

Social innovation can also be a system *process*. The example I'm going to give you, which we will go back to later, is of the Great Bear rain forest, which is right here in Canada. Since the 1990's, for almost 20 years, this was an issue of great contention and struggle in British Columbia. Activists, logging companies, researchers, First Nations, and government had all laid claims in the 1990's to various tracts of forest along the BC coast.

[This land] was at various levels of disturbance. Some of it had already been logged; some of it was pristine all growth forest; some of it represented the logging communities, the logging industry; some of it was, in fact, under First Nations treaty rights.

Everyone was disputing how that land should be used and how the resources of the all growth forest should be used. From the mid 1980s to 1990s, there was huge conflict and, actually, armed conflict—a very unusual thing in Canada—in the Clayoquot, with blockades and mass arrests, and this raised the stakes.

This particular group had got together and, over a period of time, had sought a way to form coalitions. This included Aboriginal groups, First Nations, government, scientists, NGOs, and logging companies, who all came to the table to say: *we're going to have to do something about this*.

In that period of about 10 years, they came up with a very impressive set of final agreements. They did decide to protect vast new areas, to create new parks, to further support previous parks, to create no logging zones, and to institute environment-based management, which really took an ecosystem approach. Those were items that would protect this tract of wilderness.

There was also money to help the people take a shift away from resource extraction as a way of life. There was a \$35 million mitigation package for forest workers; \$120 million for a conservation economy—which was to encourage initiatives that made money, particularly for First Nations tribal groups so they could make a living without destroying that environment.

It was partly though these initiatives that they were able to win First Nations approval

of this. This became a kind of test case which had an influence on international markets and also has been used widely in places as far away as the USA and Chile, and now is being used in Canada in the in the Boreal Forest Agreement.

It truly was innovation that had an impact on meaning. They created this whole *idea* of the Great Bear rain forest for an area of land that never had that name. It was a collection of towns and reserves, etc., and they re-framed it from being this pitched battle to kind of a generative collaboration.

Lots of money was flowing differently at the end of this and there were new relationships and practices between these different organisations, which, before, had been at loggerheads; and very different approaches to resource extraction became viable and visible. It was really effective in doing this.

There's a lot more to be said about that, but we'll talk about it a little later on. But, for now, recognize that this was a *process* that unfolded over many years. It involved many phases and stages and many actors working together and against each other that resulted in this kind of change.

There were products that were embedded in this, in terms of these new conservation economy funds and retraining funds, etc. There were new ideas embedded in this, there were a few new technologies, though not much. Overall, it was the *way* this was carried out that really created the innovation. Again, we'll come back to that a little bit later.

Another one, which is a good example of a process—and again, this comes from my colleague, Brenda Zimmerman—is a health-based one which describes how, in fact, Brazil went about addressing the whole AIDS epidemic when it came to their shores.

Brazil is a poor country. Per capita income is less than \$5,000. In the 1980s, Brazil's AIDS problem was worse than South Africa's. By 2001, South Africa's HIV infection rate was 25%, whereas Brazil's was 5%. This had gone against all predictions. The World Bank had predicted that Brazil would have a 1.2 million AIDS cases in 2000, but the actual count was half a million. Whatever they did, they were able to change the trajectory of this particular illness.

At a closer look, what was that process? How did they go about responding in an innovative way to tip this trajectory into such a different direction?

First of all, there was a kind of stable container. Brazil built on the existing infrastructure. It didn't go out and create a new secretariat for AIDS or try to set up a new health organisation. They had a somewhat shaky health system of hospitals and clinics, but they had over 600 NGOs and churches that had been very involved in working with the poor and the sick in communities.

They engaged these to help the shaky support system of hospitals and clinics and they managed for emergence. What does that mean? It's an interesting concept. We'll come back to that when we're talking about: how do you act as an agent for change in a system where you cannot plan for change?

One is that you manage for emergence. What that means is they set some targets, some goals, and some principals that they wanted to work with. But they left each community free to decide how they were going to arrive at this.

They then provided free drugs to all AIDS patients. They faced down the drug companies. This was at the very national level to make sure that the anti-retroviral drugs were going to be available if people were willing to take them. They made them available to everyone.

They found many different ways to reach different communities. One of the things that they did was a very innovative set of advertising campaigns where they tried to make the use of condoms cool and appeal to people at all ranks, male and female.

They took on the issue of how to get patients to manage their own drugs. This was a complex process. The pills were many and had to be taken in certain kinds of sequences. They did this by drawing on these local groups and organizations including the church.

They created a culture with this free treatment and the spreading of the prevention ideas so there was no labeling for those that were affected.

Prevention information was readily available and they did support very creative ad campaigns that were broadcast to everyone and left those then in the villages free to administer and get the drugs to people in their own way.

So again, a good example of a *process* which had multiple elements in it. What made it *innovative* though, was not *what* they were doing. People around the world were trying to treat AIDS; but it was *how* they did it in terms of managing for emergence; going to the communities with multiple ways of doing this; building on what was already there, including the trusted relationships that were already there; trying to appeal through advertising and mass media, which even the poor Brazilians watched; to a sense of humour, making the use of contraceptives, not only advisable, but actually desirable. People began to think of this as a cool thing to do.