

Editorial

This third issue of RRA Notes is concerned with methodologies conducted in a number of different countries and at several different stages of the development process. The first piece illustrates very well the value of ranking techniques in understanding the complexity and importance of browse as a forage resource. Indeed the study threw up some surprising and unexpected results; it also appears that the later stages of the ranking and analysis did not add significantly to the findings generated very early on. It is also interesting that the chemical analyses, taking about one year, were apparently unnecessary - the pastoralists knew best. The second piece is a reanalysis of a repertory grid analysis used by the author in Papua New Guinea - there is of course much to be gained from this kind of disciplinary cross-over and careful evaluation of methodology. In the third piece the use of Sustainability Analysis in Thailand is described within the context of institutionalising RRA tools and techniques, and it appears to be successful at creating consensus within a multidisciplinary and multisectoral workshop - it is not threatening, it is inexpensive and effective. The final section concerns the representation of rural people's knowledge in stories, histories and portraits. These are colourful descriptions of situations encountered by an RRA team or individual whilst in the field.

These Notes are now sent to some 200 practitioners world-wide: in the next issue we plan to publish this network list to encourage the distribution of interesting reports or material between practitioners. Please, though, do continue to send in contributions - particularly if they are short. The success of these Notes depends largely upon their informality.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jules N Pretty, IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London, WC1H 0DD, UK. |
|--|