a UN fund, it is only managed by UNIFEM. There is an evaluation under way which should contribute to a better understanding of its effects and how to manage it.</li> <li>- “In 1996, the General Assembly tapped UNIFEM’s growing expertise on stopping violence against women by requesting it to manage the newly created Trust Fund in Support of Actions to End Violence Against Women. The Trust Fund offers grants to innovative projects, to date disbursing more than \$10 million to 199 initiatives in 83 countries. In India, a training for judges introduced them to survivors and presented research on low conviction rates. In Kenya, the Trust Fund helped create new rites of passage as an alternative to female genital mutilation. Grantees in the occupied Palestinian Territories have worked to prevent so-called honour killings.”(UNIFEM 2006); see also Annual Report 2001, p. 25ff for more information on the Trust Fund, as well as the Trust Fund Brochure.)  “A strong emphasis of the Fund is linking community-based initiatives to national priorities and the work of governmental, non-governmental, donor and UN partners. The goal is to bring innovation and additional resources where they are needed most — at the local level. [...]” Since 1997, some 250 initiatives in nearly 100 countries have received funding totalling more than \$19 million. [...] Spawning innovation. The Fund is supporting grantees in testing and developing new approaches for dealing with violence against women.”(UNIFEM 2008)</li> <li>- “Budget requests should be within the range of a minimum of \$300,000 to a maximum of \$1 million total for duration of two to three years. Proposals will be considered for a minimum \$100,000 for duration of up to three years for innovative approaches from small civil society organizations, especially grassroots women’s organizations and networks, and those working in conflict and unstable situations. [...] The UN Trust Fund will not consider applications: [...] Requesting grants to fund on-going programmes or services - such as medications, counseling and treatment services, infrastructure or construction, etc. However, innovative piloting and evaluation of an existing programme or services intended as a model for learning and scaling up may be considered on a discretionary basis, provided it falls within the scope or purview of the overall objectives outlined in the UN Trust Fund Call; [...]” (UNIFEM 2009)</li> <li>- See also brochure on 10 years of the Fund (UNIFEM 2007).</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “UNIFEM internal and donor reporting demonstrates its capacity to effectively monitor and track results. In numerous cases, stakeholders perceive UNIFEM as innovative in that it has introduced new topics or ideas into national or regional debates, or that it helped partners take a new approach to a known issue, transforming their perception of an issue. Also, various UNIFEM initiatives, such as the gender responsive budgeting (GRB) program, have been scaled up and/or replicated by other agencies.” (Universalia 2007)</li> </ul>
<b>Innovation process</b>	
How is the innovation process understood in your organisation? Is there an agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no specific model used, as there are very different possible entry points, the situation varies on a project basis.</li> </ul>

upon/shared model of innovation? Does it include replication and scaling up?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The evaluation unit plays a key role in the attempt of bringing more attention to scaling up and replication.</li> <li>- See also above on the SP and the results framework.</li> </ul>
In your experience, what factors determine the performance in innovation promotion?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promoting innovation is requires a conscious effort. UNIFEM is improving in this respect. Partnerships and external and internal communication key instruments.</li> </ul>
How are resources allocated with respect to different innovation phases? → Any figures for past and future allocations for innovation?	-
In what way are ICTs relevant for your processes of innovation, replication and scaling up?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is something which will hopefully be tackled by the KM specialist to be employed. There is a lot of potential in this area, but within UNIFEM it has not been used to its potential thus far. The organisation is currently investing in strengthening this component.</li> </ul>
How closely are “the users”/beneficiaries involved in innovation processes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They are providing ideas all the time and UNIFEM is drawing on their experiences. We not only solicit their feedback on the effects of programming, but also they are our constituency – therefore we learn from these partners what THEY need, we respond to their demands and let their ideas guide us in programme development. UNIFEM is constantly scanning the development world and receives input from our constituency to contribute to the strategic direction of the organization- they are the experts and we listen carefully to them.</li> </ul>
Other issues	-
<b>Partnership</b>	
How does your organisation learn from others?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An important aspect is to engage with all constituents and to discuss arising ideas internally (see also above).</li> <li>- “The UN Trust Fund aims to expand the global knowledge base on effective approaches to implement national and local laws, policies and action plans by supporting the piloting, testing, up-scaling, evaluation, documentation and dissemination of catalytic, innovative and promising approaches on ending violence against women and girls. The ideal proposal will ensure rigorous documentation of findings and evaluation with a view to sharing lessons learned and to providing practical guidance for other programmers.” (UNIFEM 2009)</li> </ul>
What role do your partnerships play in replicating and scaling up innovations? Does this issue influence the choice of partners (government vs. NGOs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNIFEM cannot hold itself accountable for the choices of our partners to replicate or upscale its innovative programming – but we can track the extent to which they do choose to expand on our work. What we can track is our own ability to make the knowledge available to them – which we do track in the SP management results framework. The largest number of replicating/up-scaling partners have been governments, but we have also tracked numerous examples of NGOs and UN partners replicating or up-scaling our programmes. Do you use any specific instruments to promote adoption?</li> <li>- Previously it used to be tracked on how projects were up taken by others (see MYFF evaluation for some numbers).</li> </ul>
How are replication and scaling up dealt with in your partnerships?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “It appears that UNIFEM can (and does) actively enhance the likelihood of initiatives being replicated or scaled up through the following: i) Advocacy, and promotion of the new/”pilot” idea or approach; ii) Demonstrating and communicating effectiveness and relevance of the approach to other partners; iii) Offering technical assistance and expertise for follow-on initiatives; iv) Helping to build capacities of programming country partners who are willing/interested in replicating an idea; and v) Promoting ideas to partners who are potential investors/donors or who can help to raise additional resources.” (Universalia 2007)</li> </ul>
Do you use any specific instruments to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “UNIFEM does not take responsibility for replication or ‘upscaling’. Rather, the capacity of UNIFEM to</li> </ul>

promote adoption?	document, advocate and convene strategic partners fosters an environment conducive to replication and 'upscaling'. The extent to which others replicate or scale up the catalytic initiatives inspired or supported by UNIFEM is an indicator of the success of the catalytic effect. UNIFEM may need, in different instances, to accompany the process of replication and/or 'upscaling' with supporting documentation, evaluations and similar tools, so that it can better understand the critical elements in formulating catalytic initiatives that lend themselves to replication or 'upscaling'." (UN 2007b)
What role does the policy dialogue you are engaged in play in promoting innovations? Any scaling up experiences?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy dialogue is a key area for the transferral of knowledge and shaping changes at the policy level, particularly because UNIFEM is also trying to implement policy level commitments. It is always based on UNIFEM's technical and programme based experience.</li> <li>- UNIFEM employs a two-way approach to policy dialogue. On the one hand, it uses its technical expertise to influence positive policies for gender equality and women's rights (based upon the experience learned "on the ground". On the other hand it then plays an important role in ensuring that policy commitments are implemented on the ground – thereby coming full-circle.</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "One important issue related to the usefulness of replication/upscaling to UNIFEM is the question of attribution: While successfully replicated or scaled up initiatives may in all cases be "good" from a developmental perspective (i.e., good for the respective country), UNIFEM also has to consider issues of demonstrating its own role in creating the conditions for this broader uptake of an idea, thus showing its relevance and "fundability" as an organization. This usually requires some courtesy from the other partners involved, which is not always given. [Box]: One challenge with monitoring the degree to which UNIFEM's work results in the replication or scaling up of its initiatives is the fact that in several cases, other organizations (in particular UN agencies) do not always acknowledge UNIFEM as the initiator or "inventor" of an approach or project. UNIFEM staff (e.g., in Kenya) even reported on other agencies taking up an idea that UNIFEM had shared with them, before UNIFEM had the chance to implement a related pilot project."(Universalia 2007)</li> <li>- "Finding 10: There are numerous instances in which UNIFEM has influenced change processes in a way that is "catalytic" in the sense of the working definition. Our data indicate that UNIFEM has repeatedly acted as a catalyst in the sense of the working</li> <li>- definition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNIFEM helped to initiate change processes that would not have happened otherwise, or that most probably would have happened later or at a slower pace.</li> </ul> <p>Consulted stakeholders repeatedly acknowledged UNIFEM for having brought new issues to the public agenda, which, through UNIFEM's advocacy, triggered change processes. 'New' topics interviewees named included, for example, the concepts of GRB or the 'care economy' and related tools such as time-use surveys, the link between HIV/AIDS and gender based violence, or the link between gender and human security through the 'Safe Cities' initiative. UNIFEM also helped to initiate discussion and change by pointing out existing gaps in policies, regulations, or practices of different players (including other UN agencies). [...]</p> <p>UNIFEM influenced the speed and quality of many change processes by the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Building capacity of key players involved in the process [...]</li> <li>2) Supporting new players in getting involved and/or being heard in a change process. [...]</li> <li>3) Facilitating processes by bringing different players together that would otherwise not have worked together, [...]</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

	<p>4) Introducing innovative approaches (or proven, but not yet utilized approaches) to addressing an issue already on the local agenda. [...]</p> <p>When acting as a catalyst, UNIFEM often only provided limited financial support to the respective change process, but successfully helped to leverage resources from other parties, thus increasing the impact of its own, as well as others' available resources." (Universalia 2007)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An Innovation Institute on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment has been under discussion for a while. As this is a UNDP initiative we are still working to develop the programme and working with UNDP, who runs the innovations institute, to do this.</li> <li>- There was an initiative, again with UNDP, to strengthen the South-South exchange of information and experiences and to showcase good practices. We plan to present programmes that have generated significant results through South-South exchange for inclusion in the showcase next year.</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	
<p>When do you consider a project/programme successful enough to start replicating/up scaling?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "UNIFEM's work resulting in replication or upscaling appears to have largely followed implicit, and not necessarily articulated, theories of intervention. We did not find evidence of a systematic approach to successfully creating the conditions for replication/upscaling, nor of in-depth analysis of what made successful examples possible. Similarly, there is no clear definition of what constitutes a pilot project (as opposed to a "normal" project), nor are there reflections on the role of pilot projects for replication and upscaling (i.e., are replication/upscaling more likely if UNIFEM carries out a dedicated pilot project, or are pilots only one way of triggering the successful uptake of an idea?). The following considerations may be helpful should UNIFEM embark on an analysis of key factors influencing a conducive environment for replication and upscaling. Based on our analysis we assume that for an idea to be replicated/scaled up by other organizations the following must apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There needs to be a distinct and describable object for replication or scaling up, e.g., a project or initiative, or a specific tool or approach (such as GRB).</li> <li>• There needs to be proven success, and/or relevance of the respective object of replication or upscaling within the given context (i.e., it must be evident that the respective approach/initiative addresses an issue that is widely acknowledged as important).</li> <li>• Sufficient resources must be readily available to interested partners in order to allow an approach/initiative to be scaled up or replicated.</li> <li>• There must be proven need for "more of the same" in either the given or a similar context.</li> <li>• The initiative and/or thematic area it addresses must be within the mandate and responsibilities of the agencies or organizations that engage in its upscaling/replication.</li> <li>• The leading organizations/agencies engaged in replication/upscaling must have some benefit from doing so (e.g., enhanced visibility, improved performance, better way to meet their responsibilities)." (Universalia 2007)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>How do you identify potential areas for replication/scaling up? What role do partnerships play in this respect?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>How relevant is the availability of different financial instruments (grants, loans, mixed) to promote innovation, replication, scaling</p>	<p>-</p>

up?	
How would you describe the impact of innovation on effectiveness and efficiency of your organisation (and its partners)?	-
How do you deal with varying contexts and varying external factors which are out of control for your organisation?	- UNIFEM tries to look at support it has provided in the past and where projects go once UNIFEM has wrapped up programme implementation, but needs to do so in a more systematic way – to follow select programmes after its involvement has ended in order to have a deeper understanding of its impact.
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “56. Building on its mandate to be an innovator and a catalyst, UNIFEM attempted, during its two previous plans, to track the extent to which its initiatives have been replicated or scaled up. However, UNIFEM has not devoted resources to encouraging others to replicate or scale up its innovative programmes or tracking their success in doing so. UNIFEM plans to concentrate more specifically on this, in collaboration with UNDP and other United Nations organizations.” (UN 2007b)</li> <li>- “98. The present strategic plan emphasizes strengthening the UNIFEM role as a catalyst, and its commitment to generating concrete evidence and knowledge on the ‘how to’ of gender equality. The evaluation policy will provide guidance on using evaluations to strengthen the analytical base for making strategic decisions, foster the replication and scaling up of catalytic and innovative initiatives, and build a body of evidence to support advocacy and the provision of policy advice and technical expertise on gender equality and women’s empowerment.”(UN 2007b)</li> <li>- “40. To achieve the Millennium Development Goals, and to fulfil other key commitments that have been made to the world’s women, it is critically important that the existing level of support provided to efforts to address violence against women be increased significantly, and that effective, innovative approaches be replicated on a larger scale.” (UN 2007a)</li> <li>- “In 2006, UNIFEM tracked 10 instances of replication and 4 of upscaling or institutionalizing initiatives, as compared with 13 and 6 in 2005, and with 17 and 11 in 2004. In 2006, replications were carried out by governments and/or the private sector (2), and UN organizations (8), while upscaling was carried out by government (1), NGOs (1) and UN organizations (2).” (Universalia 2007)</li> </ul>
<b>Risks and mitigation</b>	
In your organisation, what is the general attitude towards risks and failures? Is your organisation a risk taker and early mover?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, very much so. UNIFEM is also seen as an organisation which is bringing in fresh ideas.</li> <li>- “[...] innovation has played an important role in UNIFEM’s work as a catalyst: Introducing new, innovative ideas or approaches has been a key tool in initiating or facilitating change, and is likely to have enhanced the conditions for successful catalytic effect.” (Universalia 2007)</li> </ul>
Do you have a deliberate risk management (strategy)? If yes, how does it work, what are key elements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When it comes to financing and programme development, yes, there is a deliberate strategy. This is part of accountability.</li> <li>- “68. Improving risk management is a key objective of the present strategic plan. To that end, UNIFEM is finalizing a risk assessment model. UNIFEM will make concerted efforts to identify and manage risk so as to achieve objectives while reducing threats to stakeholder interests. Securing multi-year funding is a central tenet of the financial risk management strategy of UNIFEM, since such funding will enhance predictability and reduce the need to hedge against a drop in contributions.” (UN 2007b)</li> </ul>
In your experience, is there a tension between the focus on results and focus on	- Results are important and innovation has to be linked to results.

innovation (proven solutions vs. risk taking)?	
How do you manage accountability towards different stakeholders?	- With different results based reports (including annual and donor reports).
Looking at your organisation's activities overall, how do you assess the ratio between successful and failed activities?	-
Other issues	-
<b>Good practices</b>	
When it comes to promoting innovation as an organisation: What works? What doesn't?	- Create an internal understanding and systems which support innovation. In this sense evaluation and documentation of results are crucial. Another key aspect is KM.
What were the most significant innovations that you developed to accomplish your goals? In these processes, what were the greatest challenges you faced and how did you overcome them? What were your greatest lessons learned?	-
<b>Stories</b>	
Do you have any illustrative stories of success and failure of innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "There are a few innovative examples of supporting local communities to identify approaches to working with both formal and informal justice systems in order to secure equal rights for women. For example, the United Nations Trust Fund on Violence against Women has supported the involvement of community religious and civic leaders in combating violence against women and trafficking, as has a UNIFEM initiative in South Asia with the Interfaith Leaders Forum." (UN 2007b)</li> <li>- "UNIFEM is also seen as having helped to increase programming country capacities, for example through the UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women. One of the selection criteria for projects receiving resources from the Trust Fund is the innovative character of the proposed initiative (see sidebar)." → examples from Nepal, South Africa and Rwanda. (Universalia 2007)</li> <li>- See various Annual Reports for other examples.</li> <li>- Trust Fund Grantees 2008:  <a href="http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/violence_against_women/trust_fund_grantees.php">http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/violence_against_women/trust_fund_grantees.php</a> (12 initiatives in 14 countries under the category "Catalytic, Innovative and Learning Initiatives").</li> </ul>
Can you give us an example of a successfully replicated (and/or scaled up) project or programme and identify the reasons for its success?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Under Outcome 8 a project called "Safe Cities for Women" was developed. It was a community based project. When it was reported in a meeting, it was decided that this would be taken up and made a global programme (see also: <a href="https://www.unifem-usnc.org/files/Safe%20cities%20fact%20sheet.pdf">https://www.unifem-usnc.org/files/Safe%20cities%20fact%20sheet.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.unifem.org/news_events/story_detail.php?StoryID=790">http://www.unifem.org/news_events/story_detail.php?StoryID=790</a>).</li> <li>- "UNIFEM reports also refer to numerous examples of initiatives, approaches, or projects being scaled up and/or replicated by other agencies. Some illustrative examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNIFEM's work on GRB, which has attracted additional donors — such as the government of Belgium — willing to help broaden and enhance existing GRB initiatives. In Morocco, UNIFEM and the Ministry of Finance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>are preparing a strategy to launch a francophone GRB institute in Morocco, thus institutionalizing the idea of upscaling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Jordanian pilot project aiming to enhance women’s access to and control over the benefits of Information and Communications Technologies (E-village project) was successfully taken to a broader scale by the Government of Jordan (GoJ), and has been replicated in Morocco and Lebanon. It has also attracted private sector partners that are now collaborating with UNIFEM and the GoJ on the initiative.</li> <li>• UNIFEM’s successful work with the Indian Railways to incorporate gender-responsive policies and practice son HIV/AIDS has been replicated in six additional divisions of the company and has generated interest from other donors (such as ILO and UNAIDS) to support the broadening of the initiative. There have also been expressions of interest from other countries (such as China) to adopt a similar approach.” (Universalia 2007)</li> </ul>
<b>Sources</b>	
Written	- Resources as available on UNIFEM’s website ( <a href="http://www.unifem.org/resources/">http://www.unifem.org/resources/</a> ), particularly institutional reports (bibliographic information is contained in annexe 10.3 of the main report).
Oral	- Interview with Jennifer Cooper, Programme Communications Specialist

## 10.8 Matrix World Bank (WB)

AiDA	Accessible Information on Development Activities	NGO	Non-governmental organisation
DIME	Development Impact Evaluation	OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
DM	Development Marketplace	PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
EU	European Union	STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
FY	Financial Year	WB	World Bank
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank	WBI	World Bank Institute
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	WHO	World Health Organisation
IFC	International Finance Corporation		
K4D	Knowledge for Development		

The World Bank is a vital source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world. It is owned by 185 member countries which are represented by a Board of Directors. It was established in 1944 and provides low-interest loans, interest-free credits and grants to developing countries for a wide array of purposes that include investments in education, health, public administration, infrastructure, financial and private sector development, agriculture, and environmental and natural resource management. Its headquarters are in Washington DC and more than 100 country offices. More than 10'000 employees work for the Bank worldwide. The total budget for fiscal 2008 was 2,148.3 mio US\$, net of reimbursements, including \$175.5 million for the Development Grant Facility and the Institutional Grant Programs.

*Note: Spelling of certain words and phrases is not consistent due to the use of quotes from various documents with differing preferences.*

<b>Definition</b>	
<p>How is innovation understood in your organisation?</p> <p>→ Do you think that this understanding is shared by most employees – why (not)?</p> <p>→ Was there an elaboration process for a shared understanding of the term?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Being innovative means pushing the envelope not to do the same thing; to be a little bit riskier and to bringing new perspectives and ideas which challenge the status quo.</li> <li>- Innovation is to challenge notions, not matter if you're right or wrong. It's an attitude, it's not really tangible. Or in the words of a scientist: "What I hate in science is consensus" – it is easy to be trapped in it.</li> <li>- In development work classic psychological literature on motivation is not taken into account. It has been known for a long time that intrinsic motivation is the most important, extrinsic motivation is second. And external monitoring as an extrinsic motivation is among the least motivating factors. Similarly the marginal</li> </ul>

	<p>dollar, the benefit that an individual gets out of something to do something, is less motivational for many people than for example justice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “It should be clear that the concept of “innovation” encompasses not only “technological innovation”, i.e. the diffusion of new products and services of a technological nature into the economy, but equally it includes non-technological forms of innovation, such as “organization” innovations. The latter include the introduction of new management or marketing techniques, the adoption of new supply or logistic arrangements, and improved approaches to internal and external communications and positioning.” (Aubert 2005)</li> <li>- “Innovation should be understood as something new to a local context. This relativity to the context is important and particularly relevant for developing countries. In a global perspective three forms of innovation can be distinguished. The first one relates to local improvements based on the adoption of technologies which are more or less available worldwide or locally (‘technology adoption’ from a global perspective). The second type of innovation materializes in the building up of competitive activities with some adaptation made to existing technologies (‘technology adaptation’). The third type of innovation is the design and production of technologies of a worldwide significance (‘technology creation’ from a global perspective).” (Aubert 2005)</li> </ul>
<p>From your perspective, what are (internal) prerequisites for successful innovation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most institutions – and people – are conservative by nature. Specific individuals can make a big difference in organisations.</li> <li>- In the past there has been a change in the type of people that the WB hires. They used to be “crazy”, maybe not very good at management and without too many social skills, somewhat wild people. Now the WB is loosing some of these mavericks, as people get penalized for not playing the game. There are more penalties in institutions like the WB for innovation and failures than for keeping on track.</li> <li>- International institutions are in a privileged position in the sense that they can take on risks and moving it from the clients into the organisation. They can balance it with engagements in other countries, while for their clients their country is all they have got. But the organisations are not necessarily moving into the direction of taking these risks.</li> <li>- Moving from an input based financing to output based financing (or financing for results) moves the risk to the clients. They have to take all risks. Input based financing keeps the risks with the organisations.</li> <li>- “As discussed earlier, experience shows that innovation flourishes in well defined regions where there is a concentration of talent, energy, and vision.” (Aubert 2005)</li> </ul>
<p>From your perspective, what are suitable indicators for innovative organisations (in international cooperation)? What should the innovative performance of an organisation in this field look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-</li> </ul>
<p>Other issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The major characteristics of innovation across the case studies are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovation is neither science nor technology but the application of knowledge of all types to achieve desired social and economic outcomes.</li> <li>• Often innovation combines technical, organizational, and other sorts of changes.</li> <li>• Innovation is the process by which organizations “master and implement the design and production of goods and services that are new to them, irrespective of whether they are new to their competitors, their country, or the world” (Mytelka 2000).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovation comprises radical and many small improvements and a continuous process of upgrading.</li> <li>• Innovation can be triggered in many ways.</li> <li>• Considerable value is being added in nontraditional agricultural sectors.” (World Bank 2006)</li> </ul> <p>- “[...] innovation is frequently independent of new frontier scientific discoveries. Innovation more frequently entails building the capacity to use technologies that are in widespread use elsewhere but that are new to the country, new to the firm, or used in new ways. To facilitate this type of innovation, countries must build the capacity to find, absorb, and use these technologies.” (Watkis, Ehst 2008)</p>
<b>Strategic issues</b>	-
How does innovation link to your organisation’s mission and its values? Do you have an explicit innovation and/or knowledge management strategy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The World Bank has recently recognised that innovation is becoming more important (e.g. need to be more innovative in approaches taken with its clients) and that it needs to be supported within the institution. It is therefore currently in the process of taking a more systematic approach to the issue of innovation (before any activities in this respect were based on opportunistic and ad-hoc initiatives or depended on the interest of programme managers, etc.).</li> <li>- In the process of being more systematic about innovation, an innovation pillar has been developed within the World Bank Institute (WBI). Its mandate is to promote innovation both externally in the developing world and internally within the Bank.</li> </ul>
Is innovation addressed in a strategic manner in your organisation? → How does knowledge management relate to innovation? → How do human resource policies (particularly staff selection and capacity building) relate to innovation? → How do country strategies, programme development, project selection and evaluation incorporate/deal with innovation? → How are innovation, replication and scaling up linked together?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “One of the first thing to do in this perspective is to better connect innovation policy with, and integrate innovation policy into, major exercises undertaken by the Bank for defining its action in client countries. [...] This first of all implies the training of a critical mass of specialists in the Bank who would be able to articulate innovation policy concepts and capture their impact in specific country contexts. [...] Similarly, it is essential to introduce innovation policy in the PRSP processes since, at the end of the day, innovation should primarily benefit society at large. For this, a pragmatic approach is necessary, with local policy debates focused on well identified needs or achievements, such as the introduction of new technologies, enterprise creation or urban renovation projects.” (Aubert 2005)</li> <li>- “In this perspective, the WBI K4D program is planning a Global Innovation Policy Dialogue involving a number of international organizations, experts working in the different regions, and selected policy making of clients countries. This policy dialogue using video conference facilities is planned to be developed throughout the FY 05 on the basis of one session per month.” (Aubert 2005)</li> </ul>
Are the strategic elements discussed above (particularly knowledge management and human resource) linked to adequate resources in order to support the promotion of innovation?	-
Have there been any changes in your organisation’s approach to innovation? What have been causes for significant developments (e.g. introduction of ICT, change in management)? Please describe.	-
Other issues	-

<b>Institutional issues</b>	-
<p>Is innovation a central part of the organisation's identity?  → Why (not)?  → How is this expressed?  → Are new employees trained in this respect?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The World Bank has recently recognised that innovation is becoming more important (e.g. need to be more innovative in approaches taken with its clients) and that it needs to be supported within the institution. It is therefore currently in the process of taking a more systematic approach to the issue of innovation (before any activities in this respect were based on opportunistic and ad-hoc initiatives or depended on the interest of programme managers, etc.).</li> <li>- In the process of being more systematic about innovation, an innovation pillar has been developed within the World Bank Institute (WBI). Its mandate is to promote innovation both externally in the developing world and internally within the Bank.</li> <li>- The Development Marketplace (DM) (grants competition, see below) is the largest activity within this pillar, other instruments are currently developed.</li> </ul>
<p>Do you practice an internal culture for innovation and provide space for it? In what way?</p>	-
<p>How do your organisation's structures and processes support/encourage respectively restrict innovation? (e.g. levels of (de)centralisation/delegation of responsibility/field presence; (in)formal flow of information; valuing different types of knowledge, institutionalised innovation sharing, etc.)  → Does the project/programme design and cycle provide space for time and resource consuming innovation processes?</p>	-
<p>What are incentives within your organisation (incl. human resource management) which encourage innovation, replication and scaling up?</p>	-
<p>Are there specific instruments to promote innovations?  → For which phase/aspect of innovation are they intended (is there a sequencing of instruments)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The DM (see <a href="http://go.worldbank.org/TPSFTH9420">http://go.worldbank.org/TPSFTH9420</a>) is a grant competition which provides small grants (small for the Bank: 200'000 US\$/2 yrs) to innovative projects. Its main recipients are social entrepreneurs, NGOs, new firms etc. in the start-up phase of a new project. The goal of DM is to provide funding "at the spark level". It deliberately does not provide funding for the incubation phase of ideas, which is estimated to last for about 5 years. During the two years the funding is provided, the project is supervised and there is also a support system in place and the organisations receive capacity building which is adopted to their situation.</li> <li>- The screening process for the DM is as follows:  The Bank assembles some 200 assessors both from within and outside the institution who are experts (between 15 and 20 years of experience) on the respective subject matters (recent topics of the competition covered the following: public health, sustainable agriculture, climate change adaptation or water and sanitation). In this respect really good use can be made of the network and the know-how at the Bank. There</li> </ul>

	<p>are always 4 people who look at one of the 3000 applications. The assessment is very transparent and based on listed criteria. The 100 selected finalists are invited to Washington and each is interviewed by a group of four jurors (composed of 35 senior staff members, i.e. director and above). Finally around 25 projects are winners, depending on the amount of money which is available. The Bank is really the only institution who can have a process at this large and broad scale, other organisations, e.g. the WHO might have them at a smaller and more specific scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With respect to innovation, the following criteria are considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Is it something new? The four jurors are composed of 2 external and 2 Bank staff members who really know the field and can make an assessment in this respect, i.e. assess whether something is really new, or whether it has been done in other places before.</li> <li>b) What is the growth potential of an organisation, e.g. does it have a very narrow geographic focus, is it working with partnerships (e.g. health kiosks who collaborated with the local Ministry of Health entities)? The growth potential should give an indication of the potential quality during the implementation phase. It is also showing strategic consideration, e.g., if an organisation is submitting a proposal in the domain of public goods but has no links to the public sector this is not viewed positively. So the organisations' financial strategy also shows how well thought out and integrated a proposal is.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>One last aspect is the presentation of measurable results which are seen as indicators for concrete, realistic plans which can be implemented in two years. Initially this was not an important indicator for the DM competition and the assessment tended more to favour the biggest dreams. They also give more credibility to the proposal. Also it makes it easier to evaluate the long term vision and to ground a potential replication and scaling up in the two year plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development Gateway ("initially incubated by the World Bank, now under the direction of an independent foundation): "Through its interactions with the Development Gateway, the Bank can integrate innovation and learning into its own operations and practices, [...]"; it has four operating principles, among them "continuous innovation". (Walker 2003)</li> </ul> <p>"The Development Gateway must manage the Bank as a partner, striking a balance between being a natural and effective instrument of the Bank's internal activities, and distancing itself from the Bank in order to establish credibility and encourage inclusive partnerships and participation across the development community." (Walker 2003)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Development Marketplace is a competitive grant program administered by the World Bank and supported by various partners that identifies and funds innovative, early-stage projects with high potential for development impact. DM competitions – held at the global, regional and country level – attract ideas from a range of innovators, including civil society groups, social entrepreneurs, academia and businesses." (For more information see: <a href="http://go.worldbank.org/TPSFTH9420">http://go.worldbank.org/TPSFTH9420</a>)</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "The Bank Group increasingly undertakes innovative joint initiatives. One of the farthest-reaching is a regional integration assistance strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa that seeks to strengthen collaboration among the region's countries with a focus on cross-border challenges: infrastructure; economic cooperation and harmonization; and regional approaches for addressing climate change, agricultural productivity, shared water resources, and health." (World Bank 2008)</li> <li>- "Attitudes and practices are a major obstacle to innovation. Strong incentives to innovate, arising from</li> </ul>

	<p>exposure to highly competitive markets, have rarely been sufficient to induce new patterns of collaboration.” (World Bank 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “WBI also provides an environment for knowledge innovation on frontier issues in development. One such topic is Diaspora Networks—highly skilled people who have emigrated from developing countries. The members of such networks can provide a bridge between developing countries and global state-of-the-art solutions in policy, technological, and managerial expertise by sharing knowledge and leading investment initiatives in their countries of origin. WBI is piloting a number of operational mechanisms for leveraging a country’s expatriate talent abroad by identifying and nurturing these networks of highly successful professionals.” (World Bank 2008)</li> </ul>
<b>Innovation process</b>	-
<p>How is the innovation process understood in your organisation? Is there an agreed upon/shared model of innovation? Does it include replication and scaling up?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the context of DM it is (at the moment) very clear that the focus is the spark phase and it is a conscious decision not to support mezzanine funding which would be needed for the subsequent incubator phase. This is also influenced by a review which was done some 1.5 years ago, where a randomly selected number of projects were looked at more closely: for each organisation a needs assessment was established to identify the needs for scaling-up. When these assessments were confronted with the situation in the field, there was a very big disconnection (it is unclear why). But experience has shown, that it was very difficult for both the project organisation as well as the DM team to define what would be needed for the incubation phase. Even in the most dynamic organisation with the highest capacity it was difficult to agree on how to continue. So even in a situation where the start-up was successful, a continuation is hard and continuity is not guaranteed. Furthermore, for many organisations it was difficult to see beyond their current situation and imagine how to continue.</li> <li>- Basically innovation happens all along the way, along the entire continuum of initial idea to implementation. First an idea is discussed, than it is adapted, than put into use, etc. – at each step there is innovation involved. Also robust systems have to be tweaked and there are always lessons to be learned.</li> <li>- From a strategic perspective one key question which any organisation has to ask itself is at what level of intervention it wants to commit its resources. With the DM this is done at the spark level. At a later phase this engagement might be built on and some funding might be made available for the mezzanine level (e.g. have former DM winners compete against each other for incubation funding or take up some experiences into a loan or provide some equity funding; scaling up does not always have to be a stand alone initiative).</li> <li>- Is specific to different areas (“Six changes in the context for agricultural development heighten the need to examine how innovation occurs in the agricultural sector [...]” (World Bank 2006)</li> <li>- “The process of innovation is shaped in very different ways, depending on the particular context in which innovation systems emerge and how this context changes over time. First, the pivotal actors that start the process are different—broadly speaking, they are either public or private actors. Second, the factors that trigger innovation are quite different—broadly speaking, they are either policy or market triggers. These initial conditions tend to shape two distinct innovation trajectories or systems: an orchestrated trajectory and an opportunity-driven trajectory. [...] The ultimate phase of development in orchestrated and opportunity-driven systems is a dynamic system of innovation, which can be established with the right type of support.” (World Bank 2006)</li> <li>- “The innovation systems concept places great emphasis on the context-specific nature of arrangements and</li> </ul>

	<p>processes that constitute a capacity for innovation. For this reason, principles of intervention rather than prescriptions are emphasized here. Interventions in advanced phases of development typically can build on interventions from earlier phases; the more advanced the phase, the more varied interventions can take place simultaneously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiating interventions [...] allow the transition from the pre-planned phase to the foundation phase.</li> <li>• Experimental interventions [...] allow the transition from the foundation phase to the expansion phase.</li> <li>• Interventions that help build on or nurture success [...] allow the transition from the expansion or emergence phase to a dynamic system of innovation.</li> <li>• Remedial interventions [...] help resolve the weaknesses of innovation capacity in the stagnation phase.</li> <li>• Maintenance interventions. [...] are aimed at ensuring that dynamic systems of innovation do not deteriorate.” (World Bank 2006)</li> </ul> <p>→ See this report for more info on the information systems concept as well as a box on changing approaches to innovation in the agricultural sector (p. 6)!</p>
In your experience, what factors determine the performance in innovation promotion?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When it comes to scaling up one thing which is needed is a partner which is willing to continue and who can see beyond the current situation.</li> <li>- “The Development Gateway’s guiding principles of community, partnership, continuous innovation and open technology standards have directly shaped the design and delivery of services. Its iterative and experimental approach to developing capabilities and services related to the Internet helps establish models for partnership, governance, services and technology. Measuring and analyzing impact is essential and it must allow for necessary iterative learning and innovative practices.” (Walker 2003)</li> </ul>
How are resources allocated with respect to different innovation phases? → Any figures for past and future allocations for innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The Development Gateway Foundation will need a financial strategy that goes beyond cash-in-cash-out in order to ensure the continuity of its existing programs. Without new funding sources, the demands of operating and developing existing services will be difficult to weigh against the necessity for continued innovation, experimentation and service incubation.” (Walker 2003)</li> </ul>
In what way are ICTs relevant for your processes of innovation, replication and scaling up?	-
How closely are “the users”/beneficiaries involved in innovation processes?	-
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The Development Gateway team has taken an iterative approach to develop its services, refining its content and technology strategy as it evolves. Because the Development Gateway innovates and experiments with how best to meet its knowledge sharing and development objectives, the process of developing and implementing services is in some cases as valuable as the service itself.” (Walker 2003)</li> <li>- “The Development Gateway has adopted an open source and open standards strategy for its technology infrastructure. This can make Internet applications more affordable and accessible for developing countries, and more easily adapted through local innovation.” (Walker 2003)</li> <li>- “While the ICT and knowledge landscape may be crowded in some instances, the risk of duplication is mitigated by the sheer scope of the challenges and complexity inherent in the system. There is ample room for innovation either in service development and delivery, models for partnering, funding and governing or in the technology itself. Where the Development Gateway has developed a distinct service and focused on a specific</li> </ul>

	utility, it has carved out a space relative to comparators. In these cases, the Gateway's partnerships provide strategic value, and a roadmap exists to further enhance or refine the service and the value it delivers." (Walker 2003)
<b>Partnership</b>	-
How does your organisation learn from others?	-
What role do your partnerships play in replicating and scaling up innovations? Does this issue influence the choice of partners (government vs. NGOs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sector based approaches make partnerships central. When new things are tested, potential partners cannot simply be surprised in the end by being presented some results and insights. They need to be brought into the entire process from the beginning and they need to be consulted. The client country needs to be in the driving seat and in this position it needs to manage the various expectations. If there is no consulting discussion taking place, there is no ownership and potential partners cannot be expected just to jump on the wagon at a later stage. An openness in early discussions is crucial and if the approach is successful, it will be supported at a later stage.</li> <li>- The WB is interested in bringing its approach outside of the institution and is actively engaged in discussing and exchanging with other organisations on how they do impact evaluation (e.g. Millennium Challenge Corporation is currently participating in the workshop in Addis Ababa as a result of previous exchanges).</li> <li>- Things can be done differently in the donor community and if the WB has a more client oriented approach and is pursuing it consequently that will have a rippling effect in the donor community.</li> </ul>
How are replication and scaling up dealt with in your partnerships?	- "The convening power of the Bank has mobilized resources and empowered the Development Gateway to share technology innovations globally. While this has given the Development Gateway an opportunity to create powerful technology and partnership networks, the scope of program ambitions must be managed to prevent resources from being spread thin and diluting value. The scale and reach of the Development Gateway has been most effective where it has enlisted the support of strategic partners, such as the OECD in the case of AiDA, or the EU in the case of dgMarket." (Walker 2003)
Do you use any specific instruments to promote adoption?	-
What role does the policy dialogue you are engaged in play in promoting innovations? Any scaling up experiences?	-
Other issues	- "Through partnerships the Development Gateway can learn from innovators in the development community, share resources required to pilot new approaches, and apply its learning across its network of relationships. Well managed strategic partnerships increase coordination and reduce duplication among service providers, and begin to organize relationships in the development community to leverage the capacity of the technology itself. [...] The Development Gateway is a source of learning and innovation for the Bank on how to structure and manage strategic partnerships. [...] The reach and scale of the Bank gives the Development Gateway a unique comparative advantage, empowering it to share technology innovations globally and build capacity at the country level through the Country Gateways. However, global scale is not appropriate as an end in itself, and can lead to services that are unmanageable or have had their relevance diluted in the attempt to encompass too many or broadly stated objectives. The Development Gateway team has managed the scale of its services relative to the resources available to develop and launch them. Sustainable scale will come

	through the Development Gateway's partnership network." (Walker 2003)
<b>Implementation</b>	-
When do you consider a project/programme successful enough to start replicating/up scaling?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the DM this is not an issue. One line of argument in this stance is the consideration of the type of message which would be sent if incubation capital would also be provided. This phase of innovation can also be seen as important for the organisation to reach out to new partners, identify new funds. Giving incubation funds right away might send the wrong message.</li> <li>- Statistically there are very clear indicators: Always comparing two groups ("treatment and control group") for significant changes which can be attributed to the intervention, anything which differs from zero in the right direction can be seen as an indication for effective interventions. However, this is really only from a statistical perspective. Looking at the issues from an economic or political perspective is another issue, as they bring in other criteria such as cost effectiveness. Ultimately the governments' decide to accept a specific return on investment and their decisions are always relative to other policy options.</li> <li>- Very often governments are so enthusiastic about a new approach that they do not even want to wait until first results are analysed. They just want to keep going.</li> </ul>
How do you identify potential areas for replication/scaling up? What role do partnerships play in this respect?	-
How relevant is the availability of different financial instruments (grants, loans, mixed) to promote innovation, replication, scaling up?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Grants are key – if you have grant funding, the clients will do anything and its availability totally changes the discussion. Another key factor is technical know-how/expertise. These two factors make a difference. If you provide that, people will do it.</li> <li>- "As far as financial support is concerned, this takes various forms and is generally provided in the form of subsidies for the primary steps of innovation projects. Then, for more costly phases of development and commercialization, and when there is a smaller risk of failure, funding normally takes the form of reimbursable subsidies or grants. In more sophisticated conditions, there are also schemes, often fiscal, to attract venture capital. The use of tax incentives is, however, not particularly recommended for most developing countries, notably in low-income countries, due to the fact that there is a large informal sector and a poorly equipped tax administration." (Aubert 2005)</li> </ul>
How would you describe the impact of innovation on effectiveness and efficiency of your organisation (and its partners)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "The Bank has improved the delivery of customized development solutions by introducing a range of financial and nonfinancial innovations. On the financial side, during fiscal 2008, IBRD announced the biggest simplification of and reduction in its loan pricing since the Asian financial crisis. (See <a href="http://www.worldbank.org/ibrd">http://www.worldbank.org/ibrd</a>.) Borrowers now have access to IBRD loans at longer maturities and at prices that are lower and more transparent than they had been. In response to demand for market-based instruments to address catastrophic risk, the Bank Group launched the Caribbean Catastrophic Risk Insurance Facility; it also enhanced existing contingent loan products to address countries' emergency liquidity needs following catastrophes and other exogenous shocks. The IFC's Global Index Reinsurance Facility is in place, and the Bank Group initiated the Global Emerging Markets Local Currency (Gemloc) bond program to help catalyze the development of local currency bond markets in emerging market countries. The Bank Group is also exploring other mechanisms for local currency lending and is considering innovative approaches for funding climate change and green initiatives. For example, Mexico signed the first climate change development policy loan in May 2008." (World Bank 2008)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development gateway stresses the necessity for “iterative learning and innovative practices” in order to be successful: “Achieving and sustaining the benefits of the Development Gateway will depend on several factors: [...]Ability to adapt and innovate – It takes considerable discipline and commitment to pioneer services and incorporate reflection, learning and iteration in tandem with operating them; objectives, milestones and performance targets must facilitate analysis and evaluation and at the same time allow for iterative learning and innovative practices.” (Walker 2003)</li> </ul>
How do you deal with varying contexts and varying external factors which are out of control for your organisation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “It makes little sense to build STI capacity if the legal, regulatory, financial, and economic conditions deter farmers, entrepreneurs, and investors from investing and innovating. However, capacity building is not a passive process. Productive capacity does not develop automatically once a good business climate is in place and the cost of doing business is reduced to reasonable levels. It requires conscious, deliberate policies and programs [...]” (Watkis, Ehst 2008)</li> <li>- “There is no single correct recipe for building STI capacity. Different countries have developed various policies and programs for building STI capacity. But while the programs differ in technical details and specific tactics, successful programs tend to focus on a common set of core issues: promotion of entrepreneurship; adaptation and adoption of existing technology; both the supply and demand for S&amp;T capacities; specific social and economic goals; and promotion of interactions among public institutions, academia, and the private sector. Success in building STI capacity requires a continuous process of institutional learning by the government agencies that create and administer STI policies and programs and the labs, universities, and firms that create and use knowledge.” (Watkis, Ehst 2008)</li> <li>- “While there is considerable experience accumulated in the field of innovation policy in developed/OECD countries, much of this is not directly applicable to developing countries because of the nature of the challenges the latter are facing. In fact, developing countries face genuine obstacles to innovation and this is precisely why they remain underdeveloped. These obstacles derive from inappropriate business and governance climates and insufficient education. At the same time, there is no choice: innovation policies should cope with these difficult situations. Thus there is a need to think about innovative approaches adapted to the needs and possibilities of developing countries. The situation is, however, rendered more complicated because the “developing world” presents very diverse situations in terms of levels of development, culture, etc. Consequently, innovation policy schemes have to be tailored to countries’ specific characteristics in line with the recognized fact that “one size does not fit all”, and the recognized need for working much more on national peculiarities in all walks of development economics and policies.” (Aubert 2005)</li> </ul>
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The innovation systems concept emphasizes adaptive tendencies as a central element of innovation capacity.” (World Bank 2006)</li> <li>- “Bank-financed innovation projects are quite heterogeneous, reflecting both country differences and the interests and preferences of Bank and country staff promoting the projects, with the nature of projects supported ranging from more traditional science and technology projects, to broader, more innovation and knowledge economy-oriented programs. The projects can, however, be divided into five main groups: [a) Science, technology and/or engineering education/training projects; b) Science research projects; c) Technology projects; d) Combined science research, technology and education projects; e) Broader, knowledge economy projects]” (Aubert 2005)</li> </ul>
<b>Risks and mitigation</b>	-

In your organisation, what is the general attitude towards risks and failures? Is your organisation a risk taker and early mover?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The WB has a history of being a first mover, e.g. compared to the IADB which was always moving into the same direction some 5 years after the WB had done something.</li> <li>- In this pattern of the WB being a first mover, its size definitely plays an important role. It can move development in a certain direction and create momentum. It has some outreach.</li> </ul>
Do you have a deliberate risk management (strategy)? If yes, how does it work, what are key elements?	-
In your experience, is there a tension between the focus on results and focus on innovation (proven solutions vs. risk taking)?	-
How do you manage accountability towards different stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the context of the DIME, the idea is to try new things that might be different. With the constant measuring the risks of innovation are lowered and potential failures are reduced because there is a systematic observation of the processes.</li> <li>- Organisations make changes all the time and generally all things are changed at the same time which is a risky way of doing business. The attitude in DIME is, "ok, let's measure if it is effective".</li> </ul>
Looking at your organisation's activities overall, how do you assess the ratio between successful and failed activities?	- It is estimated (from experiences made to date) that about 20% of the supported projects find their way and flourish after the DM funding, and about 40% stay at the same level. A 20% success rate is not bad for grant capital.
Other issues	-
<b>Good practices</b>	-
When it comes to promoting innovation as an organisation: What works? What doesn't?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What doesn't work: simply giving up if something has not worked out. What does work: not being blown down by failure and keep moving and looking forward.</li> <li>- What were the most significant innovations that you developed to accomplish your goals? In these processes, what were the greatest challenges you faced and how did you overcome them? What were your greatest lessons learned?</li> </ul>
What were the most significant innovations that you developed to accomplish your goals? In these processes, what were the greatest challenges you faced and how did you overcome them? What were your greatest lessons learned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the US educational system there is an interesting approach: The department can do things that are outside of the law, as long as they are tested properly and a thorough impact evaluation is done (rigorous evaluation is a condition). By showing what the effects of new approaches are, they can later be brought into the mainstream. This leaves the door open for innovation and this is also what DIME is trying to do. The entire approach of DIME is a significant innovation.</li> <li>- Mexico was the first country which did serious evaluations of poverty programmes. And the approach really was to do a pilot, evaluate it and then scale it up and it was done in that way. It was so successful, that for the first time in history when the government changed, the new president did not stop the programme and start a new one, because he needed to leave his traces. He only changed the name and maintained the poverty programme as it was. He sustained something which was working. Policy issues are generally very fragile, particularly during transition periods. But in this case, it continued.</li> <li>- "The most important finance sector innovation of the fiscal year was the launch of the Global Emerging Markets Local Currency (Gemloc) bond program, approved by the Board in October 2007. Gemloc combines the comparative advantages of the Bank Group and the private sector to help develop local currency bond</li> </ul>

	markets through three complementary efforts: a private sector investment manager that develops investment strategies for local currency bond markets; a new bond index (GEMX), based on market size and investability indicators; and Bank advisory services on reforms that can facilitate the creation of strong local bond markets. (See <a href="http://www.gemloc.org">http://www.gemloc.org</a> .)” (World Bank 2008)
<b>Stories</b>	-
Do you have any illustrative stories of success and failure of innovation?	-
Can you give us an example of a successfully replicated (and/or scaled up) project or programme and identify the reasons for its success?	-
<b>Sources</b>	-
Written	- Documents as available on the WB’s website ( <a href="http://www.worldbank.org">http://www.worldbank.org</a> ) (bibliographic information is contained in annexe 10.3 of the main report).
Oral	- Interviews with Theresa Bradley and Arianna Legovini. Short talk with Randi Ryterman.

