Off Grid Assemblies

Parth Patel
MFA, Design and Technology
Parsons School of Design

I arrived with a wind turbine and the assumption that I understood the problem. I left with something far more valuable: the realization that the object matters less than the process of making it together.

My thesis began with a clear goal: create off-grid electricity solutions, assuming a kit-based approach would be the answer. I envisioned delivering a packaged system that communities could deploy independently. But the process revealed a critical gap in this thinking. I had focused entirely on the solution itself while ignoring the operational reality that follows deployment. A working prototype means nothing if there's no capacity for maintenance, troubleshooting, or adaptation. You need to spend time after the solution has been deployed, not just drop it and leave.

My initial approach was flawed. I saw electricity as the critical issue, but the community in Turtuk didn't share this urgency. What captivated them wasn't the solution I brought, but the collaborative act of building itself. This disconnect revealed a fundamental truth about design: top-down approaches fail because outsiders cannot truly understand problems they don't live. I had contextual blindness. I couldn't see what they needed because I wasn't embedded in their reality.

The turbine didn't work as expected. By conventional metrics, the project failed. But when the community recorded our process to share at the local school, I understood that failure was the point. Iteration trumps any predetermined solution. If even one student keeps asking "how can we make this more efficient?" then we've succeeded in something more important than delivering electricity. We've planted the seed of agency.

For the people of Turtuk, my goal shifted to something more fundamental: teaching the error correction mechanism of problem-solving itself. I want them to not be taken aback by hiccups in any solution. The more they understand this iterative process, the easier it becomes to reiterate, improve, and adapt. Resilience comes from expecting imperfection and knowing how to respond to it.

This is where design education often goes wrong. We teach what to make when we should be teaching how to make. Understanding the process allows people to derive their own results, solutions that actually fit their context, their resources, their lived experience. The end users always know best because they inhabit the problem daily. My role wasn't to be the expert with answers, but the catalyst who could share methods and then step back.

For designers and creators working with remote communities, I want to emphasize the critical importance of collaborative processes without hierarchy. Often, the designer knows the least in these contexts. We arrive with technical knowledge but lack the contextual wisdom that only comes from living the problem. What emerged in Turtuk was a shift in the direction of inquiry: from me asking questions to them asking questions. This inversion is critical. Collaboration in design must be decentralized. The person who lives with inconsistent electricity, the person who understands local wind patterns, the person who knows where to source materials, each holds equally vital knowledge.

We left them with something unfinished, imperfect, and full of potential. The errors aren't bugs; they're invitations. Each inefficiency is a question waiting to be asked, each failure a problem waiting to be solved by them, not me. This is uncomfortable for designers trained to deliver polished solutions, but it's the only ethical path forward. Real impact isn't measured in what we build, but in the capacity for adaptation we leave behind