



**Performance Assessment of
DFID Research Funding Framework
2005 - 2007**

May 2007

By

Brian Thomson and Catherine A.C. Currie

The Performance Assessment Resource Centre

is managed by

International Organisation Development Ltd

The Portergate, 257 Ecclesall Rd, Sheffield, UK

S11 8NX

Website: <http://www.parcinfo.org>

And

16-20 Forth Street, Edinburgh, EH1 3LH, Edinburgh

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Chapter 1: Background and Methodology

Chapter 2: The Research Funding Framework and its Analytical Background

Chapter 3: Has CRD (and DFID) delivered on the RFF commitments?

Chapter 4: CRD's Research Partnerships

Chapter 5: Monitoring and Evaluation

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

Annexes

1 Basic Information: DFID's Research Objectives and Portfolio

2 The Evolution of DFID Policy on Research

3 Terms of Reference

4 Key informants and interview questionnaire

5 RFF Statements and Evidence

6 References

Abbreviations

CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CDI	Community Directed Interventions
CORAF	West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development
CRD	Central Research Department of DFID
DFID	Department For International Development
DRC	Development Research Centre
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
ICDDR,B	International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research Bangladesh
IDRC	International Development Research Centre (Canada)
IDS	Institute of Development Studies (Sussex)
IPR	Intellectual Property Right
KP	Knowledge Programme
LSHTM	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDP	Microbicide Development Project
MRC	Medical Research Council
NHS	National Health Service
PDP	Product Development Partnership
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PRISM	DFID's database of project performance
RFF	Research Funding Framework
RPC	Research Programme Consortium
UK-CDS	UK Collaborative on Development Studies

Executive Summary

1. This report aims to provide an assessment of progress in implementing DFID's 2004 Research Funding Framework (RFF), in order to inform preparation of the next research strategy.

2. Because of the absence of a performance framework for the RFF we developed an illustrative one ourselves (figure 1, page 8) and sought to assess progress against the (over fifty) commitments made in the RFF. We drew our evidence from documentary sources and from interviews with key informants. Our conclusions on progress are summarised in chapter 3 against the outcomes of the illustrative performance framework. We also reviewed the preparatory analysis for the RFF (chapter 2) in order to identify issues that merit consideration for the future. Chapters 4 and 5 consider in more depth the feedback we received from our informants and chapter 6 pulls together our conclusions and recommendations.

3. Overall, the approach of the RFF was sound and CRD has made good progress in implementing strategies to deliver on the outcomes, particularly where key actions could be implemented by funding new programmes. The increased emphasis on communications and capacity-building is impressive. It is too early to say (after two and a half years) whether the quality of the programmes will meet the outcomes themselves and the overall objective. However, there are positive indications from earlier programmes that continue to match the RFF priorities. There is scope to reinforce interdisciplinary working and the treatment of cross-cutting themes. It is not surprising that, in the time since the RFF was published, less progress was made on "long-term" issues such as developing better systems for choosing research priorities, strengthening international coordination, pushing the boundaries on communications and collaborating with the private sector beyond product development partnerships (PDPs). Monitoring and evaluation systems are satisfactory at project and programme level but there is scope to learn more systematically from experience.

4. We consider that implementation of the RFF has shown strengths in the following areas: -

- The coherence of CRD's strategic approach and willingness to try new things;
- A flexible approach to building collaborations with other funders;
- The quality and reputation of DFID staff;
- The quality of the long-term relationships developed with prominent research institutions;
- The diversity of the portfolio and funding mechanisms;
- The progress made in developing CRD's expertise in communications and giving greater emphasis to getting research into use.

5. In our view, the main opportunities for development are as follows and Chapter 6 presents more detailed recommendations for: -

- Reinforcing the strategic framework, including through better understanding of knowledge and innovation systems and through adopting an explicit performance framework and risk management strategy;
- Building synergies between the research portfolio and the rest of DFID, while living within the constraints on DFID management capacity;
- Strengthening the process for setting priorities and providing more space for innovative and agenda-setting activities;

- Fine-tuning the existing funding arrangements, including through increased funding of RPCs and implementing an “entrepreneurial” model by learning from the research foundations;
- Improving international coordination especially with southern stakeholders;
- Tackling the risks of failure in capacity-building, for example by focussing interventions where policy environments are likely to be supportive;
- Broadening and deepening its work on communications and uptake along the lines recommended in the communications background study for the RFF;
- Investigating options for leveraging private sector research beyond support for PDPs;
- Giving more emphasis to interdisciplinary working and cross-cutting themes; and
- Strengthening the use of monitoring and evaluation for learning.

Chapter 1: Background and Methodology

1.1 DFID has funded research into issues relating to international development for many years. Historically, the bulk of this work was managed by sectoral departments, such as Health and Population Department, reporting to DFID's Chief Advisers. Then in 2003, as part of a larger reorganisation, the management of research funding was brought together in Central Research Department (CRD) within Policy Division. The new department proceeded to develop a strategy for research funding which was published in the autumn of 2004 as the Research Funding Framework (RFF) 2005-2007. In 2006/7 CRD managed a budget of £116m for development research. Annex 1 provides a summary by CRD of its objectives and portfolio in March 2007. The RFF was based on considerable preparatory work and its implementation has evolved since 2004. Annex 2 describes the evolution of policy in more depth. Chapter 2 examines the logic of the RFF and compares it with the recommendations from the background analysis.

1.2 CRD commissioned this review of the RFF to assess its direction in relation to the overarching objective of "the production and uptake of technologies and policies that contribute to poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)". The aim is to produce ideas for the evolution of DFID's current research funding mechanisms in order to serve better DFID's objectives and absorb the significant increase in funding that is planned. The terms of reference (annex 3) require an assessment of the RFF's relevance, efficiency and effectiveness and consideration, in particular, of CRD's choice of funding instruments. It is also expected that the performance review will comment on impact or intermediate outcomes and assess the "health" of CRD's systems for measuring and monitoring research programmes.

1.3 The Government's 2006 White Paper commits DFID to doubling research expenditure to reach £220 million per annum by 2010/11. CRD is preparing a new five-year strategy to achieve this within a 20 year vision. This review will feed into that strategy. In addition, CRD has commissioned two other studies: -

1. A review of international research funding policy and process. The aim is to assess DFID's current and potential comparative advantage vis-à-vis other international research funders.
2. A think piece to inform decision-making about options for improving uptake of DFID research outputs by policy makers, intermediate users and end users.

1.4 There is considerable overlap between this review and the second study on getting research into use. As a result, we have spent less time on the communications aspects of our brief than we would have done otherwise. In particular, we have not interviewed any of the organisations funded by CRD to carry out communication functions, although we have covered communications issues in all our interviews with researchers and others.

1.5 This review takes place too soon to judge impact or outcomes. The RFF covered three years (2005 to 2007) and the period is not yet complete. Moreover, the initiatives outlined in the RFF have been implemented gradually since 2004 and most research programmes will take at least five years to produce significant results. Consequently, we have concentrated on assessing the direction of travel of the programme.

1.6 The RFF does not contain a performance framework with a coherent set of outcomes, outputs and activities. However, it does contain many commitments of different kinds. We have used these as the basis for judging progress, using evidence drawn from key documents and interviews both with DFID staff and CRD's partners. Chapter 3 explains our approach in more detail and summarises our findings on progress against these commitments. CRD organised a visioning and strategy workshop on 7 and 8 March 2007.

Many CRD stakeholders attended and it provided a good opportunity to set the comments from our interviewees in a broader context.

1.7 Within the limits of this short review, we have tried to obtain evidence on qualitative aspects of RFF implementation through interviews with a range of CRD's partners as well as with DFID staff. Annex 4 contains the list of our key informants and the questionnaire that we drew on for our interviews. We selected interviewees to reflect the three types of funding relationships which CRD manages: -

- Core and project funding of **multilateral** organisations (e.g. the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR));
- **Collaborative** funding of projects and programmes **with other international and UK funders of research** (e.g. the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC));
- **Bilateral** or directly managed projects and programmes **with researchers, research communicators etc.** (e.g. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), Institute of Development Studies (IDS)).

In addition, because of the emphasis of the RFF, we felt it was important to include some **southern partners** and **product development partnerships (PDP) involving the private sector**.

1.8 We interviewed 21 individuals from 15 organisations. The 15 organisations fell into the five categories as follows: -

1. Multilateral - 2
2. Collaborative – 2 international and 2 UK joint funders plus 4 representatives of collaborative research groups
3. Bilateral - 5
4. Southern – 2 (both collaborative research groups)
5. Private/PDP – 2 (one collaborative and one bilateral)

1.9 The interview group is not a representative sample. Health sector research forms the largest group of interviewees but our group does cover all four of the RFF's key researchable problems and includes examples from the three CRD research management teams (Growth and Livelihoods, Human Development and Social, Political and Environmental Change).

Chapter 2: The Research Funding Framework and its analytical background

2.1 The purpose of this chapter is to consider the logic of the RFF and whether it dealt adequately with the recommendations of the background analytical studies. Annex 2 describes the evolution of DFID thinking on research strategy. It summarises the important 2002 review, Research for Poverty Reduction (known as the “Surr report”), and other background studies; summarises the RFF itself and describes subsequent developments, including the report by the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology.

2.2 The RFF established the following objective for DFID’s research funding: -
“To promote the production and uptake of technologies and policies that will contribute to poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).”

2.3 The Surr report and background papers provided a solid base with clear recommendations for moving CRD and its research agenda forward. The four main directions of the RFF (below) reflect these documents and have been further delineated by the subsequent strategy documents on Research in Sustainable Agriculture and Product Development Partnerships: -

1. **Allocating two-thirds of research funding to four key researchable problems** – sustainable agriculture especially in Africa, killer diseases, where states do not work for the poor and climate change’s impact on poverty.
2. Giving greater emphasis to **building research-related capacity in developing countries**;
3. Investing in **getting research to users**; and
4. Developing longer-term approaches –
 - a. To improve the international process for **setting research priorities** and undertake horizon-scanning;
 - b. To strengthen **collaboration with other UK funders of research** with application for developing countries;
 - c. To contribute to **better coordination among research financiers internationally**, including information-sharing and joint-funding;
 - d. To **strengthen links with the private sector** with particular emphasis on product development for health and agriculture; and
 - e. To strengthen **monitoring and evaluation**.

2.4 The RFF did not set out an explicit hierarchy of objectives so we have produced an illustrative one (figure 1 below) drawn from the statements in the document. In general, we consider that the objectives and the logic of the approach stand up to scrutiny pretty well. The only aspect that was challenged in our interviews (see chapter 4) concerned British Government policy on sustaining UK development research capacity. This topic was dealt with extensively in the Select Committee report and the Government’s reply. Consequently, we do not see a case for changing DFID policy or the scope of the RFF in that area.

2.5 The RFF lacks an explicit consideration of risks, although a number are mentioned in the text. Figure 1 contains some of the more obvious ones. CRD should build risk management into its next strategy.

Figure 1:

RESEARCH FUNDING FRAMEWORK – ILLUSTRATIVE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK	
NARRATIVE SUMMARY	ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS
<p><u>RFF OBJECTIVE</u> To promote the production and uptake of technologies and policies that will contribute to poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDGs</p>	<p>1. Selection process reflects priorities of the poor and poverty-focussed policy-makers; 2. Selection process takes account of major emerging and “horizon” issues 3. Programmes are adequately resourced 4. Quality control process is adequate. 5. Good information available on international development research funding; 6. Developing country policy environments support capacity-building initiatives 7. Sound understanding of knowledge and innovation systems facilitates good interventions to promote uptake 8. Adequate incentives in place for private sector collaboration 9. DFID research management capacity is adequate</p>
<p><u>Outcomes</u> 1. Research programmes achieve applicable results on issues with major relevance for reducing poverty 2. Southern research and policy capacity strengthened 3. Research results communicated and uptake promoted 4. Collaboration between research funders achieves better use of resources to reduce poverty. 5. Collaboration with private sector researchers produces additional results applicable for reducing poverty. 6. M&E results promote effective learning</p>	
<p><u>Strategies to Deliver on Outcomes</u> 1a. Relevant research priorities identified 1b Good quality bilateral research programmes funded 1c Opportunities for collaborative funding identified and funded 2. Capacity-building programmes funded 3. Communication and uptake programmes funded 4. Effective systems in place to collaborate with other funders 5. Effective systems and funding in place to collaborate with private sector 6. M&E systems effective</p>	

2.6 In general, the RFF follows the recommendations of the Surr report and background studies fairly closely. The major differences are: -

1. The Surr report recommended that DFID should invest in understanding knowledge systems better since that was regarded as the appropriate intellectual framework for policy on research funding. The RFF has not picked this up, although the RFF's emphasis on bringing research suppliers and users together is consistent with a “knowledge systems” approach. We consider that this recommendation remains relevant since better understanding of knowledge and innovation systems should promote better uptake of research results and improve the relevance of research priorities.
2. The Surr report takes a broad view of research-related capacity development (i.e. irrespective of country location) but the RFF focuses exclusively on capacity-building in the south. This is a deliberate shift of emphasis which is consistent with DFID's objectives. The only argument for change might be in a relation to a specific research priority where global research capacity was inadequate and the most cost effective way to deal with the problem was to build capacity in the north. That is unlikely to happen often and should be dealt with on a case by case basis.
3. The Surr report considered all research funded by DFID and not just that funded centrally. The authors recommended further analysis of research funded by country programmes to determine whether greater investment in that area should be encouraged. One of the background studies recommended more joint funding of research-related activities in developing countries by CRD and country programmes. The Surr report also advocated better integration of DFID central, regional and country

programmes on research-related issues. The RFF explicitly excludes research and research-related activities funded by Policy Division and Regional Programmes/Country Offices. Better integration of DFID's overall research-related activities is an important issue which we return to in chapter 4.

4. The Surr report was concerned at the arbitrary nature of resource allocation between major problem areas. The authors recommended that DFID should develop a process for allocating resources based on the expected impact of the research on the development outcomes to which DFID is committed. However, they recognised the difficulty of the task and warned that a focus on the MDGs as the main guide to resource allocation might exclude research that questioned or went beyond the current orthodoxy. The selection of topics in the RFF was based on an invitation to research partners to submit topics and selection by senior DFID staff against the following criteria: -
 - a. Potential contribution to the MDGs or longer-term poverty reduction;
 - b. Researchability;
 - c. Funding from other donors; and
 - d. DFID's comparative advantage as a funder, e.g. from past networks and British expertise.

In our view, the Surr report aspired to an allocation process that was more precise and deterministic than seems possible. The main shortcoming in the RFF approach, which was freely admitted in the document, was too little consultation with developing countries and research users. The RFF proposed ways to improve that in the future. However, the outcome of the priority-setting process was not a radical shift in resources from one area to another but rather a gradual evolution of the existing pattern. For example, the RFF reinforced the predominance of agriculture and health within the portfolio in financial terms. There are sound reasons for that: the importance of both areas in relation to the MDGs, the high cost of technological as opposed to policy-focused research and the importance of pursuing promising avenues of research that were funded in the past. However, we consider that the dice may be loaded in favour of gradual evolution rather than radical change.

5. The background study on PPPs identified a much longer list of options for working with the private sector than the focus on product development partnerships that dominated the RFF. In particular, the RFF did not take up the ideas of seeking out intellectual property rights (IPRs) from the private sector and backing investments using a Venture Capital Fund approach. Nor did it cover activities designed to reform regulatory frameworks for private research. Clearly the RFF could not do everything and it is understandable for CRD to prioritise as it did. In our view, however, the broader ideas are worth revisiting in the context of larger financial resources for the future and based on recent experience of working with the private sector.
6. Similarly, the background study of communications raised ideas which were not taken forward in the RFF. The study advocated a major increase in resources with a financial target for downstream work on knowledge and communications issues at international and national level covering activities to increase the availability of information and to create an enabling environment for uptake. The RFF did not set a financial target (although CRD subsequently required each RPC to spend 10% of its grant on communications) and concentrated on bilaterally-funded work to improve the availability of information. Again, we consider that the proposals of the background study are worth revisiting in the light of CRD's experience with communications and the prospects for increased resources;
7. The Surr report recommended DFID should publish an independent assessment of research impact every three years. The RFF emphasised the importance of monitoring and evaluation at individual research programme level. We consider that CRD should adopt the Surr report's proposal for the future.

Chapter 3: Has CRD (and DFID) delivered on the RFF commitments?

Methodology

3.1 In the absence of an explicit performance framework, the first step in preparing a framework is extracting statements of intent from the relevant document, in this instance the RFF, against which to collect evidence for the performance assessment. We also used the Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture and the Communications Background Paper since both documents have guided implementation by CRD. A total of 55 commitments on performance were extracted. These statements were then sorted into outcomes, strategies to deliver on outcomes and ways of working. This sorting process involved the review team reworking the overall objectives of the RFF into outcome statements. The result formed the basis of the preliminary performance framework presented in figure 1 above. The ways of working underpinned the delivery of results across all outcomes. Collated evidence from our interviews and documentary sources was then matched against these outcomes and delivery strategies in order to interpret performance to date.

3.2 Once the evidence was collated, we considered whether or not the individual deliverables and strategies had been achieved (please see annex 5 for the detail). This interpretation was initially completed by the review team and then in participation with CRD. From this initial analysis, we were able to analyse the extent to which outcomes had been met. We then scored each of the delivery strategies and outcomes on a four category scale to assess progress in relation to the RFF's objectives: i) good progress; ii) limited progress; iii) no progress; and, iv) too early to judge.

Summary of Evidence by Outcome

3.5 Outcome 1: Research programmes achieve applicable results on issues with major relevance for reducing poverty

CRD has done well to put in place the great majority of the new research programmes that were included in the RFF, including collaborations with other donors, UK Research Councils and new commitments to product development partnerships. Moreover, the implementation of the problem focus suggested in the Surr report has led to relevant programmes for poverty reduction. However, we are not in a position to comment on the quality of these programmes, since they are too recent.

3.6 Nonetheless, a couple of positive indications can be taken from important activities which were decided upon long before the RFF was published. These projects have remained relevant and some are beginning to show interesting results. For example, work at the International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research in Bangladesh (ICDDRDB) has achieved highly applicable results in oral rehydration, zinc, family planning and the protocolised management of severely malnourished children. Work on tropical diseases has developed the concept of Community Directed Interventions (CDI) on River Blindness and as a result access has enhanced at a country level. The concept of CDI is currently being imbedded, helping research to work in the local context. Also, the Development Research Centres (DRCs) on Future and Crisis States are starting to influence DFID policies.

3.7 One of the thrusts of the RFF, designed to deliver quality, was an interdisciplinary approach to the problem areas involving social, political and institutional research together with the inclusion of cross-cutting themes, specifically gender and education. Our evidence is inadequate to draw conclusions across the board, although interdisciplinary approaches involving social and natural sciences and gender issues were evident in some of the programmes we covered. Nevertheless, we found no evidence that education has been treated as a cross-cutting issue (although disability has) and there is almost certainly scope to bolster interdisciplinary working both within research programmes and within CRD itself.

3.8 There are longer-term commitments made in the RFF where progress has been limited:

1. Improving the process for determining research priorities through both international collaboration, especially with respect to southern perspectives, and a horizon-scanning exercise. This will need some urgent attention in the run-up to the next DFID research strategy as well as some longer-term resources;
2. The RFF proposed annual bidding rounds for smaller policy-oriented projects to “promote the diversity and innovativeness of research outputs and to widen the numbers of institutions and researchers benefiting”. Subsequently, CRD decided to contract this out to the UK Research Councils (especially ESRC). This is still at an early stage but the reviewers consider that the effectiveness of this approach will be worth more detailed examination before long.

3.9 Conclusion: Delivery Strategies: Good progress
Outcome Level: Too early to judge but indications are strong
(Ref Para No: 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 51, 54, 55, 57, 61 and 62.)

3.10 Outcome 2: Southern research and policy capacity strengthened

Every RPC is required to have a capacity building element in its design (30% of total budget). A total of 11 in Health, 3 in Education, 3 in Economics and 4 in Social, Political and Environmental subjects have been funded during the lifetime of the RFF.

3.11 Two collaborations with DFID country offices have taken place: the RIPPLE project is working with the Ethiopian country office and the Wellcome Trust health programme is in Kenya and Malawi. The RFF expected collaboration with country offices to be a more significant thrust of CRD’s work than it has turned out to be. However, constraints on DFID personnel may make this unviable as a strategy so a revised approach is needed. Collaboration with other donors was also suggested in the RFF and this has been taken forward through the research collaborations with IDRC.

3.12 As in outcome 1 a positive indication of progress can be taken from an important activity which was committed to prior to the RFF. In this instance it is the work of the Microbicide Development Programme (MDP) which stands out. The Programme’s clinical trials operate through institutions in a range of African countries. More than 75% of these collaborators are now capable of delivering clinical trials of their own. MDP expect this to be sustainable after the project ends.

3.13 Capacity-building is an area of the RFF where achieving a sustainable outcome is risky. As the RFF itself comments, much depends on the wider policy and institutional environment in the countries concerned. As a result, conclusions about the impact of these activities would require a more in-depth study than we have been able to do.

3.14 Conclusion: Delivery Strategies: Good progress
Outcome Level: Too early to judge
(Ref Para No: 26, 27, 29, 46, 47)

3.15 Outcome 3: Research results communicated and uptake promoted

Prior to 2005 there was no communications team within CRD. The recommendation from the Surr report was implemented and in the two years since then, CRD has made some significant steps in the communication of development research. For example, CRD has adopted a Communications Strategy and provided guidance to researchers. Every RPC is required to spend 10% of its total budget on communications in order to promote interaction with users. Results will take time to come to the fore but there are already positive indications. Depending on the size of budget, some RPCs are appointing communications

officers or creating communication teams. In addition, CRD has taken some significant steps to create better systems for managing research knowledge so that those who need it can access it. This amounts to a solid foundation in the area of communications.

3.16 At the international level, CRD has worked with WHO and FAO looking at the role of information sharing. However, this kind of activity has not been expanded in the way the RFF suggested it might. Also, while some synthesis work has been done, progress has been limited on the RFF's commitments to promote syntheses as a tool for learning. Moreover, a number of important proposals in the communications background study have not yet been tackled, particularly the ideas for promoting innovative research systems that improve uptake. There is scope to do more here, provided more staff resources are available.

3.17 Conclusion: Delivery Strategies: Good progress in bilateral initiatives.
Limited progress at international level and on broader communications issues.
Outcome Level: Too early to judge
(Ref Para No: 40, 52, 54, SRSA and Communications Background Paper.)

3.18 Outcome 4: Collaboration between research funders achieves better use of resources to reduce poverty

Evidence of effective systems to collaborate with funders is highlighted through work with the UK Funders' Forum and at an international level by collaboration with IFORD and CGIAR. In the UK, consultations with other research funders have led to the establishment of the UK Collaborative on Development Sciences which should facilitate stronger collaboration. However, the progress expected on the Research Assessment Exercise with the Higher Education Funding Council is not yet evident. At the international level progress in strengthening coordination has been limited particularly in areas such as identifying research demand more systematically.

3.19 There are many examples of collaborative funding with other donors. On the whole, CRD has made good progress with joint funding initiatives and has participated actively in the international coordination of research funding. However, international coordination remains weak, except in specific cases such as agriculture.

3.20 Conclusion: Delivery Strategies: Good progress on collaborative funding and UK coordination.
Limited progress on international coordination.
Outcome Level: Too early to judge but indications are fair.
(Ref Para No: 24, 27, 29, 39, 47, 53, 54, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64.)

3.21 Outcome 5: Collaboration with private sector researchers produces additional results applicable for reducing poverty.

CRD has made good progress in funding PDPs: seven in the health sector and one in livestock vaccines. An undeveloped area committed to in the RFF is the promotion of alternative financial instruments and other incentives to encourage private investment in pro-poor research. Moreover, CRD has not evaluated the different kinds of partnership as proposed in the RFF.

3.22 Conclusion: Delivery Strategies: Good progress in funding PDPs.
Limited progress in other aspects of collaboration with the private sector.
Outcome Level: Too early to judge but indications are fair.
(Ref Para No: 27, 29, 61, 62, 63, 64.)

3.23 Outcome 6: M&E results promote effective learning

Regular monitoring and evaluation of all programmes funded by CRD is part of the M&E system. M&E has been carried out to review research progress against milestones. However the extent to which the level of staff input has produced effective learning is difficult to assess.

3.24 **Conclusion:** Delivery Strategies: Good progress
Outcome Level: Too early to judge but indications are fair
(Ref Para No: 53, 64, 65.)

3.25 Ways of working

In the RFF CRD committed to and has succeeded in supporting a variety of research and avoiding a monopoly of approaches. In addition, the RPCs have promoted the full involvement of developing country institutions and other local stakeholders in research programmes. While there is evidence that these ways of working are being maintained, the reviewers were concerned that commitments to an interdisciplinary approach and the integration of cross-cutting issues had not been fully adopted across research programmes and also by CRD itself. For example, the RFF proposal to address education issues in all research areas appeared not to have been implemented. There is a recognition within CRD that cross-team learning is not as strong as it might be. The reviewers consider that this could be an area for further work.

3.26 **Conclusion:** Limited Progress
(Ref Para No: 34, 37.)

Overall Conclusion

3.27 Overall, CRD has made good progress in implementing strategies to deliver on outcomes, particularly where the key actions could be implemented by funding new programmes. It is too early to say whether the quality of those programmes will deliver the outcomes themselves and the overall objective. However, there are positive indications from earlier programmes that continue to match the RFF priorities. There is scope to reinforce interdisciplinary working and the treatment of cross-cutting themes. It is not surprising that, within the course of some two and a half years, less progress was made on the “long-term” areas of the RFF such as developing better systems for choosing research priorities, international coordination, pushing the boundaries on communications issues and collaborating with the private sector beyond PDPs.

Chapter 4: CRD's Research Partnerships

4.1 The purpose of this section is to report on the common themes which emerged during the key informant interviews (see annex 4).

i. Strategy and the Research Funding Framework

4.2 We found little in the way of challenges to DFID's strategy for funding research either from researchers or other research funders. The only area of real controversy related to the issue of sustaining UK research capacity. UK researchers accepted DFID's position that it was not DFID's responsibility. However, some pointed to the probable erosion of the UK's research capacity on development issues unless that responsibility was taken on by someone within the British Government. They felt that the Research Councils were not undertaking the task. Comments included: the importance of the mutual interests between UK researchers and DFID which had proved beneficial to both sides, the need for a long-term commitment, the suggestion that DFID wanted a different kind of research than the Research Councils, the MRC's split role as researcher and funder gave them conflicting interests and concerns about access to the ESRC scheme. On the other hand, one multilateral commentator highlighted with approval DFID's lack of nationalistic impulses when funding research.

4.3 The question of sustaining UK research capacity was thoroughly reviewed in the context of the Select Committee for Science and Technology and the Government's reply. We do not consider that there is any case for DFID to change its policy. The Government established in December 2006 the UK Collaborative on Development Sciences (UK-CDS) which will bring together key funders of development science including the Office of Science and Innovation, DFID, the Research Councils and the Wellcome Trust. The UK-CDS will create a framework for a more co-ordinated approach to development research and, amongst other things will have an important role to play in monitoring the health, quality and impact of the UK research base. Consequently, it is appropriate for this issue to be on the agenda of the UK-CDS and we understand that is the case.

4.4 Interviewees offered a range of perspectives on priority-setting for research. Several commented that there cannot be a precise technique. One research manager felt that the RFF priorities had failed to take adequate account of the submissions made during the consultation process and another felt that DFID should be more systematic about identifying the gaps that need filling. Points made included the following: -

- There should be a different process for different kinds of research e.g. in the health field distinguishing between policy-relevant and disease-specific research;
- DFID could learn from the way other Government Departments do this e.g. the NHS is much more specific in identifying policy problems for researchers to tackle. [Comment – DFID is not directly comparable to the NHS since it does not fund research primarily for its own consumption.]
- Priorities should be set by funders and not by researchers (from a funder);
- There should be more scope for researcher-led priorities (from a research manager);
- Funders should base their priorities on their own capacity to support research as well as the opportunities for making an impact;
- Funders should leave themselves flexibility to respond to opportunities as they arise;
- Funders should be open to ideas that go beyond their identified priorities.

ii. Approaches to research funding

4.5 Some principles for the relationship between funder and researcher emerged from our interviews. In particular, research is a long-term business. You may see some

significant results after five years but impact takes a good deal longer (ten years?). This may not be simply because of the nature of research but also because of the time it takes to put the right management arrangements in place, e.g. for an RPC. As a result, DFID should have financial instruments to develop long-term relationships with researchers. There are a number of positive examples in the current portfolio including MDP and several DRCs and RPCs which are built on previous grants. Some researchers commented on the time that it takes for DFID and researchers to understand one another and that a sustained dialogue over several years is necessary. Five-year programmes were welcomed as superior to project grants because they supported research capacity (in the UK). However, there was some concern that DFID had reduced the possibilities of building new relationships by dropping the option of making small research grants which could be used to test new researchers.

4.6 A more entrepreneurial approach to research funding, as practised by the large private foundations, was commended by one informant. Small research grants could be an appropriate tool in that context. For example, a small grant to a researcher with a bright idea could well have a lot more impact than a much larger programme. Of course, the issue for DFID is having the capacity to make the inspired choices.

4.7 Several interviewees commend a competitive approach to funding, judged to exacting academic standards, as a good way of ensuring high quality. However, there were some concerns in the UK economic and social research community about gaining access to the ESRC scheme. This may be a greater issue for multidisciplinary approaches to research, although ESRC stressed the strong credentials of its panel in that area. Some interviewees commented that competition can have perverse effects when it comes to awarding programme grants. In particular, the RPC process had encouraged researchers to make big promises which they could not deliver with the resources provided. It was suggested that DFID had made awards in the knowledge that some successful bids were unrealistic and without tackling the issue.

4.8 One researcher commended DFID for allowing researchers to set their own priorities according to academic criteria within the DRCs. Another, who was involved in clinical trials, felt that it was much better to have a tightly defined research problem.

4.9 One commentator highlighted the tension between “rules-based” and “supportive” approaches to research funding. It is possible to set requirements for researchers and then award grants competitively according to a judgement on the extent to which proposals meet the requirements. However, that approach (exemplified in DFID’s RPCs) will only take you so far. The alternative is a supportive approach which involves the funder more directly in mentoring and in mutual learning.

4.10 Several interviewees commented on unrestricted core-funding. For example, this approach is consistent with DFID’s pressure for harmonisation in support of CGIAR’s system-wide priorities. It also promotes DFID’s influence amongst CGIAR’s donor group. A PDP manager endorsed the importance of core-funding to allow adequate management flexibility. One southern institution commented that the collective effect of donor funding decisions made management very difficult. Some donors provided core-funding and others provided project-funding but in practice it was very hard to juggle these funds to handle the significant variations in resource requirements that occurred. This underlines the importance of donors taking a holistic institutional perspective and it puts a premium on flexibility in funding arrangements. One research manager advocated core-funding of UK institutions, on the model of other European countries, but this did not emerge as a priority for others.

4.11 The RPCs attracted considerable comment including the following: -

- RPCs are an uneasy compromise between research and capacity-building;
- Some RPCs are seriously underfunded;
- Some bidders underestimated the management costs required;
- The set-up costs are high;
- The bidding process failed to give enough emphasis to the quality of the bidders' research ideas and encouraged bidders to lobby LDC Ministers for letters of support as evidence of demand;
- The formal relationships required for an RPC are not appropriate for new areas of research where researchers, both in the south and the north, have still to prove their competence. In such cases, it would be better to allow more flexibility to add and drop collaborators on the model of the DRCs;
- The formal relationships were welcomed by southern partners (in an established partnership) who felt that it reinforced their status;
- DFID's management of RPCs seems more bureaucratic than under previous arrangements.
- CRD should learn from a systematic review of the DRCs.

iii. **Communications and Uptake**

4.12 Comments from our informants generally supported the view that research works best where researchers, policy-makers and practitioners work closely together to solve a problem. Uptake and demand are linked. This led some to recommend more decentralised research structures and greater emphasis on downstream activities taking place close to the users. The subject of intermediary institutions and networks appears an underdeveloped but promising topic for research and capacity-building interventions. At the same time, there are clearly different types of research problems which require different strategies for ensuring that the research is used. One researcher commented on the tension within DFID's thinking between the focus on delivering global public goods and the emphasis on identifying country-level demand. A multilateral organisation pointed to similar issues at the international level i.e. whether to focus on basic or applied, upstream or downstream research. There was pressure from some funders and host countries for quick, location-specific results. However, the multilateral felt their role should be more upstream to generate results with wider impacts.

4.13 The Research into Use programme is an interesting initiative which should promote learning on the uptake process for natural resources research as well as generating specific impacts. However, it will be some years before a balanced view of the programme's value will be possible.

4.14 A number of researchers and research managers recognised that they needed help with communications. One experienced researcher commented that this was an area where researchers needed incentives. Several mentioned the importance of intermediary bodies, including in the south, and argued for investment in improved capacity amongst user groups and better mechanisms for getting evidence into policy-making.

4.15 Several of our informants stressed the importance of getting the right skills for communication and a number of researchers had employed communication experts within their programmes.

4.16 In general, there was strong support for DFID's strategic approach in this area. However, one informant expressed concern at the possibility of communicating untested results and another commented that interaction with CRD's communications team had not been as helpful as hoped because DFID's perspective appeared to be closer to advocacy than communications. It was important to gear communication activity to the state of the

research and the availability of results. Another informant regretted that DFID had watered down the proposals contained in the background study on communications prepared for the RFF.

4.17 ESRC's approach to communications by its grant-holders appears to be less intensive and more traditional than for other parts of CRD's portfolio. The ESRC programme was launched in August 2005 and it would be appropriate to look at the communications aspects of the partnership as part of a more general review around its mid-point, later in 2007/8. This should provide some lessons for CRD's work with the Research Councils as a group.

4.18 There was a lot of comment and concern about DFID's role as a user of research. This is dealt with below in the context of DFID's relationship with the research community.

iv. **Capacity-building**

4.19 Our interviews revealed strong commitment to capacity-building of southern researchers amongst CRD's partners. The exception was a PDP which felt that capacity-building was not part of its remit. Nor was capacity-building an explicit objective of ESRC or MRC grants. One research manager felt that there was a trade-off between the two objectives of producing good research and building capacity and that DFID should fund them separately, rather than incorporating both within a single funding instrument (i.e. RPCs). Concerns over inadequate funding of RPCs appeared to lie behind this view. However, a number of others argued that capacity-building of southern researchers should be an intrinsic part of research programmes. Views varied depending on the mandate of the organisation concerned (e.g. IDRC gives particularly strong emphasis to building capacity) and on the sector of research. There appears to be long experience of supporting southern research institutions as part of health and natural resources research programmes. For example, one large health programme claimed to have developed a number of collaborators in the south who already had the capacity to attract funding for clinical trials in future. However, that kind of experience is much less well developed in the social sciences.

4.20 There is a considerable range of involvement with capacity-building amongst researchers. Examples include: -

- Long-standing relationships between UK and southern institutions where assistance from the UK covers the provision of teaching materials and advice on academic management as well as the training of researchers;
- MRC's well-established overseas units which are in the process of "localisation" and greater integration into their national and regional contexts;
- Collaboration between UK and southern academics in the context of a DRC which is closer to mutual learning (i.e. capacity-building on both sides) but which does not engage with inexperienced researchers.

4.21 Informants wrestled with the question of how to build sustainable capacity in weak institutional environments. One argued that capacity-building for research was a waste of time unless there was evident national commitment. Consequently, DFID should do more to promote a dialogue with southern Governments on the importance of research institutions. Another advocated distinguishing between "opening" environments (e.g. South Africa in the early 1990s) where it made sense to invest in research capacity and "closing" environments where it did not. A third recommended support for regional centres of excellence while ensuring that they were engaged in field-level research.

4.22 There were several suggestions for improving capacity-building interventions: -

- Commitment needs to be long-term;
- Funding must be adequate and must go beyond what is immediately related to specific research projects – e.g. funding PhDs, supporting career development for post-doctoral researchers and providing capacity for partners to respond to local requests for expertise;
- Although northern research institutions will continue to play an important role there is scope to involve southern institutions much more as builders of capacity.

4.23 One informant commented that there is a lack of systematic evidence on the impact of capacity-building interventions. Another felt that there was inadequate evidence on how to build capacity. [Comment – there is considerable evidence on capacity-building interventions in other contexts.]

v. International donor relations

4.24 Several informants identified the area of international donor relations as an important one for DFID because it offered the prospect of avoiding duplication, identifying opportunities and gaps and encouraging additional funding for research priorities. One commented on the good quality and influential nature of DFID participation in the international forum (IFORD), while pointing out the limited impact of the forum's work. Another pointed to the weak international arrangements for coordinating health research and argued for a continuing strong DFID role. DFID's participation in CGIAR is also highly respected and influential thanks to DFID's willingness to provide unrestricted funding and a "balanced" approach to policy debates.

4.25 There are several examples of joint-funded projects with other donors under the RFF. In general, the funders we spoke to warmly endorsed their experience of working with DFID on a range of projects. Examples include the co-funded climate change work with IDRC which had enabled a major new initiative that would not have been possible otherwise. Moreover, the management arrangements had worked extremely well. The Gates Foundation felt that there were a range of untapped opportunities for further collaboration.

4.26 Harmonisation of donor policies and procedures emerged as an important issue in specific cases i.e. CGIAR and in relation to capacity-building and support for southern research institutions including CORAF.

4.27 One prominent multilateral highlighted the importance of engaging southern policy-makers in the international dialogue about research.

vi. DFID as research funder and user

4.28 DFID's joint-funding partners generally had a strongly favourable view of their relationship with DFID. They pointed to DFID's flexibility, professionalism, willingness to try new things and light touch to management. (Although one informant suggested that DFID's attitude to monitoring was incredibly laid back.)

4.29 A number of partners said that they found it hard to understand how DFID works and how researchers fit in. This was not helped by DFID's constant game of musical chairs with its staff. A period of stability would help. Concerns were expressed about DFID's capacity to exercise its research funding role. One informant was concerned that DFID should not be left behind in its understanding of the research and another wondered whether DFID had the competence to set objectives and monitor results for research. Several informants expressed concerns about what they perceived to be the inadequate staffing of CRD.

4.30 Most researchers we spoke to regard DFID as an important customer for their research and as an influential player in the wider community of research users. However, a number expressed real difficulties in engaging with DFID on the policy issues of concern to them. For some, the relationship had become more difficult to navigate following the reorganisation of Policy Division. One commented that researchers needed advocates within DFID and it was not clear who was taking on that role. Another felt that research was not sufficiently embedded in policy. A third acknowledged that DFID was prepared to change tack as a result of research evidence but argued that DFID should make much more use of the researchers they fund to inform policy debates.

4.31 A common complaint was the weakness of communications within DFID, particularly between CRD and country programmes. A number of our interviewees wanted to engage with country offices in areas such as identifying demand, getting research into use and capacity-building. However, responses from Country offices were very mixed and depended on the personal interests and capacities of individual advisers.

Chapter 5: Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 This section briefly considers the overall ‘health’ of CRD’s systems for measuring and monitoring research programmes.

Experiences of M&E at project and programme level

5.2 It was not within the remit of this review to conduct a detailed analysis of PRISM data however a representative sample of reports were taken from PRISM across the four research problem areas. Further documentation was supplied from each CRD team. From those sources, it is clear that the requisite reporting is being done by research managers and researchers.

5.3 An interesting example of a dedicated independent M&E element of a larger programme was noted in the Monitoring, Impact Assessment and Learning component of the Research into Use Programme. The remit of this component is twofold: firstly to provide the M&E function for the programme and secondly to look more comprehensively at the issue of knowledge translation i.e. how research outputs get into use and lessons for policy.

5.4 All interviewees were questioned on the M&E function of their work with DFID. While inception reports, mid term reviews and evaluations were evidenced, two further themes emerged. Firstly, what the team has chosen to call “bespoke” M&E i.e. arrangements tailored to a specific programme while ensuring compliance with DFID requirements. It appears that DFID has been keen to learn from M&E reporting by others and adapt it where suitable. For example, other research funders such as IDRC or MRC welcomed DFID’s willingness to use their own systems for monitoring. In one bilaterally-funded project, the research team found the logical framework approach difficult and developed supplementary monitoring tools, which were eventually accepted by DFID as part of the process. While the sample size does not allow us to make any statistically significant conclusions, it is interesting to generalise that these bespoke arrangements are in longer standing relationships.

5.5 The second theme to emerge was harmonised M&E. There are definite moves by DFID to harmonise M&E in research with partner funders (bilaterals and private funders). Examples include conducting joint evaluations, developing common M&E frameworks and joint reporting.

5.6 Our interviewees commented on some practical aspects of M & E. For example, two bilaterally-funded research teams experienced some confusion over what was required and when. In one of those, the ensuing discussion between them and CRD proved very useful as a way of building greater mutual understanding. One researcher felt that DFID’s approach to M&E had not allowed sufficiently for the long time scale of research work. In particular, the mid-term reviews of the RPCs were much too early to see significant progress. One researcher felt that the quality of the reviewers used by DFID was not high enough, from an academic point of view, to make the review a useful learning opportunity for the researchers concerned.

Developing a M&E strategy for the new strategic framework

5.7 The RFF did not include an explicit performance framework i.e. setting out the key outcomes by problem area and the results chain to achieving CRD’s strategic objectives. Understandably, driven from a budgeting perspective, each CRD team appears to monitor its portfolio on the basis of expenditure and individual project performance rather than on strategic deliverables or indeed direction towards desired change. The review team feels that there is a real and very timely opportunity for CRD to develop a framework which would allow them to rationalise the forthcoming strategic objectives into a set of outcomes,

intermediate milestones, outputs, activities and strategies for delivery. Such a framework would allow CRD teams to view the sum of their contributions as well as having a basis from which to judge the inclusion or exclusion of new research initiatives. It would also allow CRD to consider how its teams would work together to deliver specific outcomes. Moreover, a performance framework would facilitate external assessment and CRD's own learning process.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 This chapter pulls together the findings from chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 into conclusions against the questions in the Terms of Reference. We then make recommendations for CRD's future strategy.

Conclusions

6.2 The Relevance of the RFF's objectives and logic

Overall, the RFF follows the recommendations of the Surr report and the background studies fairly closely. In some areas the RFF was deliberately more limited in scope. The main differences are described in chapter 2 and we feel that some of the omissions should be revisited in preparing the next strategy. We have inferred a performance framework (see figure 1, page 8) and we consider that the RFF's logic stands up well to scrutiny. The RFF mentioned some of the risks to the achievement of its objectives but failed to set out a strategy for managing them.

6.3 Efficiency with which RFF has been translated into activities

Overall, CRD has made good progress in implementing strategies to deliver on the outcomes of the RFF, particularly where the key actions involved funding new programmes (see chapter 3).

6.4 The Terms of Reference ask us to consider whether CRD's financial resources had been used strategically to maximise rates of return for poverty reduction. We conclude that the research programmes pursued as a result of the RFF are clearly relevant to the overall objective. However, it is not helpful to think in terms of maximising rates of return (see the discussion of the Surr report proposals in para 2.6.4). We do not know where the gaps are or where demand is strongest. As a result, we do not know whether the opportunities missed had more or less potential than those that were undertaken. The outcome of the priority-setting process was not a radical shift in resources from one area to another but rather a gradual evolution of the existing pattern. It is hard to tell whether this makes good sense, although it plays to DFID's traditional strengths. We consider that the opportunity presented by CRD's enhanced resources could allow more space for flexibility and innovation. The RFF presented several ideas for improving the process of setting priorities but implementation was patchy.

6.5 CRD has employed a diverse range of funding mechanisms to implement the RFF. They are categorised in figure 2. The main variables are – (i) the nature of the receiving institution (multilateral institution, product development partnership, northern or southern research institute etc.); (ii) whether the funding is institution-wide (core-funding) or tied to a particular project or programme, (iii) whether funding is collaborative or joint with other donors, (iv) whether management is handled directly by CRD or contracted-out, and (v) whether the objective of project or programme funding is decided by DFID (or the managing institution) or responsive to bids from researchers. Figure 2 attempts some judgements about the strengths and weaknesses of the different mechanisms. CRD investigated this in some depth in its own Bilateral Models Working Group¹.

6.6 Overall, the diversity of CRD funding mechanisms is appropriate for the wide-ranging nature of research problems and the variety of institutions concerned. CRD has pursued a sensible evolutionary approach to its bilateral funding, for example, by continuing with DRCs at the same time as launching RPCs. The RPCs have allowed CRD to strengthen its focus on capacity-building and communications but these emphases are evident in most of the other mechanisms too. Our informants (see chapter 4) made several suggestions for improving RPCs. We think that the idea of devoting some funds to a more experimental approach merits further consideration. It is also worth assessing whether contracting-out of DFID's responsive funding to the Research Councils is stimulating new ideas and approaches and fostering new researchers in the way intended. As CRD moves towards greater financial resources with fewer staff to manage them,

¹ See their report of June 2005

DFID's comparative advantage will shift away from directly-managed programmes towards engagement with intermediaries at a strategic and institutional level.

Figure 2 Some strengths and weaknesses of CRD's funding mechanisms for research

Funding mechanism	Strengths	Weaknesses
1. Core-funding for multilateral and regional institutions (e.g. CGIAR, CORAF)	Allows larger interventions than could be funded bilaterally. Can reduce transaction costs for recipient if donors harmonise procedures. Allows wider DFID influence on policies of recipient and other funders. May leverage additional resources.	Works best with good quality recipient institutions. May involve compromises on DFID objectives to achieve wider influence.
2. Project-tied funding for multilateral and regional institutions	May help to promote a specific approach or idea	Increased transaction costs. Probably won't protect against institutional weakness
3. Collaborative/joint funding of research projects/programmes and PDPs a. directed (e.g. IDRC, PDPs) b. responsive (e.g. ESRC)	Allows larger interventions than could be funded bilaterally. Allows contracting-out of management with potential for reduced costs. May leverage additional resources. Programme/project choice can be directed or responsive. Responsive programmes allow scope for researchers to come up with innovative ideas. Where management process independent from research suppliers, promotes value for money.	Reduced DFID control compared to directly managed interventions. Responsive programmes discourage long-term approaches.
4. Directly managed projects or programmes a. RPCs	Formal structure promotes southern participation. Can address both research and capacity-building objectives. 5 year grant. Broad research objectives. Focus on communications. Competitive approach promotes quality	Formal structure is difficult for new research areas. High set-up costs. High management requirement for RPC director. Competitive approach requires high quality review. 5 years too short. Complex objectives. Under-resourced.
b. DRCs/KPs	As above except - Looser structure than RPCs allows greater flexibility for experimentation. Approach has evolved in the light of changing CRD policies.	As above except - Looser structure gives less emphasis to southern participation. Possibly, lower management costs for researchers.
c. Responsive projects and programmes [currently no examples]	Allows scope for researchers to come up with innovative ideas, beyond the current agenda. Allows scope to try out new researchers	High management costs. Past track record raises questions on quality. Grants tend to be small and short-term

6.7 Our informants came from across the range of CRD's partnerships (see chapter 4 and Annex 4). We found widespread support for CRD's strategic approach but concerns about the sustainability of UK research capacity on development issues. DFID is widely respected by partners for its contribution at international level and has achieved effective collaborations with other research funders. Some researchers have high expectations of engagement with DFID which are coloured by past management arrangements. They value long-term relationships and seek closer interaction with DFID, for example on the policy implications of their research, than has been achieved recently.

Effectiveness of the RFF to date

6.8 It is too early to say whether the quality of the programmes launched by the RFF will deliver the RFF's outcomes and the overall objective. However, there are positive indications from earlier programmes that continue to match RFF priorities. There is scope for improving quality by giving more emphasis to interdisciplinary working and cross-cutting themes. Less progress was made on the "long-term" areas of the RFF such as developing better systems for choosing research priorities, international coordination and collaborating with the private sector beyond PDPs. Monitoring and evaluation systems are satisfactory at project and programme level but there is scope to learn more systematically from experience.

6.9 Our informants made a range of comments that suggest the effectiveness of research is constrained by DFID's own limitations. In particular, they highlighted gaps between research and policy within DFID and weak communications with Regional Divisions and Country Offices on research-related issues. Moreover, CRD's existing staff resources are barely adequate to provide the kind of supportive management and policy engagement that researchers want. Ideally, greater efforts are needed to make the most of DFID's own potential to put research into use. We are aware that discussions are under way to look at the best operational model for research management given the tight constraints on DFID staffing. Nonetheless, DFID will not realise the full potential of its support for research unless these issues are tackled.

6.10 We consider that implementation of the RFF has shown strengths in the following areas: -

- The coherence of CRD's strategic approach and willingness to try new things;
- A flexible approach to building collaborations with other funders;
- The quality and reputation of DFID staff;
- The quality of the long-term relationships developed with prominent research institutions;
- The diversity of the portfolio and funding mechanisms;
- The progress made in developing CRD's expertise in communications and giving greater emphasis to getting research into use.

6.11 In our view, the main opportunities for development lie in the following areas: -

- Reinforcing the strategic framework including through better understanding of knowledge and innovation systems and through adopting an explicit performance framework and risk management strategy;
- Building synergies between the research portfolio and the rest of DFID, while living within the constraints on DFID management capacity;
- Strengthening the process for setting priorities and providing more space for innovative and agenda-setting activities;
- Fine-tuning the existing funding arrangements, including through increased funding of RPCs and implementing an "entrepreneurial" model by learning from the research foundations;
- Improving international coordination especially with southern stakeholders;
- Tackling the risks of failure in capacity-building, for example by focussing interventions where policy environments are likely to be supportive;
- Broadening and deepening work on communications and uptake along the lines recommended in the communications background study for the RFF;
- Investigating options for leveraging private sector research beyond support for PDPs;

-
- Giving more emphasis to interdisciplinary working and cross-cutting themes; and
 - Strengthening the use of monitoring and evaluation for learning.

The health of CRD's systems for measuring and monitoring research programmes.

6.11 Financial monitoring systems are satisfactory and there is a defined process for M&E including punctual check points such as current plans for Mid Term Reviews of RPCs. Greater focus is needed on developing an effective system for information sharing and learning that will be required to meet CRD's overarching objective. CRD should consider outsourcing elements of programme monitoring and focus instead on promoting the learning process.

Part Two: Recommendations for CRD's future strategy.

Strategic and Institutional Framework

1. DFID should invest in understanding knowledge and innovation systems (para 2.6.1). The Surr report made this recommendation to strengthen the foundations of effective research. It remains an issue since better understanding of knowledge and innovation systems should promote better uptake of research results and improve the relevance of research priorities. CRD should consider funding appropriate research in this area as part of the next research strategy. See also recommendation 17 on communications.
2. DFID should take steps to integrate all its research-related activities across Policy and Regional Divisions (para 2.6.3 and paras 4.30 and 4.31). The overall impact of DFID's activities related to research would be strengthened with better internal coordination. An overview would be helpful as a way of linking policy studies commissioned by Policy and Regional Division teams with centrally-funded research and helping DFID strengthen its significant role in international innovation systems. Stronger collaboration between CRD and Regional and Country Teams on uptake and capacity-building would also be beneficial.
3. CRD should consider commissioning a special programme aimed at identifying and building synergies between the research portfolio and DFID staff in Policy and Regional Divisions as well as Country Offices. This will be particularly important if DFID decides to contract out the bulk of central research management. The aim is to ensure that the linkages between research and DFID's policy work and country programmes are not weakened but strengthened. A first step could be to identify a limited number of country programmes and areas of policy where the potential links seem strongest. CRD could then commission some experimental joint initiatives.
4. CRD should include a performance management framework and proposals for managing risks in its next strategy (paras 5.7 and 2.5). This framework would facilitate the process of clarifying responsibilities within CRD for delivery of outcomes.

Setting Priorities

5. When setting priorities for research in the next strategy, CRD should invest in consulting developing country stakeholders and research users, should take account of its capacity to support particular research topics with appropriate expertise as one of the criteria for choice and should consider whether it can learn more from the experience of other British Government Departments. The existing Funders' Forums represent a good starting point for the latter but there may be a case for taking this further. (Paras 2.6.4, 3.7.1 and 4.4)
6. CRD should leave some modest space in the programme to fund research proposals that are innovative, challenge the current orthodoxy and contribute to setting the future agenda (para 2.6.4). This may require an innovative funding mechanism (see below).
7. CRD should allow scope to respond to opportunities and emerging issues during the five year strategy period. This could be achieved by a combination of a horizon-scanning initiative, reviewing priorities after an interval and staggering the award of new research contracts (para 4.4).
8. CRD should reinforce the "problem focus" of the RFF by encouraging greater attention to interdisciplinary working and cross-cutting themes. A wider assessment of current practice and the scope for improvement could be linked to forthcoming reviews of research programmes.

Funding arrangements

-
9. CRD should retain a broad array of funding options to cope with the diversity of research that it supports. This should include core-funding of international and southern institutions, co-financing of major programmes, five-year (and longer) programme grants and small grants (para. 6.6).
 10. CRD should offer arrangements that will develop long-term relationships with good researchers. This requires small grants to test new researchers that can be followed with more substantial support where justified (para 4.5).
 11. Since DFID's management constraints will not allow CRD to support researchers directly, particularly those in developing countries, CRD should increasingly look to funding through intermediaries with good records in supporting southern researchers (para 4.9).
 12. CRD should maintain options for responsive funding to achieve the RFF objective of promoting the diversity and innovation of research outputs. CRD's collaboration with the UK Research Councils in this area is still at an early stage but the effectiveness of this approach will be worth more detailed examination before long. CRD should review the progress of the ESRC scheme at its mid-point later this year including with reference to communications and uptake issues (paras 4.4 and 4.17).
 13. CRD should consider taking a more entrepreneurial approach by learning from the experience of the research foundations and risking some of its resources to sponsor bright ideas and grow new talent that may attract mainstream funding in due course (para 4.6).
 14. CRD should take advantage of the sunk costs and increase funding for the best RPCs. The forthcoming mid-term reviews, which should involve good quality peer review, will allow some judgements to be made about potential, albeit at an early stage in the research. Those reviews should be complemented by a competitive process, again involving peer review, to judge proposals for additional funds. (Para 4.11)
 15. CRD should ensure that the lessons from the experience of the DRCs and KPs are learned, if necessary by commissioning a meta-evaluation (para 4.11).
 16. CRD should consider the case for greater flexibility in the constitution of RPCs in a few research areas where partnerships need time to develop and formal commitments are not appropriate at the outset. (para 4.11).

Capacity-building

17. CRD should consider a number of capacity-building issues further in preparing its next research strategy. In particular:
 - o how to deal with the challenges posed by weak institutional and policy environments in a way that is consistent with DFID as a whole;
 - o whether the time horizon for CRD's commitments (normally five years) is long enough for capacity-building interventions;
 - o whether there are better options than the current emphasis on capacity-building through RPCs. These might include bilateral projects sponsored jointly with DFID regional divisions (although the scope for that will be limited by staff constraints) as well as partnerships with organisations such as IDRC, the African Capacity Building Foundation and various research and user networks. (paras 3.10, 3.12 and 4.22)
18. CRD should help the research community's learning process by making available a summary of the experience from capacity-building interventions in other sectors². These lessons include the crucial importance of the broader policy, institutional and financial context and the need for deep-rooted local ownership. (Para 4.23)

Communications and uptake

19. CRD should re-examine the proposals in the communications background study with a view to increasing and broadening the activities funded. In particular, there is scope to build on existing achievements by promoting international fora and by collaborating with international development research initiatives to strengthen research communications. More work is needed too on creating an enabling environment for uptake. (paras 2.6.6 and 3.14)

Private sector

² See for example the summary of some of DFID's experience in the PCR Synthesis Report 2005 EV664

-
20. CRD should re-examine the proposals in the background study on leveraging private sector research. In particular, CRD should investigate the potential for (a) improving regulatory environments for research investments and (b) taking advantage of IPR held by the private sector other than the pharmaceutical industry, for example through an opportunistic venture capital business model. (paras 2.6.5, 3.19)

International coordination

21. CRD should build on its efforts to improve international donor coordination but, given the patchy institutional framework, an opportunistic approach is appropriate. Mainstream DFID policies on harmonisation and alignment should be adapted for the very different research context and only implemented where they make sense. Harmonisation is required where there are lots of donors and where the recipients are southern based institutions. From CRD's portfolio examples include CGIAR and CORAF. In other contexts international coordination could focus on information-sharing, promoting good practice (e.g. on communications) and generating ideas on research priorities. (para 4.26)
22. CRD should do more to strengthen and improve the quality of international dialogue with southern policy-makers about a range of topics including uptake, research priorities and improving the policy environment for southern research capacity. (para 4.27)

Monitoring and evaluation

23. CRD should publish an independent assessment of research impact every three years. (para 2.6.7)
24. CRD should strengthen its project monitoring and evaluation by improving the dialogue with researchers and should consider options for making reviews a better learning process for all sides, for example by strengthening the quality of peer reviewers. It is important to get the right mix of evaluation experience and research skills in contracted resources. Maintaining the focus on harmonised approaches with other donors will continue to be important.
25. CRD should strengthen its own learning by making more systematic use of M&E processes. This will involve taking stock of experience across internal team boundaries with a view to learning the broader lessons. Ideally this should be an internal exercise but it may be necessary to commission some synthesis work. Topics that could be addressed include funding arrangements (see recommendations 10 and 13), the progress made on interdisciplinary working and cross-cutting themes across the portfolio and its impact on quality (recommendation 8), and a comparative review of public-private partnerships as proposed in the RFF.

ANNEX 1

BASIC INFORMATION: DFID'S RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND PORTFOLIO

[Extracted from CRD paper for the Visioning and Strategy Workshop 7/8 March 2007]

1. DFID's research goal, set out in the Research Funding Framework 2005-7, is to contribute to poverty reduction in partner countries by promoting the production and adoption of technologies and policies that will help reduce poverty and achieve the MDGs. The International Development Secretary's priorities for research are: climate change, killer diseases, sustainable agriculture, water & sanitation and more effective states for the poor. Two-thirds of DFID's central research funds are devoted to these themes. DFID conducts no long-term research in-house. The role of Central Research Department is to identify and manage research that it believes will provide the best rates of return for poverty reduction.

2. DFID's objectives are for research to be *problem led* and *responsive to users*; to increase *developing country capacity* to do research and to get *research into use*.³ Other objectives relate to positioning: DFID wants to use its funds to leverage additional international funding for international development research and get wider collaboration with UK science. (A UK Collaborative for Development Sciences was recently established for this latter purpose⁴.)

3. DFID's budget for centrally funded research is £116 million in 2006/7, rising to £220 million by 2010. Traditionally, sustainable agriculture and health have accounted for around 70% of investment, but the programme on climate change and environmental issues is growing rapidly.

3. DFID funds the following types of research⁵:

- Basic, strategic and translational, including clinical trials
- Applied, adaptive and implementation research
- Developmental - research into use and communication with end users
- Capacity building to do and use research
- Research dissemination and synthesis

4. Funds are channelled through a number of modalities, the distribution between each being roughly as follows:

(i) Multilateral Core-funded	44%
(ii) Bilateral/directly managed	
- UK Research Councils (mainly responsive mode)	20%
- Research Programme Consortia (28 in total)	15%

³ DFID's approach is to generate and make available new knowledge as a pro poor public good, rather than as a consumable for its own operations, although DFID staff are, of course one audience for DFID funded research

⁴ The UK Collaborative for Development Sciences (UK-CDS) brings together key funders of development science. The founder members of the Collaborative will be the Office of Science and Innovation, DFID, the Research Councils and the Wellcome Trust, who will be supported in an advisory capacity by the Gates Foundation. It will help improve co-ordination of UK medical, agricultural, environmental and other areas of research that will help combat disease and eradicate poverty in the developing world.

⁵ DFID's policy groups commission shorter term research and analysis to inform policy. Research, analysis and statistical surveys related directly to achieving and monitoring DFID'S country programme objectives are also commissioned.

- Other directly managed projects 13%

(iii) Joint/ collaborative (e.g. with IDRC) 8%

5. Research is funded in the following areas:

Development socio-economics and governance: around £6.7 million in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Future states		UN Research Institute for Social Development
Crisis states		
Chronic poverty		
Citizenship and participation		
Migration and globalisation		
Inequality, human security and ethnicity		
Children and poverty		
Women's empowerment		
Faiths in development		
Disability		
Power, politics and the state (planning/tendering stage)		
Urbanisation (pending)		
Aid effectiveness (pending)		

Environmental change: around £5.5 million in 2006/07 (rising to £9.3 million in 2007/08)

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Water and sanitation	Climate change adaptation in Africa	
Energy for the poor (planning/tendering)	Eco-system services (pending)	

Agriculture and natural resources: around £34 million in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Research into use programme	Responsive programme with Biological and Biosciences Research Council	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
African regional research programmes and one planned for India		Core and project support to other international centres

Transport: around £4 million in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Transport Knowledge Programme	Community transport in SE Asia (WB)	Transport and Rural Infrastructure Services Learning and Sharing Partnership (WB trust fund)

Growth and economics: around £1.5 million in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Institutions for Pro-Poor Growth Research programme consortia		World Bank Trust Fund – Knowledge for Change
		Training grants through World Institute for Development Economics research

Health and HIV and AIDS: around £46 in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Health systems	Maternal mortality assessment	WHO Tropical Diseases and Human Reproduction research
Sexual and reproductive health and rights	Partnership with Medical Research Council, including major clinical trials (Microbicide and HIV treatment)	Product development – AIDS vaccine and Microbicides
Mother and infant care	Tobacco control	Product development – new drugs for malaria, TB, neglected diseases
Mental health		International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research Bangladesh
HIV treatment and care		
Economics of HIV and AIDS		
Communicable diseases and poverty		
Effective Healthcare alliance		
Applied health research		
Clinical trial and capacity building (Vit A)		

Education: around £1.6m million in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Education quality		
Education access		
Education outcomes		

Science and Technology: around £0.2m in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
		NEPAD – assistance to Strategy for Science and Technology

Research communication and dissemination: around £6.7m in 2006/07

Bilateral	Collaborative/joint	Multilateral
Media capacity to use research	Information Communications Technology in development	Platforms providing free on-line access to research and high quality scientific journals
Range of web based, electronic and print information services for development decision makers	Support to science and technology journalists' associations	Networks linking Southern researcher institutes and building their capacity for research dissemination
Science news digests		International information standards for research

Multi-media support to broadcast/disseminate outputs of DFID research		Information exchange about agricultural technology
Portal for DFID centrally funded research		Integrity in public sector information and records systems
		District-level public health information system for Africa

ANNEX 2 THE EVOLUTION OF DFID POLICY ON RESEARCH

1 This Annex describes the preparatory analytical work for the RFF, summarises the RFF itself and sets it in the context of subsequent developments, including the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology and the Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture.

Surr Report

2 The RFF was based on considerable preparatory work from 2002 to 2004, including a major review of DFID's research funding⁶ (known as the Surr report) and individual studies of research communications⁷, in-country research⁸, collaboration with the private sector⁹ and a review of DFID's role in the national research effort¹⁰.

3 The Surr report proposed policies to guide DFID's research work over the longer-term in order to contribute to poverty reduction. The report's thinking located research within the wider context of knowledge or innovation systems. This implied that the impact of research depended on factors such as user engagement in the research process and effective networking between suppliers and users.

4 The authors acknowledged the quality of much of DFID's research effort and their proposals represented an evolution of current practice rather than completely new approaches. The report identified a number of issues to be addressed arising from the way DFID managed research funding in 2002. These included: -

- Centrally funded versus country programme funded research – the authors acknowledged the split between DFID's central departments who funded research of global significance and the role of DFID country programmes in promoting country-focussed activities. They felt that DFID country programmes might be under investing in research but further analysis was needed;
- Commissioned versus responsive research – they endorsed the trend towards more commissioned programmes. However, they advocated that a small but significant proportion of funds should be retained in responsive mode for work that was innovative, challenged the current orthodoxy and contributed to setting the future agenda;
- The growth of Development Research Centres (and similar long-term research programmes) – there appeared to be considerable benefits from achieving a critical mass of effort so the authors welcomed this trend and felt that DFID should fund far fewer small, supply-driven, non-strategic research projects;
- Diverse management systems – they considered that the current widely different management systems for different kinds of research could be appropriate but this diversity limited opportunities for lesson learning and joint approaches across the research programme;
- Outsourcing management – it was not clear whether this was cost effective and DFID needed better management information to judge how best to obtain value for money;
- The role of UK institutions and future of the UK resource – The authors considered that long-running relationships between DFID and specific UK institutions would be disrupted and their DFID funding would probably decline as a result of the decision to untie research funding. However, they argued that untying could improve the quality of DFID-funded research by increasing competition. DFID should make explicit its strategic vision about the research capability it needed, where it would be optimally located (i.e. in developing countries or elsewhere) and how to ensure that it would be available when required.

5 The Surr report put forward the following elements for a research strategy: -

⁶ Research for Poverty Reduction, Surr et al, Nov. 2002

⁷ New DFID Research Strategy: Communications Theme. Dodsworth et al. Dec. 2003.

⁸ Effective In-country Research. Spray and Thomas. Aug. 2003

⁹ DFID new research strategy: leveraging private sector research. Holden and Brown. 2003

¹⁰ Review of DFID's role in the national research effort, Aton and Grant, August 2003.

- Research-related capacities in developing countries need to be strengthened in order to access, produce and utilise research;
- User engagement must be increased both to determine research needs and to facilitate uptake;
- Uptake mechanisms need to be strengthened within developing countries, the international development community and DFID. This will involve more emphasis on downstream activities;
- Mechanisms for allocating resources and management structures need to be developed to enable the optimal balance for DFID's whole research effort;
- A more international approach needs to be taken to resource allocation based on comparative advantage;
- Research on sectors should be replaced by research on problems;
- DFID should consider what research capacities are likely to be required over the longer-term and should determine how best to strengthen and influence them;
- DFID should leverage private sector research towards a pro-poor agenda;
- DFID's central, regional and country research effort should be better integrated;
- The full range of UK government support to research should be better joined-up to bear more directly on the fight to eliminate poverty;
- DFID should establish a central research group to manage the programme using a single research strategy. DFID should strengthen its research management capacity.

Background Studies

6 The background study on uptake and communications produced some radical proposals for a large increase in resources allocated to this work. The study proposed that CRD should spend at least 10% of its budget on knowledge and communication activities beyond research projects and within each research project a further 10% of the grant should be devoted to communications. The authors recommended that DFID should aim both to increase the volume of useful research information available and create an enabling environment for uptake at international, regional and local levels. Various suggestions for new programmes were made which would: -

- Establish good communications in commissioned research based on partnerships between researchers and policymakers or users;
- Build better international systems to make research accessible to those who need it; and
- Develop innovative communications systems to improve uptake (e.g. through action research to explore constraints to uptake, research-policy linkages, the nature of demand etc. and through collaboration with international initiatives).

7 The background study on in-country research proposed two approaches to increase DFID funding for research within developing countries: co-funding by CRD of projects identified by DFID country offices (often to develop capacity for policy analysis or technology development rather than just research); and contracting-out such activities to the IDRC which had well-established programmes in that area.

8 The third background study considered the options to leverage private sector research. The authors' analysed ways to strengthen the incentives for the private sector to invest in new technologies of value for poverty reduction. The options fell into three categories: – increasing the value of the market through global procurement funds or advanced purchase contracts etc.; sharing the costs of research through public private partnerships (PPPs) etc. and reducing the costs of investing in research through improved regulation. The study recommended that DFID should: -

1. Help to put in place an international framework to coordinate investments because of the proliferation of PPPs and Global Funds in the health sector;
2. Improve its capacity to manage PPP investments and invest in the Global Alliance on Livestock Vaccines

-
3. Seek out and use Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) held by the private sector that are relevant to poverty reduction. The study suggested a Venture Capital Fund business model as a possible approach.
 4. Work to simplify regulatory frameworks at international and national levels in order to encourage private research.

9 The review of DFID's role in the national research effort concluded that: i) the awareness of DFID's R&D activities with other UK funders of research is low; ii) There are a number of opportunities for DFID to enter into mutually beneficial partnerships with UK funders of research; iii) in comparison to other UK funders of research, DFID's R&D activity is understaffed; and, iv) there is an opportunity for DFID to take a forward-looking strategic approach to setting research priorities. From these conclusions the authors recommended that DFID:

- Take a more proactive stance in engaging with other UK funders of research by establishing a Funders' Forum on Research in International Development;
- Evaluate the merit of continuing its concordat with the MRC and entering into new concordats with the NERC and ESRC;
- Recruit suitably qualified individual to oversee DFID's R&D interests in the UK setting;
- Establish a horizon scanning research programme.

The Research Funding Framework

10 The RFF picked up most of these themes. However, it confined itself to DFID's centrally-funded research work by excluding the short-term analytical work commissioned by Policy Division and activities funded by DFID country programmes. It also excluded consideration of DFID's role as a consumer of research.

11 The RFF established the following objective for DFID's research funding: -
"To promote the production and uptake of technologies and policies that will contribute to poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals."

12 In summary, the RFF set out four main directions for achieving this aim: -

5. **Allocating two-thirds of research funding to four key researchable problems** – sustainable agriculture especially in Africa, killer diseases, where states do not work for the poor and climate change's impact on poverty. The RFF identified a range of further areas where research proposals would be sought and committed DFID to maintaining an annual bidding round for smaller policy-oriented projects;
6. Giving greater emphasis to **building research-related capacity in developing countries**;
7. Investing in **getting research to users**; and
8. Developing longer-term approaches –
 - a. To improve the international process for **setting research priorities** and undertake horizon-scanning;
 - b. To strengthen **collaboration with other UK funders of research** with application for developing countries;
 - c. To contribute to **better coordination among research financiers internationally**, including information-sharing and joint-funding;
 - d. To **strengthen links with the private sector** with particular emphasis on product development for health and agriculture; and
 - e. To strengthen **monitoring and evaluation**.

13 The RFF initiated an international bidding process for five-year programme grants for Research Programme Consortia (RPCs) which would include developing country institutes. It also stressed the importance of adopting an interdisciplinary approach to address the key researchable problems.

Since the RFF was published

14 While the RFF was reaching its finishing stages, DFID's approach to science and technology was subject to investigation by the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee which produced a critical report in October 2004¹¹. The Government's reply¹² contains some important clarifications of DFID's position on managing research. The key points were: -

1. strengthening DFID's scientific expertise through the appointment of a Chief Scientific Adviser in Dec 2004 and recruiting skilled staff for CRD. The Chief Scientific Adviser was given responsibility for horizon-scanning for future research priorities;
2. committing DFID to produce a science and innovation strategy by 2005 which, amongst other things, would deal with the roles and interrelationships of the different parts of DFID. (The strategy has not yet been published.)
3. strongly defending DFID's decision to untie its research funding and committing DFID to advocate untying by other donors;
4. emphasising that the responsibility for the health of the UK resource for development research lay not with DFID but with the Office of Science and Technology, the UK Research Councils and the Higher Education Funding Council.

15 DFID has also developed its research funding policies further since the RFF was published. CRD published a Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture in August 2005 which took forward the themes of the RFF in the following ways: -

1. by continuing to support international agricultural research, especially through the 15 centres of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR);
2. by establishing a new Research into Use programme which would promote the use of 30 successful technologies developed from DFID's earlier research programmes;
3. by establishing four regional research programmes in West, East and Southern Africa and South Asia in close partnership with existing regional organisations; and
4. by establishing responsive research programmes jointly with UK Research Councils.

16 In October 2005 CRD issued a strategy paper on product development partnerships (PDPs)¹³ which underlined the value of PDPs for achieving DFID's objectives and proposed that: -

1. DFID new investments in PDPs should follow the criteria of proven effectiveness, CRD's policy focus on killer diseases, maximum impact on the poor plus risk-sharing with other donors; and,
2. DFID should develop its role in influencing, donor coordination and advocacy especially to promote resource mobilisation and advanced purchase mechanisms.

¹¹ The Use of Science in UK International Development Policy. House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology. Thirteenth Report of Session 2003-04. Oct. 2004

¹² Government response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2003-04. Jan. 2005

¹³ Investing in new tools for HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis through Public Private Partnerships. Alistair Ager, Joanna McGowan, Val Snewin and Saul Walker. Central Research Department Strategy Paper. October 2005.

ANNEX 3 - TERMS OF REFERENCE, PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF DFID RESEARCH FUNDING FRAMEWORK 2005-2007

Background

1. DFID's strategy for centrally managed research is set out in a Research Funding Framework (RFF) 2005-2007. The RFF groups DFID's research effort into four main thematic areas or "key researchable problems": sustainable agriculture; making states work for the poor; "killer diseases"; and environmental change. The RFF also addresses the findings of a major review of DFID's research funding¹⁴, which recommended DFID increase the impact of its research investment by: building developing country research capacity; paying more attention to getting research into use; positioning DFID research within a broader, international context; and increasing collaboration with other research funders, including the private sector and UK science base.

3. During 2007, DFID will develop a successor research strategy, to run over five years (2008/9-2012/13). This will reflect, amongst other themes the priorities set out in DFID's 2006 White Paper on International Development: Making Governance Work for Poor People. DFID now requires a rapid and light assessment of progress against the current framework in order to inform future plans. In a number of areas, it will be less than twenty months since the new models and procedures have been implemented: the emphasis of the performance review will therefore be at the activity-level, including drawing out examples of good practice.

4. Central Research Department (CRD) uses a range of mechanisms to fund research. These include Research Programme Consortia (a partnership between developing country and usually UK-based research institutes); funding regional research systems; joint funding with other donors (including responsive research programmes with UK Research Councils); public/private Product Development Partnerships (especially to develop new drugs and vaccines); and core funding to such multilaterals such as the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

Purpose and objectives

3. The **purpose** of the performance review is to assess the direction of the RFF in relation to its overarching objective of "the production and uptake of technologies and policies that contribute to poverty reduction and the MDGs", including drawing out examples of good practice. The review will consider in particular CRD's choice of funding instruments (ie funding mechanisms) and their suitability to RFF aims.

4. In so doing, the review will consider the RFF in terms of:

DFID processes

- A brief assessment of the **relevance** of RFF objectives and logic behind them. *Are the objectives consistent with the overall RFF goal; are they still valid and have the recommendations of the Surr report been adequately addressed?*
- A considered assessment of the **efficiency** with which the RFF has been translated into activities. *What are the strengths and weaknesses of the funding mechanisms currently used; the quality of the partnerships/collaborations made; have financial resources been used strategically to maximise rates of return for poverty reduction?*
- A considered assessment of the overall **effectiveness** of the RFF to date in: *generating policies/technologies and promoting their uptake; building developing country capacity to*

¹⁴ Research for Poverty Reduction, Surr et al, 2002

do, access and use research; and communicating the findings and implications of research to a range of practitioners. Where has most and least progress been made and what have been key success factors?

5. To the extent possible, the performance review will comment on what can be said at this stage about impact, or at least about intermediate outcomes. A brief assessment of the overall “health” of CRD’s systems for measuring and monitoring research programmes is also required.

6. The review will conclude with recommendations and ideas on how DFID’s current research funding mechanisms could/should evolve to better serve DFID’s research objectives and as a basis for absorbing significant increase in funding. (Detailed analysis of proposals emerging from the assignment can be considered in more detail during the mid term reviews of a number of Research Programme Consortia, which are due to take place in June 2007.)

Methodology, outputs and timing

7. The consultants will produce a report of no more than 20 pages, including an executive summary (but excluding any annexes).

8. CRD will carry out initial data collection in order to provide an RFF history and overview. DFID will provide a list of key stakeholders to act as key informants to the evaluation. CRD will also provide access to performance management information on PRISM and co-ordinate meetings required with CRD advisers and research management staff.

9. CRD will provide up to 20 consultancy days for this assignment. CRD’s expectation is that the consultancy will start in January 2007 and run over a four-week period. The consultants will be responsible for submitting an interim report two weeks into the assignment on which CRD will comment.

10. In response to this TOR the consultants will be required to submit their proposed methodology and workplan.

Competence and expertise requirements

11. A team of two consultants is required to undertake this assignment, including a team leader. The team requires a combined skill set and experience in the following areas:

- Extensive experience of evaluating DFID programmes, preferably including research funding
- Knowledge of DFID objectives and organisational processes, particularly for monitoring and evaluation
- Background in research and research capacity building
- Familiarity with both UK research organisations/stakeholders and DC research environment
- Excellent interpersonal, organisational and writing skills

ANNEX 4 - KEY INFORMANTS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>
MULTILATERAL	
<i>Francisco Reifschneider</i>	<i>Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research</i>
<i>Robert Ridley</i>	<i>WHO</i>
COLLABORATIVE	
<i>Hannah Kettler</i>	<i>Gates Foundation</i>
<i>Nina Schwab</i>	<i>Global TB Alliance</i>
<i>David Sack</i>	<i>International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh</i>
<i>Paco Sereme</i>	<i>CORAF</i>
<i>Sara Bennett</i>	<i>Alliance for Health policy and Systems Research/WHO</i>
<i>Claire Newland</i>	<i>Medical Research Council</i>
<i>Rohinton Medhora & Lauchlan Munro</i>	<i>International Development Research Centre</i>
<i>Ian Diamond</i>	<i>Economic and Social Research Council</i>
BILATERAL	
<i>Jonathan Weber & Sheena McCormack</i>	<i>Imperial College and Medical Research Council</i>
<i>James Putzel</i>	<i>London School of Economics</i>
<i>Andy Haines & Anne Mills</i>	<i>London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine</i>
<i>Simon Maxwell & John Young</i>	<i>Overseas Development Institute</i>
<i>Tim Donaldson</i>	<i>Research into Use Programme</i>
DFID	
<i>Paul Spray</i>	<i>Previous Head of CRD</i>
<i>John Burton</i>	<i>Head Pan-Africa Department</i>
<i>David Howlett, Sue Kinn, Simon Anderson, Dylan Winder, Richard Thomas</i>	<i>CRD</i>

**Performance Assessment of Research Funding Framework
By
Performance Assessment Resource Centre¹⁵**

Interview Schedule

1. *How would you describe your relationship with CRD and DFID generally? Which team or teams do you work with (within CRD and DFID)? How long have you had this relationship? Is DFID the sole funder you are involved with on this specific project?*
2. *What are the objectives of your work with CRD and how does this relationship support this?*
3. *Do you have designated roles? How does the relationship compare with other research institutional relationships you hold?*
4. *How do you track results within the relationship?*
5. *How have you defined your research? Does it have a disciplinary focus? Does it accommodate broader issues? If so, how?*
6. *Will your work result in stronger capacity in southern institutions? If so, which ones and how? What are the implications for your research activities?*
7. *Do you have a communication strategy? How has it been operationalised? What has it contributed towards?*
8. *How are you engaging with partners and other organisations to deliver the results?*
9. *How did you assess demand for the outputs and outcomes from your work/research/projects?*
10. *How will you or are you assessing the impact of your work?*
11. *Are there any other important factors we need to consider when looking at 'x'?*
12. *How do you assess DFID's management of the research programme?*

¹⁵ The PARC is managed by International Organisation Development. More information on the PARC can be found at www.parcinfo.org.

ANNEX 5 – RFF STATEMENTS OF INTENT BY OUTCOME, WAYS OF WORKING AND EVIDENCE

OUTCOMES

1. Research programmes achieve applicable results

	Statement	RFF page and para	Reviewers' verdict	Reviewers' summary	Evidence	Performance Framework reference
2	The process identified four key researchable problems, to which DFID will devote about two-thirds of research funding	9/25	Good progress	2/3s of funding devoted to 4 researchable problems	In HD team for 2006 about 36M on 'killer diseases' and 8.7M on other areas – approx 80/20 split. But, hard to be very accurate as AIDS, TB, Malaria and other neglected diseases are often a theme in the other areas of work e.g. health systems, education research and capacity development activities so separating out can be difficult. Climate Change research on track to total £30m per annum by 2011 <SPEC and G&L still missing>	Delivery Strategies (DS) 1A, 1B, 1C
3	The focus will be on Africa, but research can also extend to other rainfed areas which have not benefited from the green revolution. Three intertwined approaches are needed: i) participation...; ii) technology...;iii) access...	9/26	Good progress	Focus on Africa	Riu - Country focus = Five African and one South Asia country 4/15 of CGIAR's research centres are in Africa Have 3 Regional Research Programmes in Africa and 1 in South Asia	DS 1B, 2
4	DFID will 'double funding for the CGIAR, to £20million per year...We will engage very actively with the CGIAR to promote its focus on the poor, and will support reform to strengthen it.'	10/27	Good progress	CGIAR enhanced focus on poverty outcomes	It appears that the system's priorities are well aligned with DFID's emphasis on poverty alleviation, environmental sustainability and increasing the uptake of research results. In addition, DFID has enhanced the poverty focus by providing a balanced view on internal committees and task forces. Supported CGIAR in terms of i) Core funding to challenge programmes; ii) Support to challenge programmes themselves; iii) Project related support; and, iv) CSO engagement. As a result of the IEG evaluation of CGIAR from 2006 onwards a system-wide research agenda has been put in place. Funding has been increased to just under £20 million per year.	Outcome 1

5	DFID will ' use the 2004 evaluation of DFID's own eleven year RNRRS to identify the most promising ways forward, and promote those lessons internationally.'	10/27	Good Progress	Promote lessons from RNRRS Evaluation	Used lessons in Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture	DS 1B
6	DFID will ' commission substantial new DFID programmes that build on the successes of the previous ten RNRR programmes.'	10/27	Good progress	Commission programme on basis of RNRRS	Used lessons in Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture & Riu Programme	DS 1B & 2
9	DFID will ' promote and seek to rationalise key public private partnerships and multi-donor collaborations	10/29	Good progress	Established PPPs and multi-donor collaborations in Health	1. Health Systems – Alliance for Health Policy and Healthy Systems – one of a number of funders.2. Communicable diseases – PDPs in TB and Malaria product development. Vaccines – Fund IRV – Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise is a large umbrella under which IVR works. DFID has funded 2 stakeholder meetings of this. The enterprise is nearly up and running – given all support it can. • Drugs against malaria – not funding vaccine – fund PDP – Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) – with Wellcome Trust. Each gives £10m over 5 years. Also looking at drugs for neglected diseases initiative (DNDi). 3. Fund RPC – mental health and Tobacco Control with CIDA.4. Joint funding with other donors on maternal health trial (Aberdeen).Supports 5 PDPs: MMV, TB drugs, DNDi, IPM and IAVI.	Outcomes 1, 2, 4 & 5
10	Microbicides for women to use to protect themselves against HIV/AIDS and sexually-transmitted diseases...	10/29	Good progress	Funding research in..	Microbicides: Microbicide (mdp) development programme which tests out most promising mbc. £40m is given – main funder – started funding when Clare Short was SoS. The programme was extended a year ago. Currently got a large clinical trial underway. Huge amount of social science research behind this. Rates of recruitment into trial are on target. Large interdisciplinary aspect also looking at fit with local communities' expectations. Infact local community support groups are very developed. • PDP – International partnership for mbc. Virtual pharmaceutical company. £7.5m over 3 years. Work in partnership with other companies, it is about drug development. The partnership covers drug discovery, drug advocacy and marketing of drugs in the right way to the market.	DS 1B, 1C, 2 & 5

11	HIV/AIDS vaccines;	10/29	Good progress	Funding research in...	Joint funding of UK MRC(Dart and Arrow) and fund International Aids Vaccine (IAVI)	DS 1B & 1C
12	Drugs and vaccines against malaria. This will include collaborative funding with the Wellcome Trust	10/29	Good progress	Funding research in..	Drugs against Malaria, not funding Vaccine - Medicines for Malaria Venture. Gates Foundation funding a vaccine.	DS 1B, 1C & 5
13	TB treatments, vaccines and diagnostics.'	10/29	Good progress	Funding research in..	Global Alliance for TB drug development - 3 years - again not vaccines but diagnostics. (WHO)	DS 1B & 1C
15	DFID will ' commission new DFID-funded programmes, and promote multi-donor collaboration, on new approaches to delivering services to poor people, particularly improving access by women, children and the most vulnerable groups.This will include ways of improving accountability of services; improving the availability and capacity of health workers; and improving access to services.....Throughout, this will draw on the experience of existing DFID Knowledge Programmes.'	10/29	Limited progress	Established multi donor collaborations on new approaches to delivering health services to poor Improved access to services particularly women, children and most vulnerable groups	Co-financing programmes supported include: Concordat with MRC, TDR work with WHO, MDP with MRC, core funding for ICDDRB. The terms of reference for RPCs asks them to take a 'health systems' approach. No evidence of impact on increased access to services.	Outcomes 1, 2 & 4
			Good progress	New programmes commissioned	1. Health Systems – Fund 2 RPCs and multilateral work. Alliance for Health Policy and Healthy Systems – one of a number of funders. 2. Communicable diseases – RPCs in TB, Malaria, HIV/AIDS and ICDDRB diarrhoea fund. PDPs in TB and Malaria product development. Vaccines – Fund IRV – Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise is a large umbrella under which IVR works. DFID has funded 2 stakeholder meetings of this. The enterprise is nearly up and running – given all support it can. • Drugs against malaria – not funding vaccine – fund PDP – Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) – with Wellcome Trust. Each gives £10m over 5 years. Also looking at drugs for neglected diseases initiative (DNDi). 3. Fund RPC – mental health and Tobacco Control with CIDA. 4. Reproductive/Maternal/Child Health. Fund clinical trials on: Vitamin A in Ghana, DART and ARROW, joint funding with other donors on maternal health trial (Aberdeen).	DS 1B, 1C

					Total of 11 RPCs in Health and 3 in Education.	
16	DFID will 'promote a range of research on HIV prevention and treatment, and on the social impact of HIV/AIDS, in the light of the Government's strategy on tackling HIV/AIDS in developing countries announced mid-2004.'	10/29	Good progress	Promote range of research on HIV prevention and treatment	In terms of prevention work – vaccines and mbc. In terms of treatment – research being done on developing new treatment by RPCs looking at the social context, treatment and care (set up before with the Global Aids Policy Team and Health Advisers)	Outcomes 1, 2 & 4
17	DFID will fund research which builds on the work of four ongoing Development Research Centres: one on the state itself, one on how citizens can develop the ability to participate, one on how states respond to crises, and one on ethnicity, inequality and conflict.'	11/31	Good progress	Fund four DRCs	Funding six DRCs. Second five year funding has been given to: Crisis States Programme and Chronic Poverty Research Centre. Centre for Research in Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity is in its 4th year of funding. Migration, Globalisation and Poverty RC is entering its 3rd year. Citizenship, Participation and Accountability RC and Future States RC appear to be in early stages of development.	DS 1B
18	Important issues that require further work include how citizens can hold states accountable; ways in which communities can come together to provide the goods and services they need...; strategies for managing crises and potential conflict; understanding the international factors that facilitate or trigger poor performance; understanding how to transform war economies; understanding better the factors that promote or undermine human security; and the dynamics of change...additional research may be commissioned over the next few years.	11/31	Limited progress	Fund further programmes	A number of relevant research programmes have been commissioned. They include RPCs on Religion and Development, Pathways to Empowerment, Crisis States, Future States, Women's Empowerment in Muslim Contexts, Politics, Power and the State.	DS 1C
19	Working closely with the DFID Global Local Environment team, we will carry out scoping work on the implications of climate change during 2004, i) to establish most urgent needs; and ii) identify what research other funds are supporting.	11/33	Good progress	Scope work necessary on climate change	Completed 3 scoping papers: i) Energy planning in developing countries; ii) The impact of macro-economics on the climate adaptive capacity of African countries; iii) Water ecosystem services and poverty reduction under climate change.	DS 1A
22	The remainder of DFID's central research funding for 05/06 will be spread over a range of issues. DFID will seek proposals for new or extended research programmes starting in 2005.	12/35/36	Good Progress	Funding not committed to four problem areas was spread over range of issues and proposals received for new or extended research programmes	Communications Budget within this. Moved into/moving into new areas including: Ecosystems, Transport, Water, Energy, Education and Faith & Development. Plans for work on environmental governance but no implementation yet. Follow-up programmes on governance systems for the management of forests and water is to covered in the	Outcome 1

					Ecosystem Services & Poverty Alleviation programme with NERC and ESRC.	
26	Our future research efforts will be guided by the evaluation of these (EngKaR) investments, and by scoping work to determine when new knowledge is needed.'	12/38	Limited Progress	Evaluation carried out	Results informed recent work on water and sanitation	DS 1A
27	We will maintain an annual bidding round for smaller policy-oriented projects.	13/39	Limited progress	Annual bidding round conducted	The ESRC scheme provides this to some extent as does MRC but as a rule not done in house – policy decision taken to move away from this.	DS 1A, 1B
28	We shall explore the possibility of collaboration with other UK funders such as Research Councils. We will ensure that such collaboration supports applied research, and involves a wide range of researchers, including universities, ngos, and the private sector and developing country partners.'	13/39	Limited progress	Responsive collaborations support innovative and diverse research Outcomes	Working on these collaborations with Research Councils	Outcomes 1 & 4
29	We will delay decisions in these areas so that we can take account of the evaluations to identify and build upon successes (RNRRS & Engineering)	14/40	Limited progress	Evaluation findings used to build on successes	Subsequent development in G&L team of RiU Programme request for proposals. Evaluation of the Eng KaR which is being used in the energy and water research management	DS 1B
40	...raising the 'demand-pull' for research...our current proposals are to: i) support an informal group of key research donors, seek better information on who funds what, and investigate...	18/54	Limited progress		Climate change programme and regional agricultural programmes including RIU are responding to demand from south. For iv in the list HD11 – the treatment and care for HIV and AIDS RPC is looking at interventions that will support the work of the global fund for AIDS, TB and malaria and the two communicable diseases RPCs (HD205 and 206) are working with national and international disease control programmes in TB and Malaria. A number of the health RPCs (e.g. HD7 work closely with WHO).	DS 1A, 3

41	ii) systematically use existing sectoral consultations ...to: i) hear what topics developing countries want, and ii) stimulate processes to set priorities that take into account user needs	18/54	Limited progress	Used existing sectoral consultations		DS 1A,
42	iii) Collate existing studies on demand, and commission new studies on priorities from southern institutions	18/54	No progress			DS 1A
43	iv) identify opportunities to use research in support of major international development initiatives	18/54	Limited progress	Research used in support of major international development initiatives		DS 1A
44	DFID's research choices will also be informed by a horizon-scanning exercise across the whole of DFID to identify research and policy agendas by looking 10-20 years ahead...It will have a budget initially of £1 million a year	18/55	Limited progress	Conduct horizon scanning exercise	CRD dropped this idea. It is now the responsibility of DFID's Chief Scientist	DS 1A
46	DFID will call a UK Funders' Forum on ID during 2005, to identify common opportunities with all Research Councils and other key UK funders	19/57	Limited progress	Participate in UK Funders Forum on ID	This has evolved into the Development Research Collaborative to be chaired by DFID's Chief Scientist	DS 1A, 4
47	DFID will undertake more detailed consultations with Research Councils and other key funders, to explore where there could be opportunities for cooperation.....	19/57	Good progress	Carry out consultations with Research Councils	Work with UK Research Councils (MRC, ESRC, BBRC etc.), joint-funding schemes and the Collaborative.	DS 1A, 4
48	DFID will engage in discussions on the Research Assessment Exercise, to examine if and how the impact of research can be taken into account when High Education Funding Councils are deciding their funding allocations to UK universities.	19/57	No progress	Carry out discussions on Research Assessment Exercise	Some contact but the people running the RAE were not very receptive to ideas on impact. Things are changing with the way that the RAE will be handled in future.	DS 1A, 4

49	(where these conditions apply) DFID will seek to support joint research funding in cases where....'	20/61	Good progress	Joint research funding established	Many examples are possible here. To mention a few: CGIAR DFID is third largest funder (WB and USAID other two) and largest core funder. In FARA currently conducting a joint evaluation with external partners. Work by G&L team in establishing Regional Agricultural Research - ASARECA and CORAF for example, as it is DFID's intention to develop joint programmes with sub-regional programmes that are supported by a number of donors; CCAA programme with IDRC; Work with Gates Foundation, WHO, MRC.	DS 4, 5
51	DFID's bilateral programme may support promising schools of thought that are under funded by others	20/62	Too early to judge	Under funded promising schools of research thought supported	HD7 is a Cochrane collaboration group on infectious diseases - DFID funding of the group is different from the funding other groups receive from other sources.	Outcome 4

2. Southern research and policy capacity strengthened

9	DFID will ' promote and seek to rationalise key public private partnerships and multi-donor collaborations	10/29	Good progress	Established PPPs and multi-donor collaborations in Health	1. Health Systems – Alliance for Health Policy and Healthy Systems – one of a number of funders.2. Communicable diseases – PDPs in TB and Malaria product development. Vaccines – Fund IRV – Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise is a large umbrella under which IVR works. DFID has funded 2 stakeholder meetings of this. The enterprise is nearly up and running – given all support it can. • Drugs against malaria – not funding vaccine – fund PDP – Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) – with Wellcome Trust. Each gives £10m over 5 years. Also looking at drugs for neglected diseases initiative (DNDi). 3. Fund RPC – mental health and Tobacco Control with CIDA.4. Joint funding with other donors on maternal health trial (Aberdeen).Supports 5 PDPs: MMV, TB drugs, DNDi, IPM and IAVI.	Outcomes 1, 2 & 4
15	DFID will ' commission new DFID-funded programmes, and promote multi-donor collaboration, on new approaches to delivering services to poor people, particularly improving access by women, children and the most vulnerable groups.This will include ways of improving accountability of services; improving the availability and capacity of health workers; and improving access to services.....Throughout, this will draw on the experience of existing DFID Knowledge Programmes.'	10/29	Limited progress	Established multi donor collaborations on new approaches to delivering health services to poor Improved access to services particularly women, children and most vulnerable groups	Co-financing programmes supported include: Concordat with MRC, TDR work with WHO, MDP with MRC, core funding for ICDDR.B. The terms of reference for RPCs asks them to take a 'health systems' approach. No evidence of impact on increased access to services.	Outcomes 1, 2 & 4
			Good progress	New programmes commissioned	1. Health Systems – Fund 2 RPCs and multilateral work. Alliance for Health Policy and Healthy Systems – one of a number of funders. 2. Communicable diseases – RPCs in TB, Malaria,	DS 1B

					<p>HIV/AIDS and ICDDRDB diarrhoea fund. PDPs in TB and Malaria product development. Vaccines – Fund IRV – Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise is a large umbrella under which IVR works. DFID has funded 2 stakeholder meetings of this. The enterprise is nearly up and running – given all support it can.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drugs against malaria – not funding vaccine – fund PDP – Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) – with Wellcome Trust. Each gives £10m over 5 years. Also looking at drugs for neglected diseases initiative (DNDi). <p>3. Fund RPC – mental health and Tobacco Control with CIDA. 4. Reproductive/Maternal/Child Health. Fund clinical trials on: Vitamin A in Ghana, DART and ARROW, joint funding with other donors on maternal health trial (Aberdeen). Total of 11 RPCs in Health and 3 in Education.</p>	
16	DFID will 'promote a range of research on HIV prevention and treatment, and on the social impact of HIV/AIDS, in the light of the Government's strategy on tackling HIV/AIDS in developing countries announced mid-2004.'	10/29	Good progress	Promote range of research on HIV prevention and treatment	In terms of prevention work – vaccines and mbc. In terms of treatment –research being done on developing new treatment by RPCs looking at the social context, treatment and care (set up before with the Global Aids Policy Team and Health Advisers)	Outcomes 1, 2 & 4
31	The CRD will ' support DFID country and Regional departments wishing to pilot capacity building programmes. These can include the capacity of developing country policy-shapers to use research.'	16/47	Limited progress	Support DFID country and regional development through pilot capacity building programmes	G&L: Africa Division on Agriculture SPEC: RiPPLE working with country office and country programmes	Outcome 2
32	The CRD will 'support international efforts to build capacity and strengthen research networks including initiatives that improve developing country researcher's access to knowledge, and the capacity of users to source, evaluate and utilise existing and new knowledge.'	16/47	Limited progress	Improve developing countries' researchers' access to knowledge	Communications work and some research programmes are relevant but mainly limited to sourcing knowledge	Outcome 2
33	The CRD will 'promote the full involvement of developing country institutions and other local stakeholders in our research programmes. 'proposals for capacity building' will be one of the criteria by which new research management contracts are assessed.'	16/47	Good progress	Focus on capacity building across research programmes maintained	The RPC rules are designed to ensure this happens.	Outcome 2

34	The CRD will 'investigate possibilities further, with other Government departments, and with other donors with greater expertise in capacity-building'.	16/47	Limited progress	Capacity Building Discussions	IDRC and Climate Change Programme MRC African research centres and joint Wellcome Trust/DFID work on health research capacity strengthening. DEFRA is on the advisory committee of the Ecosystems programme	Outcome 2
----	---	-------	------------------	-------------------------------	--	-----------

3. Research results communicated and uptake promoted

35	We will pursue four lines to improve the impact of research i).establish procedures that promote inter-action with users.	17/52	Good progress	Establish procedures	Communications Team included new terms in RPC project grants about proportion of budget spend on comms to promote interaction with users and provided guidance.	Outcome 3
36	ii) as part of our research programmes, we will support synthesis reviews of available knowledge.	17/52	Limited progress	Synthesis Reviews Conducted	Some synthesis work undertaken e.g.HD7 is an RPC that does synthesis reviews specifically though the Cochrane collaboration (health related). Most other HD RPCs have or are doing a range of synthesis reviews as part of their work – education RPCs in particular. There are a whole range of synthesis studies from the RNRRS. The current research framing studies on energy policy trade-offs, fresh water ecosystems and climate adaptive capacity are other examples. Limited impact on uptake.	Outcome 3
37	iii) Building on work with FAO and WHO, we will support international organisations to improve their information services and systems	17/52	Limited progress	Improved information services and systems in international organisations	Communication team activities with: FAO, funding WHO information services and systems work (Africa Health Infoway) and a programme with the International Records management Trust on requirements for building integrity in public sector information systems. Funding of IDRC which includes spending on communications.	Outcome 3
38	iv) we will investigate further (from experience in Uganda, Bangla and Bolivia) by establishing an Action-Research programme to explore a to d.	17/52	Limited progress	Action Research Programme established	New regional programme in the Andes is building on Bolivia work. Communications team still intend to do something in this area, possibly a resource centre to build capacity in research communication. Some of the issues (e.g. c and d) are being addressed in some of the communication team programmes (e.g. Makutano Junction – TV drama series, ILRI work on policy and practice). Also the RiU project is relevant.	Outcome 3

	Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture, Agriculture Policy Paper		Limited progress	Get new technologies to poor farmers & help governments make better policies	New initiatives include: RiU programme. Currently completing inception phase, looking to promote 30 successful technologies from research funded over last 11 years. Working with CAADP, working with sub regional organisations like CORAF (total of 4 regional research programmes); Support to international agricultural research through 15 centre of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research.	Outcome 3
	Communication Background Paper		Limited progress	1. Good communications in the research programmes we commission based on establishing working partnerships between researchers and policymakers or users throughout the research timetable	Prior to 2005 there was nothing on this. Now have a CRD Communication Strategy and Communication Guidance Notes. Quoted by other donors as being world leaders. 10% of each RPC budget should go on communication. Depending on budget are starting to see communications officers or communications as part of RPC teams. M&E guidelines.	Outcome 3
	Communication Background Paper		Limited progress	2. Better international systems for managing research knowledge, so that those who need it can access it	Single source of information on www.research4development.info portal (over 9000 hits in last recorded month of Dec 2006). Worked with WHO and FAO looking at role of information sharing. Hosted IDS meeting which brought together 10 bilaterals (Proving our worth: developing capacity for the M&E of communicating research in development. (see programme Summary Report from RC M&E Group). Mass Media Projects: Soap Opera Project in East Africa - market research survey suggest significant rise in awareness of research in Kenya. Also working with PANOS to build radio journalist capacity. Also support IDS in mobilising knowledge for development through Eldis and ID21. Publication of 'Development Works: 52 weeks a year' included 11 case studies from CRD.	Outcomes 3 & 4
	Communication Background Paper		Limited progress	3. Innovative research systems, nationally and internationally that respond to demand, are evidence based and improve uptake	No evidence on systems.	Outcome 3

4. Collaboration between research funders achieves better use of resources to reduce poverty

1	We will seek to promote a better international process to identify priorities, but this will take time to put in place.'	9/24	Too early to judge		FARA, RIU linked into CAADP process (continental process) and work with other development partners and international process with global donor platform on rural development. There is work through the product development partnership funders group (for health) looking at how funders can work together better to identify priorities for funding PDPs – still at a very early stage.	Outcome 4
8	DFID will 'support international collaborations in this area' (i.e. sustainable agriculture)	10/27	Good progress	Work with international collaborations	Worked with NEPAD's Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP). Worked through CAADP on Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA). Links with CGIAR. Also worked with the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA) on its Agricultural Research for Development Strategy's Operational Plan. ASARECA's activities are being coordinated by Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and FARA. In a related initiative DFID with others presented a concept note for harmonisation of support to the implementation of the Strategic Plan.	Outcome 4
9	DFID will 'promote and seek to rationalise key public private partnerships and multi-donor collaborations	10/29	Good progress	Established PPPs and multi-donor collaborations in Health	1. Health Systems – Alliance for Health Policy and Healthy Systems – one of a number of funders.2. Communicable diseases – PDPs in TB and Malaria product development. Vaccines – Fund IRV – Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise is a large umbrella under which IVR works. DFID has funded 2 stakeholder meetings of this. The enterprise is nearly up and running – given all support it can. • Drugs against malaria – not funding vaccine – fund PDP – Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) – with Wellcome Trust. Each gives £10m over 5 years. Also looking at drugs for neglected diseases initiative (DNDi). 3. Fund RPC – mental health and Tobacco Control with CIDA.4. Joint funding with other donors on maternal health trial (Aberdeen). Supports 5 PDPs: MMV, TB drugs, DNDi, IPM and IAVI.	Outcomes 1,2 & 4

15	DFID will 'commission new DFID-funded programmes, and promote multi-donor collaboration, on new approaches to delivering services to poor people, particularly improving access by women, children and the most vulnerable groups. This will include ways of improving accountability of services; improving the availability and capacity of health workers; and improving access to services.....Throughout, this will draw on the experience of existing DFID Knowledge Programmes.'	10/29	Limited progress	Established multi donor collaborations on new approaches to delivering health services to poor Improved access to services particularly women, children and most vulnerable groups	Co-financing programmes supported include: Concordat with MRC, TDR work with WHO, MDP with MRC, core funding for ICDDR.B. The terms of reference for RPCs asks them to take a 'health systems' approach. No evidence of impact on increased access to services.	Outcomes 1 & 4
16	DFID will 'promote a range of research on HIV prevention and treatment, and on the social impact of HIV/AIDS, in the light of the Government's strategy on tackling HIV/AIDS in developing countries announced mid-2004.'	10/29	Good progress	Promote range of research on HIV prevention and treatment	In terms of prevention work – vaccines and mbc. In terms of treatment –research being done on developing new treatment by RPCs looking at the social context, treatment and care (set up before with the Global Aids Policy Team and Health Advisers)	Outcomes 1 & 4
28	We shall explore the possibility of collaboration with other UK funders such as Research Councils. We will ensure that such collaboration supports applied research, and involves a wide range of researchers, including universities, ngos, and the private sector and developing country partners.'	13/39	Limited progress	Responsive collaborations support innovative and diverse research Outcomes	Working on these collaborations with Research Councils	Outcomes 1 & 4
40	...raising the 'demand-pull' for research...our current proposals are to: i) support an informal group of key research donors, seek better information on who funds what, and investigate...	18/54	Limited progress	Greater demand pull for research	Climate change programme and regional agricultural programmes including RIU are responding to demand from south. This is big agenda and DFID is at the beginning of tackling it.	Outcome 4
45	DFID will participate actively in Research Funders Fora on Health in Developing Countries, and on the Environment	19/57	Good progress	Participate in fora in Health	The health funders' forum is a grouping of DFID, MRC, Wellcome Trust, Dept of Health and ESRC. It meets 2 or 3 times a year and discusses areas of joint interest. Members of the group represent each other at international meetings and share back to office and other reports of mutual interest through the year.	Outcome 4
49	(where these conditions apply) DFID will seek to support joint research funding in cases where....'	20/61	Good progress	Joint research funding established	Many examples are possible here. To mention a few: CGIAR DFID is third largest funder (WB and USAID other two) and largest core funder. In FARA currently conducting a joint evaluation with external partners. Work by G&L team in establishing Regional Agricultural Research - ASARECA and CORAF for example, as it is DFID's intention to develop joint programmes with sub-regional programmes that are supported by a number of donors; CCAA programme with IDRC; Work with Gates Foundation, WHO, MRC.	Outcome 4

50	In the international field we should support variety	20/62	Good progress	Supported variety		Outcome 4
52	Collaboration with other research funders should not lead to monopoly of approach	20/62	Good progress	Avoided monopoly of approaches through increased collaborations		Outcome 4
	Communication Background Paper		Limited progress	2. Better international systems for managing research knowledge, so that those who need it can access it	Single source of information on www.research4development.info portal (over 9000 hits in last recorded month of Dec 2006). Worked with WHO and FAO looking at role of information sharing. Hosted IDS meeting which brought together 10 bilaterals (Proving our worth: developing capacity for the M&E of communicating research in development. (see programme Summary Report from RC M&E Group). Mass Media Projects: Soap Opera Project in East Africa - market research survey suggest significant rise in awareness of research in Kenya. Also working with PANOS to build radio journalist capacity. Also support IDS in mobilising knowledge for development through Eldis and ID21. Publication of 'Development Works: 52 weeks a year' included 11 case studies from CRD.	Outcomes 3 & 4

5. Collaboration with private sector researchers produces additional results applicable for reducing poverty

7	DFID will 'promote a public-private partnership to develop vaccines against common livestock diseases, and investigate the potential for partnerships in other areas, particularly those that involve small and medium sized enterprises.'	10/27	Limited progress	Established Public Private Partnerships in Sustainable Agriculture	Established Global Alliance for Livestock Vaccines and have worked with the African Agricultural Technology Foundation (AATF)	Outcomes 4 & 5
9	DFID will 'promote and seek to rationalise key public private partnerships and multi-donor collaborations	10/29	Good progress	Established PPPs and multi-donor collaborations in Health	1. Health Systems – Alliance for Health Policy and Healthy Systems – one of a number of funders.2. Communicable diseases – PDPs in TB and Malaria product development. Vaccines – Fund IRV – Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise is a large umbrella under which IVR works. DFID has funded 2 stakeholder meetings of this. The enterprise is nearly up and running – given all support it can. • Drugs against malaria – not funding vaccine – fund PDP – Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) – with Wellcome Trust. Each gives £10m over 5 years. Also looking at drugs for neglected diseases initiative (DNDi). 3. Fund RPC – mental health and Tobacco Control with CIDA.4. Joint funding with other donors on maternal health trial (Aberdeen). Supports 5 PDPs: MMV, TB drugs, DNDi, IPM and IAVI.	Outcomes 1, 2, 4 & 5
53	We will promote the development and use of alternative financial instruments and other incentives to encourage private investment in pro-poor research.	20/63	Limited progress	Promoted and used alternative financial instruments to encourage private investment in pro-poor research		Outcomes 4 & 5
54	We will consider other areas where ppp might be effective.	20/64	Limited progress	Area where ppp effective identified	Livestock Diseases	Outcomes 4,5 & 6
54	We will also plan and implement a systematic evaluation of partnerships about types of cooperation: what works best for what circumstances.	20/64	No progress	Evaluate different types of cooperation	Not carried out	Outcomes 4 & 5

6. Monitoring and evaluating results promote effective learning

39	In the longer term there are 5 ways in which we need to make progress, i) focus on right research priorities ii) strengthen collaboration with other UK funders of research with application for developing countries iii) contribute to better coordination among research financiers internationally iv) strengthen links with the private sector v) monitor and evaluate	18/53	Limited progress	v) monitor and evaluate	ii)work through DRCs, RPCs iii)IDRC, Gates Foundation iv) Human Development work v) Communications work, standard M&E reporting	Outcome 6
54	We will consider other areas where ppp might be effective. We will also plan and implement a systematic evaluation of partnerships about types of cooperation: what works best for what circumstances.	20/64	No progress	Evaluate different types of cooperation		Outcomes 4,5 & 6
55	There will be regular monitoring; to review research progress against both milestones and the underlying criteria for research...This will build on the positive experience of monitoring built up in DFID's past programmes, extending it by greater DFID staff input. It will also address the issue of ensuring adequate baseline data against which programmes can be monitored and evaluated. We will use independent peer reviewers to select research projects and evaluate our programmes. The criteria will include likely effectiveness, as well as rigour: we will work hard to include NGOS and other researchers, avoiding over-academic formulation. The CSA and CE will have important roles in overseeing quality control and providing advice. We shall take the opportunity of co-location within the same Division to liaise closely with DFID's Evaluation Department.	20/65	Good progress	Various	Many examples, some of which are as follows: MIL Component of Riu Programme. Conducted joint evaluation of MOM – coordinated by HRC. Just setting up joint evaluation for IPM.TES Evaluation, MTR of WREN (Multimedia Support (branded media services AGFAX and New Agriculturist) to Broadcasting Outcomes from DFID's Agricultural related Central Research Programme), Makutano Junction Programme Survey, Review of Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information (PERI) 2001 - 2004 (published 02/05), M&E Guidelines from Comms Team.	Outcome 6

Ways of Working

20	An interdisciplinary approach, involving social, political and institutional research will be used to address these four problem areas.	12/34	Limited progress	Interdisciplinary approach instituted across four problem areas	Sustainable Agriculture by assessing the social, environmental and political impacts of all projects/programmes.	N/A
21	Gender and education will also need to be addressed by all four themes	12/34	Limited progress	Gender and education addressed across all four areas	Considered during design. Chosen to look at cross-cutting issue of disability. HD, G&L and SPEC have asked all RPCs to collect information on disability as a variant in programmes but nothing to pull together. Want to look at it across themes, so for example disability HIV/AIDS, disability and education, pull together and commission new work looking at cross cutting research on disability across Research Programmes. Also resourcing disabled people doing research on disability – demand pull. Southern Africa Federation of Disabled People – draws on research to do advocacy. Now commissioning them to do disability research – going to train them and asking them to draw on RPCs for information and capacity building.	N/A
24	We will retain flexibility to take on new research themes in the future	12/37	Good progress	Flexibility maintained		N/A
30	DFID has moved away from funding stand-alone projects to working directly with governments and civil society..this will have the greatest impact on improving research in the long run...	15/46	Limited Progress	Continued working directly with governments and civil society	This is happening independently of CRD – RPCs and examples such as RiPPLE taking it forward.	
33	The CRD will 'promote the full involvement of developing country institutions and other local stakeholders in our research programmes. 'proposals for capacity building' will be one of the criteria by which new research management contracts are assessed.'	16/47	Achieved	Focus on capacity building across research programmes maintained	The RPC rules are designed to ensure this happens.	
50	In the international field we should support variety	20/62	Achieved	Supported variety		
52	Collaboration with other research funders should not lead to monopoly of approach	20/62	Partially achieved	Avoided monopoly of approaches through increased collaborations		

ANNEX 6 – REFERENCES

- DFID - Research for Poverty Reduction:DFID Research Policy Paper. Martin Surr, Andrew Barnett, Alex Duncan, Melanie Speight, David Bradley, Alan Rew, John Toye, Nov. 2002
- DFID - New DFID Research Strategy: Communications Theme. Elizabeth Dodsworth, Sue Smith, Indira Biswas-Benbow, Megan Lloyd-Laney, John Young, Dylan Winder. Dec. 2003.
- DFID - Effective In-country Research. Paul Spray and Yvonne Thomas. Aug. 2003
- DFID - DFID new research strategy: leveraging private sector research. Sarah Holden and Taylor Brown. 2003
- DFID - Review of DFID's role in the national research effort, Aton and Grant, August 2003.
- DFID – Research Funding Framework 2005-2007, (Autumn 2004)
- House of Commons - The Use of Science in UK International Development Policy. House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology. Thirteenth Report of Session 2003-04. Oct. 2004
- House of Commons - Government response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2003-04. Jan. 2005
- report of the CRD Bilateral Models Working Group of June 2005
- DFID - Strategy for Research on Sustainable Agriculture August 2005
- DFID - Investing in new tools for HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis through Public Private Partnerships. Alistair Ager, Joanna McGowan, Val Snewin and Saul Walker. Central Research Department Strategy Paper. October 2005.