

Transformative Outcomes in the Global South
Workshop

25-26th June 2020

13:00-17:00 BST, 14:00-18:00 CEST/SAST; 07:00-12:00 COT

Organized by the Transformative Innovation Policy Consortium, Science Policy
Research Unit (SPRU), University of Sussex
and Centre for Global challenges (UGlobe), University of Utrecht

Written by: Maria Luz Casal & Sumit Kumar

Edited by: Bipashyee Ghosh, Carla Alvial Palavicino & Alissa Kerklingh

Workshop conceptualised by: Bipashyee Ghosh, Carla Alvial Palavicino, Chux
Daniels and Matias Ramirez

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
<i>General aims of the workshop:</i>	4
<i>Workshop structure</i>	4
Background	5
Part I: Pitches	5
<i>Researches on systemic transformations in Global South contexts</i>	5
STI decision-making and second order learning for social and environmental challenges - experience from Mexico	5
Engaging Men in Maternal Health: A health systems perspective from India.....	5
Potential of digital manufacturing laboratories to promote transformative innovation in Mexico	6
Role of innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems in social and economic transformations experiences from East Africa	6
Transition to a circular economy in automotive industry - Experience from Brazil.....	6
From outer Space to farmers: insights into the role of Space technologies in agricultural and water management in African countries	6
<i>Breakout group discussions:</i>	7
Case study analysis through the lenses of transformative outcomes	8
<i>Description of the exercise</i>	8
Case I: Informal settlements in Nairobi.....	8
Case II: Wetlands in Bogota.....	9
Case III: Mobility systems in Kolkata.....	10
Final plenary discussion	12
ANNEXURE I: Agenda of the workshop	13
<i>DAY 1 - Thursday 25th of June</i>	13
<i>DAY 2 - Friday 26th of June</i>	13
<i>ANNEXURE II: List of confirmed participants (in alphabetical order)</i>	14
ANNEXURE III: List of suggested references	14
ANNEXURE IV: Links to case studies publications	17
ANNEXURE V: A tool for Transformative outcome quality and constraint mapping	17

At a glance

The idea of Transformative Innovation Policy has gained momentum to analyse how transformative change can be effective to address the issue of sustainability globally. However, to understand transformation in different contexts, it is important to recognize the similarities and differences of these processes in different regions, in order to assess whether a given methodology could be used to enable transformations. This workshop focused on understanding systemic transformations in the context of the Global South, bringing together researchers with experience working in these contexts.

A large section of the workshop was dedicated to applying the new TIPC methodology of [12 transformative outcomes](#) in case studies to generate debate around quality of transformative outcomes and challenges associated with implementing these outcomes. Following a few facilitated exercises, there was an open plenary where participants engaged in a deep discussion on the objectives, opportunities and risks of having such a framework. There were also questions and comments regarding who will use the framework, what skills are required and how relevant is it in Global South contexts.

Introduction

The two-day workshop titled “Transformative Outcomes in the Global South Workshop” was organized between the 25-26th June 2020, with the joint effort of the Transformative Policy Innovation Consortium (TIPC), the Science Policy Research Unit (University of Sussex) and the Centre of Global Challenges (Utrecht University). Firstly, the purpose of the workshop was to learn from participants about their research experiences in the Global South contexts. A second objective was to discuss the Transformative Innovation Policy (TIP) framework called ‘12 Transformative Outcomes’ which is targeted to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Thirdly, the aim was to build a community among the diverse participants of the workshop in order to create a space for knowledge exchanges.

The Transformative Innovation Policy Consortium is a five-year transdisciplinary research programme that seeks to address the SDGs through systems change. Through its work from member countries and associates, it seeks to support the ongoing efforts of research organizations, science and innovation policy funders, as well as other innovations and transformation leaders around the world, who seek to implement and mainstream their ideas, and provide radical alternatives solutions to pressing global challenges. Recently, TIPC established hubs in Africa and Latin America (for more information, see <http://www.tipconsortium.net/>), where crucial research and implementation is being done for policy experimentation and formative evaluation – the two cornerstones of the TIPC methodology. The rationale for organizing this workshop was to explore how global sustainability challenges are experienced in contexts of the Global South, as to adapt the TIPC methodologies for supporting ongoing efforts of systemic change in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

General aims of the workshop:

- To understand processes of system transformations to address sustainability challenges in the Global South context.
- To learn from the knowledge within the group and research projects based in Africa, Latin America and Asia.
- To debate the TIPC Transformative Outcomes framework and stretch current thinking on transformation processes and transition dynamics.
- To build a community of transdisciplinary scholars working in Global South context, which is invaluable to develop research and action approaches that resonate with the dynamics of different geographies.

Workshop structure

The workshop was conducted over 2 afternoons. It was composed of two main activities: discussion of emerging themes in transitions in the Global South, and a guided discussion on Transformative Outcomes, based on quality and challenges for their use and implementation in specific cases. The detailed agenda can be found in the ANNEXURE I: Agenda of the workshop.

Background

This year, it has become evident that we need to urgently address global, interconnected social, economic and environmental challenges. As the COVID-19 crisis unfolds, we observe how inequality and environmental degradation exacerbate its impact in the most vulnerable populations, triggering social instability and unrest. The Sustainable Development Goals and its call for universal transformations in societies are more relevant than ever.

It is broadly acknowledged that the literature in sustainability transitions and science, technology and innovation policy studies have a strong conceptual and empirical bias towards Western Europe and North America. This is not only a matter of representation; it is also acknowledged that in many places in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe, the context and processes of transitions do not necessarily fit the frameworks developed in the literature.

Seeking to enable critical and open reflection on the concepts and frameworks currently under development in TIPC and to understand its usefulness and implications for Global South contexts, a discussion must be held regarding the transformative outcomes as a process-oriented method to support experimentation for transformations towards sustainability.

Part I: Pitches

Researches on systemic transformations in Global South contexts

STI decision-making and second order learning for social and environmental challenges - experience from Mexico

Presenter: Paulina Terrazas

The key question asked was ‘how can Science Technology Innovation (STI) be relevant for policy issues related to the transitions towards sustainability in Mexico?’. Insights from the implementation of the Agenda 2030 demonstrated that although a lot of work has been done on agreeing on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), there is still a long debate regarding implementation. Paulina shared her experience of bringing together public sector, government, civil society, companies and universities in one platform in order to build consensus around the issue of implementation. Although there have been several political changes that could have affected this initiative, it has managed to survive at a small scale. Yet, the key questions for sustainability are still pending.

She also reflected on how transformative change can happen in the five dimensions of the regime. She argued that there is still a lack of clarity on how the three pillars of the SDGs (social, environmental and economic) interact. There is also lack of understanding on what processes the NGOs and government needs to focus on in order to have a multi-stakeholder, multilevel and multidisciplinary engagement. During her presentation, she referred to the paper by Ramirez et al. (2019), which highlights that in Mexico research mostly focuses on diagnosing existing problems, while only 4% of the investigations proposes solutions.

Engaging Men in Maternal Health: A health systems perspective from India

Presenter: Devanik Saha

Devanik’s research explores how men experience pregnancy and childbirth in an informal settlement of Delhi in India. The main problem identified is that men are not involved in the process of maternal health at the time of pregnancy and maternal care, as there is a lot of resistance from care providers working in the health systems.

Devanik has observed that due to existing conservative beliefs in society, men are usually not welcome in these spaces as maternity is conceived primarily as a women’s job. Moreover, issues like lack of resources, lack of time and the apathy of the doctors towards men were highlighted. He proposed that systematic change is required from both top down and bottom up initiatives in order to prepare the health system to accommodate such engagements.

Potential of digital manufacturing laboratories to promote transformative innovation in Mexico

Presenter: Carmen Bueno Castellanos

Carmen shared her work around the Digital Manufacturing Labs, referred to as maker-spaces. Reflections were made over the potential of these labs as promising niches in the Global South. Also, it was remarked that these maker-spaces challenge the underlying rules of the dominant regime. Characteristics of these labs were highlighted, such as the fact that they are a part of a global movement, they have a very inclusive nature and governance system and they promote 'out of the box' thinking. In her perspective, while makerspaces are promoting change, this looks more like "fit and conform" (incremental change) than "stretch and transform" (radical change), therefore not challenging the fundamentals of the socio-technical regime.

Finally, the discussion covered issues related to the funding, path dependency and erratic public policy programmes, since policymakers do not envision maker-spaces as agents of change. However, digitisation trends may empower these niches. Nonetheless, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused considerable disruption, although opportunities to promote frugal innovation are still available.

Role of innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems in social and economic transformations experiences from East Africa

Presenter: Pauline Cherunya

Pauline presented a collaborative project between the University of Rwanda and Chalmers University of Technology (Sweden) with two main areas of focus: building the research capabilities of scholars in Rwanda, as well as developing an innovation hub in order to support innovative ideas. As part of the project, she has focused on identifying innovation hubs in Africa and the processes required in order to establish an innovation hub in Rwanda.

She noted that there has been a mushrooming of innovation hubs in Africa, since innovation has become a buzzword. These innovations hubs are used for resource mobilization. Another important feature of these hubs is that people come together to build networks in order to find solutions. The hubs attempt to strengthen the innovation ecosystem in order to set a conducive environment for entrepreneurship development.

Transition to a circular economy in automotive industry - Experience from Brazil

Presenter: Adriana Marotti de Mello

Adriana is currently a part of the Centre for Organisation Studies (CORS), an organization at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil. The organization leads several projects that seek to study how transformative change can happen by exploring the role of the firm strategy and meso institutions to build public-private partnerships. One of their projects, which is in collaboration with universities in China, is focused on exploring the mobility system. She mentioned a second project that focuses on the issue of circular economy, particularly on the reuse of plastic packaging and stationary items such as pens and paper. Furthermore, the organisation pursues building partnerships with different universities in France and China on issues around food safety and security.

From outer Space to farmers: insights into the role of Space technologies in agricultural and water management in African countries

Presenter: Xiao Shan Yap

Shan is looking at the use of outer space technologies in order to bring transformation in the agriculture and water management system in African countries. In her presentation, she shared the work of the Copernicus program, which has focused on building satellite systems for better environmental monitoring and management. The main vision of the program is support achieving the SDGs in emerging and developing economies. The program has been accompanied by an increasing access to ICT and mobile phones, which has provided more business opportunities to the people in the Global South.

The researcher shared her ideas regarding the transformative nature of the space technology as it might create rapid and new transition pathways for countries in the Global South. Moreover, dependency on Global North will be reduced since the countries will be receiving real time information on environmental monitoring and management directly. However, the researcher also highlighted several challenges. One of the main issue she

mentioned was the fact that the technology has not been able to address the needs of the people on the ground. Moreover, the researchers also faced a lot of resistance since their findings have revealed new problems which challenge the current regime (regulations).

Breakout group discussions:

When discussing about Science Technology Innovation (STI) and its relevance to policy issues related to transitions towards sustainability in reference to Pitch 1, the discussion was based on the difficulties found when trying to destabilise a regime, as there can be a lack of accountability for system failure in a regime. Therefore, suggestions were made about addressing the issue under the transformation approach. However, challenges arise when attempts are made to ground and implement the theory. There is a need to analyse who is the key beneficiary or recipient of the project and how the process of prioritization of the SDGs is considered.

During the discussion of pitch 3, the potential of maker-spaces was remarked as they are places that can enable existing technologies to upgrade and that can be a response to an existing demand in local contexts. However, concerns are held regarding the overarching risk of neoliberal approaches diminishing the role of STI for the SDGs. Thus, these spaces are crucial for the continuity of independent creative entrepreneurs. Moreover, reflections were made considering the importance of the strength of the institution to overcome challenges, the willingness of the regimes to open up voluntarily, directionality of innovations in maker-spaces and the involved trade-offs to find a middle point on expectations. Distrust on government and corruption were some of the constraints identified by scholars. Concerns were raised regarding the possibility of the initiatives being hijacked by narrow party politics. Still, maker-spaces are embedded in a global network that goes beyond country level and can have international support and cooperation for its sustenance.

When discussing the role of innovation and entrepreneurship in Africa (pitch 4), reflections were made regarding the establishment of the labs and the challenges for their sustainability over. The main concern was funding as well as directionality. It was highlighted that focusing on the infrastructure of the spaces could harm the service that the facilities deliver and relegate the main goal of empowering young people and employment. Furthermore, questions regarding commitment with a wider range and purpose were brought into the discussion.

Lastly, the groups discussed space technologies (pitch 6) and their applicability as monitoring tools for farmers, and the challenges related to accessibility of the data and directionality of the technology. The group discussed transformative nature of an elite technology and a top-down approach, and whether a more demand driven technology was raised. On the one hand, the difficulty remains on how to make the data accessible and open for the users, while on the other hand the question is raised how users can work with institutions to give input regarding their necessities of environmental data and engagement. How can the data be transformed into an user-oriented platform that adds value to the need of the farmers? Interdisciplinary approaches need to merge to envision participatory processes while developing friendly interfaces. On the other hand, issues of directionality were discussed in developing top down technologies and the use of data. Particularly, in an agricultural context it is worth asking what agricultural model is going to be supported with this technology and whether it will fulfil its promise. Does it support large scale agriculture? And, to what extent can this technology work at a micro-level? Issues regarding ownership were also raised, thus, the role of leadership and how the technology is going to be led were emphasized.

Part II

Case study analysis through the lenses of transformative outcomes.

Description of the exercise

This exercise was aimed at discussing the transformative outcome approach using three existing case studies of transitions in the Global South, discussing informal settlements in Nairobi, governance of wetlands in Colombia and mobility in Kolkata, India. Each of the groups was asked to analyse the transformative outcomes (TOs) in terms of quality and the challenges to achieve them. The main goal of the group activity was to learn and reflect on the potential and challenges of the implementation of each transformative outcome, by better understanding how to operationalize transformative outcome concepts tangibly through quality criteria and associated challenges. Please refer to ANNEXURE IV for case studies.

Table 1. List of transformative outcomes for each of the three cases

Case Study	Suggested transformative outcome
Informal settlements in Nairobi.	De-aligning and de-stabilising regime; Unlearning and deep learning in regimes; Changing perceptions of landscape pressure; Circulating.
Wetlands in Bogota.	Networking; Navigating expectations; Institutionalising; De-aligning and de-stabilising regime.
Mobility in Kolkata.	Navigating expectations; De-aligning and de-stabilising regime; Unlearning and deep learning in regimes; Institutionalising.

Case I: Informal settlements in Nairobi

Corresponding reading: Fostering Place-Based Coalitions between Social Movements and Science for Sustainable Urban Environments: A Case of Embedded Agency (Cherunya et al., 2020)

This case (Kenyan Slum Upgrading initiative) analyses the relocation process of slum dwellers in one of the largest slums in Nairobi. The case focuses on the significance of the livelihood's reconstruction as a necessary condition for successful informal settlement. The research highlighted that the legitimacy of the project was reduced because of the inadequate understanding and consideration of the livelihood reconstruction which resulted in the rapid deterioration of physical amenities.

The group discussion focused on the possibilities of using the transformative outcome framework for this particular case, but did not look at specific outcomes as initially intended, since it was not immediately clear the connection between the outcomes and the case.

The group discussed how "quality" could be understood in this specific case, and how a specific definition would require to make explicit the actor group – "quality for whom". From the perspective of the public servants, quality can be understood as effectiveness and efficiency of delivery, but this is certainly not what the case intends to show. From a the perspective of the beneficiaries (the settlers) quality relates to the improvement of livelihoods, which is a multidimensional, contextual and complex indicator.

A second element discussed was the difficulty to use some of the transitions concepts such as regime, landscape and niche solely based on the information provided in the paper. Based on their prior knowledge, some participants defined what regimes and niches are. According to one participant, pressure from funders to implement the program almost acted as a landscape pressure. During the discussion, the question was raised regarding the margin of flexibility in defining the regime. There were doubts among the participants whether resilience instead of transformative outcomes would be a better approach to assess the case study.

In the second half of the exercise, the group focused on diverse challenges posed by the case. With respect of working with policy makers, they mentioned issues of distrust in public official and institutions, and corruption embedded in some institutions within socio-technical systems as a energy. In addition to this, the group felt that

there is often a lack of capabilities among public officials which difficults the implementation of changes. TIPC researchers noted that, despite the difficulties, in their experience it is possible to promote experiments in a Global South context. In South Africa, many researchers and institutes have been connected in a network through the work done by TIPC.

Case II: Wetlands in Bogota

Corresponding reading: Fostering place-based coalitions between social movements and science for sustainable urban environments: A case of embedded agency. (Ramirez et al., 2020)

The case study focuses on a social movement in the urban wetland in Bogota (Colombia). The study highlights the wider insights into debates on the relationship between science and society and how the priorities of the scientific community are influenced by the agenda of the social movement.

The group discussion concentrated around how networks can be understood in terms of quality and its connection to other transformative outcomes. In this specific case, the construction of a long-term and diverse network was key to support the transformation of the wetland's regime. For the participants, a quality network accommodates different actors and visions and is able to address conflict and diverse types of knowledge. Such a network is able to drive and influence other transformative outcomes. There was a discussion regarding the trade-offs between stability and renovation of a network, since the ability to create new ties can relate to learning. At the same time, it was acknowledged that the functionality of the network would evolve over time and for this, a certain degree of flexibility is required.

The most important outcome for the wetlands case is navigating expectations, as being able to create a shared vision empowering this network of actors in their process of change. With respect to the institutionalization outcome, the group considered that it was less clear if the new regulations promoted by the social movements would be fully implemented and lead to sustainable change. In connection with this, the group reflected how the de-aligning and de-stabilization outcome related to the role and capacities of the state in addressing the demands from social movements.

In terms of challenges, the group discussed the specific challenges of democratic governance in Colombia and the specific challenges to respond to the demands of social movements that push for transformations in a given regime, such as wetlands. They also mentioned issues of corruption and highly stable regime in terms of group of actors in power, and these challenges making it hard to destabilize this. They felt that long-term changes would be required in the structure of institutions and democracy in the country.

Table 2. Transformative outcomes quality for the wetlands case

Transformative outcome	Criteria for Quality	Score	Unknowns
<i>Network</i>	Inclusiveness; relevance; embracing local knowledge; diversity; inclusiveness; sustainability; influence over other transformative outcomes	4	It was not clear in the case whether network ties were weak or strong.
<i>Navigating expectations</i>	Directionality and societal goal; learning and relexify; unlearning	5	How to make translation from technology and development to local necessities.
<i>Institutionalizing</i>	Consider whether new regulations have been implemented as a result of this outcome	n/a	n/a
<i>De-aligning and de-stabilizing</i>	Change in the narratives & Policymaking; Visibility of the movement; Strength of the state; structural change	1,7	No information about the continuity of the network; nor is it clear whether a strong network is required for sustainability

Table 3. Transformative outcomes challenges for wetlands case

Transformative outcome	Challenges	Score	Unknowns
<i>Navigating expectations</i>	Network stability: Composition: Power relations: capability of the network to conduct its function	1	To what extent the networks are dependent of specific actors, political leadership and geographical proximity.
<i>Navigating expectations</i>	Mismatch of expectations; Democracy, understanding of wellbeing and conflicting visions; lack of interfaces to negotiate different imaginaries	n/a	What is the role of developers and how they can influence the outcome and environment of the wetlands.
<i>Institutionalizing</i>	Implementation of new regulations; immature structures and lack of capacities for the successful implementation of policies	4	Who will oversee the implementation of new regulations
<i>De-aligning and de-stabilizing</i>	Unbalanced power and weak democracy; regulations that favour the regime; highly stable regime; corruption: strong constrain; no deep change in regime	n/a	n/a

Case III: Mobility systems in Kolkata

Corresponding reading: Towards a novel regime change framework: Studying mobility transitions in public transport regimes in an Indian megacity (Ghosh and Schot, 2019)

The research is focused to understand problem of sustainability associated with the mobility system of a city mega city (Kolkata) in India. The study looks at the socio-technical change in past 15 years in multiple urban public transportation regimes and concludes that sustainability transitions can happen within the existing regime and without recourse to niche development.

The group was able to explore the transformative outcomes selected for the case both in terms of quality and constrains. The discussion moves around the issue of inclusivity in transformations of socio-technical systems in the Kolkata case, and how this would reflect in the different TOs. As quality criteria they referred to the need of opening-up processes of transformative change to a variety of stakeholders, especially less privileged groups, taking into account both the directionality of the process and the space for multiple visions and expectations, as well as caring for the quality of engagement with these different stakeholders. At the moment in this socio-technical system there is little interaction between niches and regime actors, and between different types of actors in general. Unlearning and second order learning can potentially result from this broadening of the stakeholders involved in the process. However, they felt that some of the visions of change in these socio-technical systems are imported from the Global North and don't necessarily reflect the needs and desires of the local population. The participants mentioned that sometimes the motivation for socio-technical system change is to catch up with global trends, without a fundamental understanding of the rationale behind it, which can lead to policy imitation rather than learning.

A second important element was what it meant to destabilize a regime in a Global South context. The participants felt that destabilization might not be a desirable outcome, since regimes were already quite unstable. At the same time, they discussed what the place was within the transformative outcome for solutions outside institutionalized settings – for example, within the informal economy – that often provide sustainable solutions to an important part of the population in these contexts.

In terms of the challenges and in addition to the challenge of participation and inclusion, they mentioned the lack of spaces for experimentation within policy settings, incentives against change for civil servants and lack of policy support, and lack of engagement from high-level officials which leave projects in the hands of middle-rank bureaucrats instead.

Table 4 Transformative outcomes quality for mobility case

Transformative outcome	Criteria for Quality	Score	Unknowns
<i>Navigating expectations</i>	Broadening, deepening and aligning expectations; Directionality/share vision; quality of exchanges between different actors.	2	Not clear how different actors, visions and voices interact and whether there is the space to do so.
<i>De-aligning and de-stabilizing regime</i>	Contextualize directionality/sustainable direction; de-stabilizing regime to more sustainable direction (more inclusive); ability to identify inflection points of the system actors	2	The trade-offs between different options are not clear, nor how these are negotiated. Also, lack of information about changes in behaviour
<i>Unlearning and deep learning</i>	Changes in cognitive and normative rules	4	Not clear if a change of vision can be related to unlearning that shows as a change in practices
<i>Institutionalizing</i>	Need to take policy makers out of their comfort zone	n/a	Not clear whether mainstreaming of new practices is happening

Table 5. Transformative outcomes challenges for the mobility case

Transformative outcome	Challenges	Score	Unknowns
<i>Navigating expectations</i>	Heterogeneity of expectations; Governance and accountability; Silo bias and lack of coordination: no infrastructure for participatory decision making.	n/a	unknown data about user preferences/new user survey.
<i>De-aligning and de-stabilizing regime</i>	Directionality failures; governance as in challenges in integration and accountability; alignment and resistance to change among different participants and social movements; legitimation of the transformative regime	n/a	There is not enough information to assess whether the transformation to a modern system has been beneficial
<i>Unlearning and deep learning</i>	Imitation of foreign knowledge rather than deep learning as a driver; catching up without questioning the rationale of technology; challenges in experimenting and evaluating deep learning; lack of spaces to experiment and unlearn; time constraints; lack of engagement from higher-level public officials	n/a	Time is a variable that demands policymakers to deliver quickly and showcase an efficient investment of public financing.
<i>Institutionalizing</i>	Incentives against change, investment, regulation may not last; Lack of persistent policy support; Lack of trust in government.	n/a	n/a

Final plenary discussion

The last part of the session started off looking at the concept of Transformative Outcomes critically, but broadened out in a general discussion. Some questions guiding the discussion were : what did the participant think about the transformative outcome's framework? how do the transformative outcomes relate to different contexts and how it can be operationalised? What can we learn from the previous frameworks or other literatures e.g. development studies? What are some of the key learnings from various pitches from research in Global South discussed during the workshop?

The participants raised several questions and concerns which has been summarised under the different themes below.

Transformative framework

Participants indicated that they were curious to know the rationale behind the framework. For instance, what was the purpose and objectives of having the transformative outcomes as a new methodology. Consequently, it was remarked that the transformative outcomes should help policymakers to visualize things which have not been captured by other frameworks.

Link between academia and practice

The missing link with the practitioners was a shared concern of participants. There is mismatch between the industry and academia in terms of the expectation they have from the output of such exercises. It was suggested that TIPC can try to bridge academia and practice. It is important to understand who is going to use these tools: is it only for academic purposes or is it going to be used by practitioners on the ground? Questions were raised regarding the capacity of the policymakers to understand these new concepts in order to engage with them and use the framework to measure transformative potential of their projects, programmes and policies. One participant with experience as a practitioner shared that in day to day job, a lot of policy makers work on basic provisions of services. They are less concerned what concepts or frameworks are used to analyse their work. Terminology and concepts can make or break innovations and services; thus, the language and communication need to be simple since policy makers are still failing to relate to concepts like transformational adaptation to climate change, sustainability transitions, circular economy etc. The question was raised on who needs to adapt to whom in order to create an impact on the ground, is it academics or policy makers? The idea should not just be to measure transformation but also how to provoke transformation to happen on the ground.

Working with the TO framework

The discussion revealed that there was curiosity around what the practical challenges are that TIPC researchers face while explaining the three frames of innovation to the policy makers? One of the participants highlighted that from the monitoring and evaluation point of view it is important to understand what the expected output is using the TO framework. It is important to have experts who can measure transformative change while the others are doing the implementation work. One of the participants highlighted the appropriation of value and how the good entrepreneurs should be protected from the rich capitalist and ensure that they are not exploited.

TO in different contexts

TO as a concept is being used to summarize transformative innovation of the 20-25 years of the work that has already been done. In STI there are meta narratives that exist, and they are always used and abused. However, it is important to work on this new meta narrative since they have a strong foundation in understanding around transitions. As the exercises have shown, a few TOs may not fit in the Global South contexts. It is a challenge to convince the policymakers to steer change in the right directions, while using this framework to implement change.

Finally, it was said that we should not lose the sight that there are issues of sustainability, democratization and social justice. We need to understand what the key idea is behind these frameworks and that the main real-world issues are sometimes lost in complex theories. The workshop closed by suggestion to have webinar around the concept of transformative innovation policy so that the participants can engage with the concepts in a much better way during such workshops. However, the participants acknowledged that the transformative outcomes framework can be very effective in co-producing knowledge around transformations, globally.

ANNEXURE I: Agenda of the workshop

DAY 1 - Thursday 25th of June

Time (BST)	Programme	
12.45 – 13.00	Logging in to Zoom and saying hello!	
13:00 - 13:20	Welcome and introduction to the workshop	
13:20-14:20	Six short pitches on emerging research themes on transformations in the Global South	Devanik, Paulina, Carmen, Pauline, Adriana and Shan
14:20-15:00	Breakout group discussion based on the pitches Aim: to have an open and facilitated discussion on transformative change, issues, processes and impacts in the Global South, drawing inspiration from the pitches Key themes of discussion: Governance, policymaking, gender aspects, niche dynamics, regime dynamics, transformations, system change.	Group 1 Oscar and Paloma Devanik and Paulina Group 2 Claudia and Sumit Carmen and Pauline Group 3 Carla and Mei Adriana and Shan
15:00-15:20	Break	
15:20-15:30	Introducing the first group activity	
15:30-16:40	Group activity with case studies Part I Aim: To assess quality of transformative outcomes visible in each case narrative	Nairobi case: Carla, Sumit and Pauline Bogota case: Claudia, Mei and Oscar Kolkata case: Paulina, Rattana and Bipashyee
16:40-17:00	Reflections on the activity and first day wrap up	

DAY 2 - Friday 26th of June

Time (BST)	Programme	
12.45 – 13.00	Logging in to Zoom and saying hello!	All
13:00 - 13:30	Introduction to TIPC work in Latin America and Africa	Matias, Chux
13:30-14:00	Discussion of results from group activity I and introduction to second group activity	
14:00-15:00	Group activity with case studies Part II Dropdown: Aim: To identify and assess challenges for achieving the transformative outcomes visible in each case narrative	Nairobi case: Carla, Sumit and Pauline Bogota case: Claudia, Mei and Oscar Kolkata case: Paulina, Rattana and Bipashyee
15:00 - 15:30	Break	
15:30 - 16:00	Presentations of group activities part I and II	One person per group
16:00 - 17:00	Critical reflection on transformative outcomes and future collaborations	

ANNEXURE II: List of participating organisations

1	University of Sao Paolo, Brazil
2	Centre for Frugal Innovation in Africa, Kenya
3	Centre for Global Challenges, University of Utrecht
4	Chalmers University, Sweden
5	CSIR-Science and Technology Policy Research Institute, Ghana
6	DEFF- Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries, South Africa
7	DST - Department of Science and Technology, South Africa
8	Iberoamerican University, México City
9	INGENIO (CSIC-UPV), Spain
10	Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK
11	National Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa
12	SPRU, University of Sussex, UK
13	Stellenbosch University, South Africa
14	Universidad de San Buenaventura, Cali, Colombia

ANNEXURE III: List of suggested references

- Swilling, Mark. The Age of Sustainability: Just Transitions in a Complex World. Routledge, 2019. <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=1ay8DwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Swilling, Mark, Josephine Kaviti Musango, and Jeremy Wakeford, eds. Greening the South African Economy: Scoping the issues, challenges and opportunities. Juta and Company (Pty) Ltd, 2016. https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=p_ZyDwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Sustainability Transitions in SA Muhammed N, 2018 <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781315190617>
- Ethos and Brookings, 2017. Impact bonds in Mexico: Opportunities and Challenges. https://ethos.org.mx/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/IB_Executive-Summary-1.pdf
- Pacto por la Primera Infancia, 2019. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/167X45z7j9dEWCqvaeFwt4QMHUGfvAcZR/view>
- "Mathews, J.A., 2014. Greening of Capitalism: How Asia is driving the next great transformation. Stanford University Press.
- Shen, W. and Xie, L., 2018. The political economy for low-carbon energy transition in China: towards a new policy paradigm?. New Political Economy, 23(4), pp.407-421. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13563467.2017.1371122>
- "Lindtner, Silvia (2014) "Hackerspaces and the Internet of Things in China: How makers are reinventing industrial production, innovation and the self" China Information, Sage Journals, vol. 28 (2) 145 – 167. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0920203X14529881>
- Smith, Adrian, Mariano Fressoli, Dinesh Abrol, Elisa Arond and Adrian Ely (2017) Pathways to Sustainability. Grassroots Innovation Movements, Edit Earthscan from Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781315697888>
- "DANIELS, C. & TING, M. B. 2019. Transforming Science, Technology and Innovation Policies in Africa: Insights from Ghana, Kenya, Senegal and South Africa. TIPC Policy Brief, Brighton, U.K. <http://www.tipconsortium.net/publication/tipc-policy-brief-transforming-science-technology-and-innovation-policies-in-africa-insights-from-ghana-senegal-and-south-africa/>

11. TING, M. B. & BYRNE, R. 2020. Eskom and the rise of renewables: Regime-resistance, crisis and the strategy of incumbency in South Africa's electricity system. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 60, 101333. <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/90029/>
12. Hu, M.-C., Wu, C.-Y. and Shih, T. (2015) 'Creating a new socio-technical regime in China: Evidence from the Sino-Singapore Tianjin Eco-City', *Futures*, 70, pp.1–12. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0016328715000476>
13. Osunmuyiwa, O. et al. (2018) 'Applying the Multi-Level Perspective on Socio-Technical Transitions to Rentier States: the Case of Renewable Energy Transitions in Nigeria', *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 20 (2), pp. 143–156. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1523908X.2017.1343134>
14. Ramirez, M, Romero R. Schot, J, Arroyave, F (2019), Mobilizing the Transformative Power of the Research System for Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. SPRU Working paper December Series 25:1-27 <http://www.tipconsortium.net/publication/spru-working-paper-series-mobilizing-the-transformative-power-of-the-research-system-for-achieving-the-sustainable-development-goals/>
15. Ramirez, M, Garcia, J, Obando, C and Romero O (in print), Fostering place-based coalitions between social movements and science for sustainable urban environments: A case of embedded agency.
16. Van Welie, M. J., Cherunya, P. C., Truffer, B., & Murphy, J. T. (2018). Analysing transition pathways in developing cities: The case of Nairobi's splintered sanitation regime. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 137, 259-271. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162517303323>
17. Ghosh, Bipashyee, and Johan Schot. "Towards a novel regime change framework: Studying mobility transitions in public transport regimes in an Indian megacity." *Energy Research & Social Science* 51 (2019): 82-95. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214629618304547>
18. Transformative spaces in the making: key lessons from nine cases in the Global South, by Pereira, L. et al. (2019), *Sustainability Science*, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11625-019-00749-x>
19. Dinosaurs in transition? A conceptual exploration of local incumbents in the swiss and German energy transition, by Mühlemeier, S., *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 31 (2019) 126–143. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2210422418301515>
20. *Advances in the Theory and Practice of Smart Specialization*, Radosevic, S. et al., eds. (2017). See: <https://www.elsevier.com/books/advances-in-the-theory-and-practice-of-smart-specialization/radosevic/978-0-12-804137-6>. Not many of the chapters address Global South (one of them looks at cases in Argentina). <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128041376000103>
21. Lawhon, M., & Murphy, J. T. (2011). Socio-technical regimes and sustainability transitions. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(3), 354–378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132511427960> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132511427960>
22. Quaye, W., Akon-Yamga, G., Daniels, C., Ting, B., & Asante, A. (2019). Mapping of Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Development in Ghana Using the Transformative Change Lens. Brighton. <http://www.tipconsortium.net/resource/mapping-of-science-technology-and-innovation-policy-development-in-ghana-using-the-transformative-change-lens/>
23. Sokona, Y. et al (2013) Widening energy access in Africa: Towards energy transition, *Energy Policy*, 47:3-10; DOI: 10.1016/j.enpol.2012.03.040 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421512002455>
24. Delina, L. (2018) Whose and what futures? Navigating the contested coproduction of Thailand's energy sociotechnical imaginaries, *Energy Research and Social Sciences*, Vol.35, p48-56, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214629617303754?via%3Dihub>
25. Sustainability transitions in developing countries: Stocktaking, new contributions and a research agenda <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901117311838>
26. Transformative spaces in the making: key lessons from nine cases in the Global South. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11625-019-00749-x>
27. Ramirez, M. (2019) 'Fostering place-based coalitions between social movements and science for sustainable urban environments: A case of embedded agency 1', (June). doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.12034.73925.
28. Souza, J. V. R. de et al. (2020) 'Challenges to develop business models towards sustainable urban mobility: A comparative empirical investigation between Brazilian and Chinese case studies', in 28th International Colloquium of Gerpisa.
29. Access (2016) *Innovations in Sustainable Agriculture*. New Delhi. <https://livelihoods-india.org/sitaram-rao-case-study-competition/previous-competitions.html?key=VldJbStnYnNpUEIxTU00WmZ5WStJdz09>

30. Marshall, F and Dolley J. (2018). Transformative Innovation in Peri-Urban Asia. **Research Policy**, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.10.007>
31. Klerx, L., & Rose, D. (2020). Dealing with the game-changing technologies of Agriculture 4.0: How do we manage diversity and responsibility in food system transition pathways? *Global Food Security*, 24(December 2019), 100347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.100347>

ANNEXURE IV: Links to case studies publications

Cherunya, Pauline C., Bernhard Truffer, Edinah Moraa Samuel, and Christoph Lüthi. 2020. "The Challenges of Livelihoods Reconstruction in the Context of Informal Settlement Upgrading." *Environment and Planning A* 0(0): 1–23. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0308518X20926514>

Ghosh, Bipashyee, and Johan Schot. 2019. "Towards a Novel Regime Change Framework: Studying Mobility Transitions in Public Transport Regimes in an Indian Megacity." *Energy Research and Social Science* 51(May 2018): 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.12.001>.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214629618304547>

Ramirez, Matias, Javier Hernando Garcia Estevez, Oscar Yandy Romero Goyeneche, and Claudia E.Obando Rodriguez. 2020. "Fostering Place-Based Coalitions between Social Movements and Science for Sustainable Urban Environments: A Case of Embedded Agency." *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* (June). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3497623

ANNEXURE V: A tool for Transformative outcome quality and constraint mapping

We have 12 transformative outcomes across 3 transformation processes. However, a key issue is assessing the quality of the outcomes and associated constraints in achieving transformative outcomes (irrespective of quality). In the upcoming TIP in Global South workshop, we will test a new tool to map/assess the quality of transformative outcomes and constraints in a variety of case studies. This will constitute a group activity during the workshop and this note is a brief description of the tool to receive your feedback prior to the workshop.

Description of the tool:

This tool is operationalised to critically reflect on a case study by a small group of participants in a workshop (this will be a policy experiment in TIPC engagement process). The cases are pre-selected on the basis of the criteria that 1) they are about a socio-technical system change and 2) narrates the dynamics of the change processes. For this particular workshop, we have selected three cases from Africa, Latin America and Asia. The ambition with the tool is to be able to use it for assessing transformative outcomes in actual policy experiments. Next week we do a pilot in an academic setting.

During the session, participants will decide (for next week's workshop, we will identify the outcomes beforehand to save time) on focussing 3-4 transformative outcomes that are explicitly visible in the case narrative. Through their understanding of the case, the participants will 'score' to what extent the transformative outcomes are being achieved in the case. This is an exercise of reflecting on the case narrative (past and present), and less about future possibility of what can be achieved in the case context.

Two types of scoring system are proposed:

1. **A quality measurement score** - This is a score that shows a pragmatic judgement about the quality of the outcome achieved at a moment in time. Quality is contextual, hard to have a standard definition on what is good quality outcome. But the six TIPC criteria can be a guide - e.g. directionality, inclusivity etc. Also, whether the outcome supports multi-system change can be a criterion for good quality. While thinking about this score, participants should evaluate solely the quality of the outcome itself, ignoring the drivers or barriers to achieving the outcome.

On a scale of 0-5,

5 = Outcome achieved of excellent quality

4 = Outcome achieved of good quality

3 = Outcome achieved of fair/acceptable quality

2 = Outcome achieved of poor quality

1 = Outcome achieved of very poor quality

An explanation should accompany any score about why the quality is judged to be at a particular level. The explanation should also include assumptions made about the availability of resources, capabilities, existence of supportive infrastructure to achieve the particular level of quality of the outcome (this is to understand the conditions on which outcome quality is dependent on).

2. **A constraint measurement score** - this is a score about the existence of challenges and disablers that are in the path of achieving the outcome. This is a moment where participants ignore the quality of the outcome and focus on the challenges constraining the achievement of the outcome in a particular case context.

On a scale of 0-5,

5 = Challenges in achieving the outcome is extremely constraining

4 = Challenges in achieving the outcome is highly constraining

3 = Challenges in achieving the outcome is fairly constraining

2 = Challenges in achieving the outcome is slightly constraining

1 = Challenges in achieving the outcome is not constraining

An explanation should accompany any score about why the challenges are assessed at a particular level. The explanation should also include whether the challenges are deep, structural or systemic, making it easy or difficult to mitigate (this is to understand the nature of the challenges and whether other outcomes might help addressing the challenge).

Operationalisation:

Group activity Part I: Mapping quality of transformative outcomes in a case study

- The exercise is to discuss and score the quality of transformative outcome visible in the case study
- Have a think about how you judge 'quality' - what criteria would you use?
- Try to collectively come up with a score from each outcome quality in your case.
- Explain the score - without it, the number is useless
- What is unknown from the case narrative that might have helped you to make a better decision? What assumptions do you need to make about the case dynamics to judge quality?
- Express your disagreements with the (collectively agreed) score and criteria (contest!)
- The exercise is less about the case and more about reflections on transformative outcomes.
- There is no need to 'do justice to the case'

Group activity with cases part II (Day 2)

- The exercise is to identify the challenges associated with achieving transformative outcome in the case study
- These are barriers or disablers that are in the path for achieving an outcome; what, at a given point of time, constraints fulfilling an outcome.
- Imagine you are a policymaker and name a challenge that is restricting you from achieving an outcome
- E.g. Governance challenge, weak institutions, scaling as a challenge (or not), directionality failure, demand articulation failure, coordination failure, learning and reflexivity failure, political ideologies??
- What is unknown from the case narrative and what assumptions do you need to make to understand the constraining effect of the challenge?
- Explain why the particular challenge is more or less constraining? Scoring is optional
- Express your disagreements about the type of challenge and degree of its impact on the outcome (contest!)
- Think broader than the case - use your experience about the Global South context