IOB Evaluations | no. 304 Summary | May 2007

Evaluation of the Netherlands' Research Policy 1992-2005

Experiences with a new approach in six countries: Bolivia, Ghana, Mali, South Africa, Tanzania and Vietnam

Buitenlandse Zaken
Ontwikkelings samenwerking

IOB Evaluations | Policy and Operations Evaluation Department | no. 304 Summary | May 2007

Evaluation of the Netherlands' Research Policy 1992-2005

Experiences with a new approach in six countries:

Bolivia, Ghana, Mali, South Africa, Tanzania and Vietnam

Printing OBT, The Hague
Design Corps, The Hague
Cover design Eindeloos, The Hague
Lay-out Eindeloos, The Hague
ISBN 978-90-5328-353-0
Ordercode OSDR 6611/E
www.minbuza.nl/iob
May 2007

Preface

Development and research are closely connected. Research gives an understanding of the processes of change that can lead to development. Research also generates knowledge about the opportunities and complications that may arise, and gives an insight into the power relations which determine how complications can be overcome and opportunities exploited.

Awareness that research is vital for development underlies the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' support for research in developing countries, which dates back to the earliest days of Dutch development cooperation. The sums involved are relatively modest, but this is no reflection of their significance for the recipient, especially where they lead to knowledge transfer and greater local research capacity.

Dutch support for research in developing countries has often stirred up heated discussions. This was particularly true in the 1990s when the then Minister for Development Cooperation heralded significant changes to existing policy in the 1992 *Research and Development* policy document. One of the most important changes was replacing the supply-driven approach – determined by what the Netherlands could offer by way of research – with a demand-driven approach, in which developing countries' needs were paramount in setting and implementing research agendas.

After more than ten years' experience with the new research policy, the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) decided that the time had come for an evaluation. The evaluators examined how the innovative policy of the 1990s had contributed to increasing knowledge about processes of change in developing countries, and strengthening local capacity, the two main objectives of the 1992 policy. The evaluation focused on the experiences of six countries – Bolivia, Ghana, Mali, South Africa, Tanzania and Vietnam – with the multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes and other projects.

Given that a new memorandum, *Research for Development*, had been published in 2005, and to ensure their evaluation had some relevance to current policy, the evaluators decided to compare their main findings with the new memorandum's objectives. Traces of the comparison are evident at a number of points in the evaluation. It should, however, be noted that neither the policy intentions of the new memorandum, nor their implementation, are a formal part of this evaluation.

Dr Fred van der Kraaij, IOB Inspector, was responsible for the evaluation. He coordinated the study together with Ria Brouwers (Institute of Social Studies, (ISS)). Jilles van Gastel and Liesbeth Kuyate-Inberg acted as research assistants. A reference group of experts commented on each country study and the draft final report. The external members of the group were Prof. Louk de la Rive Box (ISS), Prof. Arie de Ruijter (Tilburg University) and Prof. Caspar Schweigman (University of Groningen). Dr Henk Molenaar represented the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Research and Communication Division DCO/OC ('the Research Bureau').

Ria Brouwers and Fred van der Kraaij drew up the final report, a large proportion of which is based on the six country studies. Five of these studies were conducted by external researchers. Their names are given in the 'Organisation of the evaluation' annexe (available on the IOB-website). Many other people made important contributions to this evaluation. They are also mentioned in the annexe. The IOB would like to thank all those involved for their assistance. Needless to say, ultimate responsibility for the evaluation rests exclusively with the IOB.

The present summary of the evaluation also contains a section on 'Main findings and key issues for the future'. The summary (in English) and the evaluation (in Dutch) can both be found at IOB's website, www.minbuza.nl/iob.

Bram van Ojik
Director Policy and Operations Evaluation Department

Contents

List of abbreviations

CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CNRST	Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique
DGIS	Directorate-General for International Cooperation
GHRP	Ghana-Netherlands Health Research Programme
IER	Institut d'Économie Rurale (Rural Economy Institute)
IOB	Policy and Operations Evaluation Department
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MMRP	Multi-annual Multidisciplinary Research Programme
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NWO	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PIEB	Programa de Investigación Estratégica en Bolivia
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RAWOO	Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems (later: Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council)
REPOA	Research on Poverty Alleviation
SANPAD	South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on Alternatives in Development
SPAAR	Special Programme for African Agricultural Research
VNRP	Vietnam-Netherlands Research Programme
WOTRO	Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research

Main findings and key issues for the future

Background

In 1992 the policy document *Research and Development* was published by the Minister for Development Cooperation. It marked the enthusiastic launch of a new research policy, the general premise of which was that research and development were closely connected and that developing countries must be helped to make up their scientific deficit.

The policy had two main objectives. It was supposed to contribute to a) the acquisition and revision of knowledge of the processes of change in developing countries and b) the strengthening or development of the local research capacity needed to do so. The policy broke with tradition i) by putting demands in developing countries before Dutch and other Western universities' supply, ii) by emphasising multidisciplinary and problem-based research involving interaction between research and policy, and iii) by giving Southern partners ownership over the research. The idea was that research collaboration between the Netherlands and developing countries would no longer consist of individual projects, but would instead be more cohesive and programmatic. Cooperation would also be more sustained, lasting ten to fifteen years at a minimum.

The policy built on ideas on research and development arising from national and international debates. It caused a great deal of controversy, both inside and outside the Ministry. As its interests were no longer being given priority, the Dutch academic world feared it would lose its role in development cooperation.

Dilemmas surrounding the central concept of the policy, i.e. the question of a demand-driven approach, had already been discussed at length before the document was published. The Minister for Development Cooperation referred to

one of them, namely the difficult question of whose demand takes precedence, particularly if the country in question cannot reach a consensus on research and development priorities, as the 'Ganuza dilemma'. Dr Enrique Ganuza was a Latin American researcher who was the first person to give succinct expression to this dilemma. Researchers highlighted a second dilemma, namely that letting Southern partners themselves shape and implement the programme was incompatible with their limited research capacity and infrastructure. This was called the development paradox.

This evaluation examines how this innovative policy was put into practice. Were the new principles implemented, and how did the policy contribute to the acquisition and revision of knowledge of processes of change in developing countries and the development of research capacity? The evaluation concentrated on the model programmes embodying the new policy, the multi-annual research programmes, and on the new cooperation programmes based on the same principles. The main conclusions are largely based on six case studies of programmes conducted in Bolivia, Ghana, Mali, South Africa, Tanzania and Vietnam.

Policy developments

The simultaneous introduction of new policy, new programmes, a new organisational unit at the Ministry and increased financial resources reflected the importance the Minister attached to research for development. Although the message was that Dutch researchers no longer had the upper hand, existing research projects were allowed to continue. Such projects did, however, have to adapt in line with the new policy, meaning that they had to take greater account of developing countries' demands. The Netherlands also propagated the demand-driven research approach within international organisations and programmes, and adapted funding accordingly. The Netherlands attracted considerable international praise for the idea of demand-driven research programmes.

All programmes, for example the Biotechnology Programme, were revised in light of the new demand-driven approach. The new principles also guided cooperation programmes set up in the 1990s. The vast majority had to gradually change direction. Truly different in structure were the special programmes which embodied the innovative approach: the multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes (MMRPs).

This policy enjoyed prominence until 1998, when research in development cooperation became less of a political priority. With the introduction of the sector-wide approach, which focused more on social than productive sectors, many bilateral agricultural and food security research projects were ended and not replaced. A combination of changes led to the DGIS Research Bureau losing control of research policy in the years immediately after 2000. In 2004 the Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS) stopped central funding for showpiece multi-annual research programmes.

In 2005 the theme of research resurfaced in the *Research for Development* policy memorandum. The vision, objectives and emphasis of this memorandum differ from the 1992 policy document. Despite the title, the new policy concentrates on knowledge rather than research, as the emphasis is on the use of knowledge for poverty reduction and sustainable development within Dutch development cooperation policy. Research is just one means of fulfilling this need for knowledge; in other words a new guiding principle has been applied. According to the 2005 memorandum, the demand-driven approach used since 1992 was too limited. Aiding research in developing countries is given less emphasis in the new policy frameworks. One of the core objectives of the 1992 policy, developing and/or strengthening research capacity in developing countries, has disappeared as an objective. The 2005 policy is more inward-oriented. Particularly striking is that the memorandum does not formulate an opinion on international agricultural research; this contrasts with the period 1992-2005, when it accounted for 25 per cent of all development cooperation research spending. The memorandum does, however, suggest ways to improve relations with the Dutch academic world.

Main findings

1 *Research programmes were set up in accordance with the objectives and new ideas of a demand-driven approach and local ownership, with mixed results.*

Almost no developing country is in a position to free up sufficient funding for scientific research. The idea of setting up a fund in a developing country for the purposes of financing promising research, managed by an organisation within the country itself, has proved to be productive.

The key concept of demand-driven research was complicated from the outset, and in order to assess the results we must first examine the concept itself. The main characteristics of demand-driven research were:

i) The research agenda had to reflect demand for research in the country in question, in the sense that research themes needed to address the most pressing problems. To realise this, researchers, policymakers, NGOs and other relevant groups were to be given a say in the drawing up of the agenda at national level.
ii) Research had to be implemented in accordance with the knowledge needs of the parties concerned, i.e. those who were to benefit from it. These could be either researchers themselves or target groups.

i) The consultation procedure was followed each time a research agenda was drawn up. This took so much time that some programmes only got off the ground after years of preparation. Consultation was not as wide-ranging in some countries as in others. In Vietnam and Mali, for example, ministerial bodies dominated. The NGO sector was not involved in consultations on the Ghanaian health research programme, even the church-based organisations that provided almost half of all care in the country. Steering committees took decisions on research agendas once the consultation rounds were complete. Steering committees in Bolivia and Tanzania believed that, in addition to the consultations, they had their own responsibility for the research agenda.

ii) Researchers' demands played an important part in shaping the research carried out. They formulated project proposals in keeping with their own interests, sometimes in consultation with the research's target groups. All the programmes – including the less successful – thus offered scope to carry out research that the country itself considered important, that people identified with because it related directly to them and that was inexpensive but, without outside help, could not have been carried out because of limited funding.

Some multi-annual research programmes and partnerships developed into successful programmes, signifying a real gain for research in the countries concerned. Evaluation has shown that programmes run in Bolivia, South Africa and, to a lesser extent, Tanzania enabled research that was important to the country in question and broadened understanding of local processes of change. To a greater or lesser extent, the key characteristics of multidisciplinarity, a demand-driven approach, local ownership and interaction between research and policy were realised, and local research capacity was strengthened. The programmes run in Ghana and Vietnam were less successful, while the Mali programme was a failure.

2 *The guiding principle of adopting a demand-driven approach was applied dogmatically to multi-annual research programmes.*

The move from supply-driven to demand-driven research dominated policy between 1992 and 2004. The guiding principle of adopting a demand-driven approach was applied so dogmatically that it overshadowed the objective of helping developing countries to acquire and revise knowledge of processes of change in their own countries, and harmed programme implementation.

This evaluation has highlighted the drawbacks of the demand-driven concept. They can be summarised in three lessons. First, a demand-driven approach is not always the best solution. With hindsight, the wisdom of setting up a research programme in Vietnam and Mali on this basis is questionable. It would have been more appropriate to have offered the research aid Vietnam so needed in a more traditional form, more in line with established academic research but gradually allowing space for experimentation. The research programme in Mali may have achieved more had it built on the experience of the Dutch-Malian agricultural research projects running since the mid-1970s.

The second lesson is that, by adhering rigidly to the demand-driven approach as a guiding principle and resisting all other possible external influences, programmes became isolated. Interaction with Dutch and other Western researchers was discouraged by the Research Bureau, on the grounds that it could influence the demand orientation. This meant that new programmes were unable to fully profit from external expertise; the development paradox in a nutshell.

The evaluation has shown that a demand-driven approach does not necessarily require programmes to be isolated from the Netherlands and Dutch researchers. Developing countries involved in Dutch-South partnerships profited from Dutch researchers' knowledge, experience and networks without compromising the demand-driven nature of the project. Participants in the multi-annual research programmes did not have this opportunity.

The third lesson is that dogmatic application of the demand-driven approach hindered the growth of a coherent research programme. Instead, it generated a great many small-scale, fragmented research projects, which failed to cover all the themes arising from the rounds of consultation. In particular, more politically tinged subjects and macroeconomic issues – which were often of strategic importance to poverty reduction – were insufficiently addressed. Not only did

some themes fall by the wayside, there was also little cohesion between individual research projects conducted within one given theme. This meant that knowledge accumulation, which is so important in stimulating processes of change, did not take place.

3 *Systematically developing and strengthening research capacity was a factor in the success of certain programmes.*

The second main objective of the 1992 research policy was developing or strengthening research capacity in developing countries. Little research is conducted at universities in developing countries, partly because the limited funding and manpower that is available is reserved for teaching. As a result there is no research tradition and the knowledge and infrastructure needed for research is inadequate.

This evaluation has shown that the most successful programmes were also the most active in developing and strengthening research capacity. Short courses and training sessions were set up within the programmes for researchers, policymakers and other interested parties, but these were usually little more than drops in the ocean. This is why programmes in Bolivia, Tanzania and South Africa made a systematic attempt to tackle the capacity problem. The training component in the 'Programa de Investigación Estratégica en Bolivia' (PIEB) has gradually become institutionalised and is now known as 'Universidad PIEB'; not, as the name would suggest, a university, but a programme training people to be researchers. This service meets a need not served by any universities in Bolivia.

The Tanzanian Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA) programme gradually intensified training activities, entering into partnership agreements with both Tanzanian and foreign institutes. A mentoring system was set up in which senior and junior researchers worked together in a team, the latter learning as they went. However, the mentor system did not always perform as well as expected. The South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on Alternatives in Development (SANPAD) ran a mentor system with mixed success. Therefore, SANPAD took more rigorous measures and set up a year-long training programme designed to prepare researchers and trainee researchers for doctoral research. External specialists (in the case of SANPAD, the Dutch partner) played a leading role in capacity building in both Tanzania and South Africa.

One of the main reasons that PIEB and SANPAD's role in capacity strengthening was not challenged in their own countries is that the programmes themselves

did not conduct research. Instead, they enabled others to do so and thus did not compete with universities, research centres or government services.

Research capacity does of course benefit the quality and value of research work. Significantly, the programmes run in Bolivia, Tanzania and South Africa were the only ones that carried out research subsequently disseminated outside of the programmes' immediate circle and which, in some cases, had a demonstrable influence on policy.

4 *The Ministry's internal organisation did not function adequately.*

The DGIS Research Bureau played a pivotal role in the switch from supply-driven to demand-driven research. It was very active in setting up and managing multi-annual research programmes, financing international research and advising bilateral projects. Following the 1996 review of foreign policy its advisory role came to an end. From that time onwards the embassies decided on the funding of research activities from a delegated budget, meaning that the Research Bureau's advice and/or approval was no longer needed. The multi-annual research programmes and a few partnerships were not delegated and remained under the control of the Research Bureau.

The staff of the DGIS Research Bureau dedicated a disproportionate amount of time to the multi-annual programmes in relation to the programmes' limited funding. Its efforts to ensure that programmes were as pure as possible and to see that they flourished and were protected from the traditional supply-oriented approach were sometimes rather rigid. The research world in both the Netherlands and further afield, as well as Dutch embassies in the participant country, were routinely excluded from MMRPs. The embassies, for their part, showed little interest in the multi-annual research programmes. Their involvement in partnerships was greater and more positive.

There was a fair amount of backseat driving in the relationship between the Research Bureau and the multi-annual programmes. Despite emphasising over and again that programmes must be demand-driven, conditions were imposed unilaterally, namely the characteristics dictated by multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes. As soon as Southern partners wanted to make any adjustments that departed from these fixed characteristics, such as was the case in Bolivia and Tanzania, DGIS objected. Also, partners were not free to enter into partnerships with other donors, because the Netherlands was afraid that they would not respect the special character of the programmes. This was why most

multi-annual research programmes got into difficulties when the Ministry in The Hague prematurely pulled the plug on funding in 2004.

DGIS decided that the multi-annual research programmes would no longer be financed from The Hague. The embassies were now permitted to take programmes over; but they were not instructed to do so. Most embassies did not react. After years of exclusion they had no desire to take on responsibility for programmes which DGIS had rejected. The Netherlands proved to be an unreliable partner for research institutes in developing countries; the way this episode was handled damaged the Netherlands' reputation in these countries.

The Ministry adopted a new approach to research in the 2005 *Research for Development* policy memorandum. This time the initiative lay not so much with the minister, but with DGIS management, who were also responsible for coordinating the entire process. The leading role played here by Ministry officials provides a striking contrast with the politically directed policy formulation and policy implementation that typified the first half of the 1990s. Past experience has taught the importance of generating support for policy. In contrast to 1992, formulating research policy was now a Dutch matter, with no contribution from the Southern partners.

5 *DGIS largely excluded the Dutch academic sector.*

The relationship between DGIS and the Dutch research community has not been particularly warm over the last ten to fifteen years. Some of the Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council's (RAWOO) advice was incorporated into 1992 policy, but the ensuing years were characterised by tension between the Council and DGIS. Dutch academics did still have access to research funding, but there was only limited scope for contribution to policy. To all intents and purposes the sector was excluded. It is only since the development of the 2005 policy, which specifically refers to increased collaboration with the Dutch academic world, that relations have been on a more positive footing.

Although they were effectively excluded from most multi-annual research programmes, Dutch academics were involved with the setting up and implementation of partnerships with Ghana and South Africa. Southern researchers especially valued having access to partners' knowledge, networks and research infrastructure. The partnership helped socioeconomic academics in South Africa to escape a legacy of isolation. All parties in Ghana, South Africa and the Netherlands alike expressed their appreciation of the possibilities the cooperation programmes opened up to them.

There was less cooperation than might have been expected. This is not because Dutch academics were not welcome. The opposite is true. It has more to do with the fact that there is decreasing enthusiasm in Dutch university circles for conducting research as part of development cooperation programmes. The Dutch university ratings system emphasises the importance of academic output in the form of publishing in renowned journals. Cooperation with Southern researchers is time-consuming, particularly if training is involved. That is incompatible with the demands of the academic system.

Key issues for the future

The following key issues are based on the evaluation of the 1992 Dutch research policy reform. The 2005 policy intentions, as defined in the *Research for Development* memorandum, have also been taken into account in the interests of making these comments as relevant as possible.

1 *The demand-driven approach: clarification and closer examination*

A new discussion on the concept of the demand-driven approach is needed. The 2005 *Research for Development* policy memorandum gives the demand-driven approach a more peripheral role, but provides little by way of explanation for this change. This does not do justice to the accumulated experience of Dutch research policy. Moreover, the ideas about a demand-driven approach and local ownership that caused so much controversy in research policy in the 1990s have now become part of the jargon of international cooperation, as discussions on Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), the sector-wide approach, the millennium development goals (MDGs) and new aid architecture etc. demonstrate. This makes elucidation of the concept even more important.

Recent experience has shown that previous discussions on the 'demand from developing countries' and the 'supply from the Netherlands' often resulted in polarisation. It is clear from the evaluation that the dilemmas surrounding the demand-driven approach, which were already pointed out at the beginning of the 1990s, have not yet been solved. A new discussion is needed on the meaning of the key concepts of the demand-driven approach and developing country ownership in a globalising world. How broadly should the concept of a demand-driven approach be conceived in the context of international cooperation? How can developing countries' demands realistically be addressed? And – the question again arises – whose interests take precedence? What does a demand-driven approach mean in the context of international cooperation with PRSPs and sector-

wide policy? What can knowledge and research signify for the process of poverty reduction? How are knowledge and research shaped, and what role do donor country researchers play? Can concepts taken from the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, such as coordination with local authorities and harmonisation of donor procedures, be combined with demand-driven steering?

In the 2005 policy memorandum, Dutch policymakers' and academics' knowledge needs occupy centre stage. The needs of parties in developing countries are barely mentioned. Interested parties in developing countries are no longer a direct research policy target group. Scope for research into processes that fall outside the range of international cooperation is under threat. It was precisely for the benefit of processes considered important at local level that research programmes created an independent platform in recent years. How can, and will, the Netherlands support such independent forums in the future? On what grounds will conditions for support be imposed? More clarity on these points can help prevent unnecessary confusion and take us beyond empty rhetoric.

2 *Continuing and strengthening capacity building*

The present evaluation has shown that having sufficient capacity is a determining factor in the success of a research programme. Capacity building cannot be tackled in a makeshift manner; it requires a systematic, solid approach.

Despite the success of some initiatives, there is still a lot of work to do in improving local research capacity. In this sense, the 2005 policy memorandum falls short. The idea of capacity strengthening is encapsulated in the 'principles of the system approach' and is subsumed in 'innovation systems' and hence lost from view, whereas capacity building ought to be central to this policy. Current research policy needs to place far greater emphasis on capacity building, including capacity that may generate knowledge outside the framework of international cooperation programmes.

The evaluation has shown that successful capacity development goes hand in hand with: i) good interaction between Northern and Southern researchers, ii) good mentoring of junior researchers by senior researchers, also during field studies, iii) junior researchers having the scope to conduct their own research, and not just doing odd jobs, iv) a good infrastructure, in other words access to literature and knowledge from external sources, the opportunity to attend courses and having sufficient time for the research.

As well as developing individual capacity, it is very important to invest in an institution's capacity to train researchers and conduct research. That means investing in setting up national knowledge systems, allowing new knowledge to be communicated and stimulating its application. It is in this key area that cooperation between institutes in developing countries and western universities (in this case, the Netherlands) can be productive, as exemplified by SANPAD in South Africa.

3 The need for differentiation

Research cooperation does not always have to be seen in terms of narrowing the gap between North and South in the areas of science and technology, as many preambles to conventions and agreements would suggest. This kind of approach does not do justice to the reality. Rich industrialised countries are striving to achieve technological and scientific innovation and are spending billions on doing so. However, most developing countries, certainly in Africa, have few reserves to invest in research. This imbalance means that knowledge disparity between most developing countries and industrialised countries is growing. Development cooperation will not be able to eliminate it. But a realistic approach can stimulate research, give researchers better training, create more facilities for conducting research and help develop a research culture. The more other variables, such as economic growth and foreign investments, develop in the right direction, the more related incentives can be used to further increase research standards.

The 2005 memorandum rightly highlights the existence of different forms of knowledge and research, such as academic and non-academic, informal knowledge and innovative research. This differentiation has to be considered when the detail of policy is being developed, as each type of research requires different objectives, approaches and actors. For example, in certain situations the choice might be made to emphasise non-academic knowledge and to concentrate research on making it accessible, perhaps with the help of NGOs. In other cases the emphasis might be on applying academic knowledge developed elsewhere to the local situation, for example in the case of medicines or certain technology. In countries in which science is more advanced there will be more opportunity for innovative research. The local situation will determine how the Northern-Southern partnership is shaped. Development cooperation must allow for a combination of forms of research, keeping in mind the lesson that no one type of research, for example multi-annual demand-driven research, provides all the answers.

4 *Research for development cooperation is primarily about development cooperation*

A research partnership involving Northern and Southern parties should ideally be concerned with heightening the knowledge and skills of the Southern researchers. That can mean that research projects are longer term and are less innovative in nature. Research for Development cooperation will often primarily be an opportunity for Southern researchers to learn. It is better to recognise that rather than to pretend that high-quality academic research can go hand in hand with capacity building. Both parties benefit from agreeing beforehand where the emphasis lies. Is capacity building the priority, with research results coming second? Or, is the emphasis on high-quality, publishable research? The approach and expectations will differ accordingly. In both cases, incentives should be available. If Dutch researchers enter into partnerships of this kind for other than purely academic reasons, alternative forms of recognition could be provided, such as funds set up by DGIS and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, or more intangible forms of recognition from universities.

5 *Partnership – it takes two to tango*

Research programmes based on the principle of equal partnership offer better prospects for developing countries than those subject strictly to local ownership. Local partners' voices are important and should be heard; but developing countries can also benefit from the North's experience and knowledge, and should not be left on their own on the pretext of local ownership.

The idea of partnership and how it should be defined deserves serious consideration. By relinquishing multi-annual research programmes, the ministry in The Hague has lost some of its Southern partners in the development of research policy. Indeed, there was minimal input from Southern partners in the 2005 *Research for Development* policy memorandum; the agenda was determined by the Netherlands. Now that, as of 1 January 2007, the RAWOO has also been wound up, it is even more important to have something new which involves Southern researchers.

The guiding principles of the 2005 policy, namely knowledge development and the exchange and use of knowledge, do not give a clear indication of the place that demand in developing countries will occupy in the new policy.

This shortcoming can be rectified by making some policy adjustments. For instance, by continuing to help partners in developing countries work towards

independent research, both their local significance and their contribution to international discussions will be strengthened. In addition, rewarding Dutch researchers' cooperation with colleagues from the South will allow knowledge transfer and capacity building to take place.

It should be noted that governments in developing countries could be more proactive than they currently are. The PRSPs show that they are not making research a priority and have few research plans of their own. As the saying goes, it takes two to tango.

1 Introduction

In 1992 the Minister for Development Cooperation of the Netherlands introduced new research policy. The idea behind it was the close connection between development and research and the need for developing countries to make up for lost ground in research. The policy gave precedence to research demand from the South over research supply from Dutch and Western universities and research institutes. It focused more on multidisciplinary and problem-oriented research with close interaction between researchers, policymakers and grassroots organisations. The aim was to enable the developing world to take control of the research agenda and its implementation. The two main objectives of the new research policy were to facilitate the ongoing process of adding to and refining knowledge of change processes in developing countries and increase the relevant research capacity in those countries. The Netherlands committed itself to supporting multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes (10-15 years), which symbolized the new approach.

This was a clear paradigm shift, and it aroused much debate within the Ministry and in the Dutch scientific world. The new policy would change the role of Dutch scientists and research institutes and possibly diminish their work. From the start there were questions about the South's insufficient capacity to manage the new-style programmes, and about the definition of 'demand driven'. Who, after all, would decide what the demand was?

In 2004 the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department decided to evaluate this new policy for two reasons. A few years earlier the Dutch government had adopted a rule that every policy aim would have to be evaluated once every five years. The other reason was that the new policy had been operational for more than a decade, long enough to identify some lessons learnt.

The evaluation would assess the results of Dutch research efforts ensuing from the 1992 policy. The policy was new in several respects and was exemplified by the

multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes, which were consequently included in the evaluation. In these multi-annual programmes, autonomy was moved to the South and Dutch researchers and research institutes were kept at a distance.

The multi-annual programmes were not the only object of review. The evaluation also examined several research cooperation programmes, which differ from the multi-annual programmes in that they are partnerships or other forms of cooperation between Southern and Dutch researchers and research institutes. In addition, a study of individual research projects in four countries was carried out. All in all, research activities in six countries were evaluated: Bolivia, Ghana, Mali, South Africa, Tanzania and Vietnam.

The evaluation set out to answer the following central questions:

1) How relevant (purposeful) was the Dutch policy vis-à-vis research and development, as formulated in 1992 and implemented in the years thereafter? How relevant were the funded research activities?
2) How effective were these activities?
3) How efficient were they?
4) How sustainable are the results?
5) Did the internal organisation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs function satisfactorily?
6) What was the position of the Dutch research world in the development of the new policy, how did it react to this new policy and what was its role in the implementation?

The specific characteristics and aims of the multi-annual programmes were also examined, with particular attention for their demand-driven nature, local ownership, multidisciplinary nature, capacity building and social relevance (i.e. the interaction between research and policy). In the case of research cooperation programmes special attention was paid to the framing of the research agenda (who, where?) and to the cooperation between Northern and Southern researchers. The evaluation also examined whether research efforts helped to strengthen local capacity and whether the results were integrated into policy.

The beginning of the evaluation in early 2004 coincided with the abrupt decision to end central government monitoring and funding of the multi-annual

programmes. This had an impact on the conditions under which the evaluation was carried out.

The evaluation covers six countries with research programmes supported by the Netherlands. Four of them, Bolivia, Mali, Tanzania and Vietnam, have multi-annual and other programmes supported by Netherlands. New research cooperation programmes were evaluated in two countries: the South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on Alternatives in Development and the Ghana-Netherlands Health Research Programme.

2 Background and context of the 1992 policy change

Although the 1992 policy seemed groundbreaking nationally and internationally, the understanding of a close link between development and research was much older. The United Nations organised conferences on this very subject back in 1963 and 1979. An Action Plan for capacity building in the South and technology transfer from the North to the South was adopted during the second conference. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been supporting research activities in the South since the 1960s. Over the years, several advisory bodies in the Netherlands have issued recommendations, some of which were implemented while others fell on deaf ears.

The 1990 policy document *A World of Difference* laid the immediate foundation for the 1992 paper *Research and Development*. *A World of Difference* stated that '*Scientific research potential and scientific knowledge are very largely concentrated in the rich North and are associated with interests in the North. At a time when the importance of scientific knowledge for economic, technological and social development is growing, developing countries should have their own research capacities. As a counterbalance to a northern scientific community with worldwide pretensions, the South needs to be asking its own questions and developing and using its own scientific know-how.*'

This understanding of relations within the scientific world led to the two main objectives of the 1992 research policy: to contribute to a continual process of creating knowledge about processes of change in developing countries, and to strengthen research capacity in these countries. Research had to be more location-specific, and multidisciplinary rather than thematic or sectoral. Location specificity would help involve end users in the research process.

The 1992 policy document Research and Development

The new policy was elaborated in a policy document entitled *Research and Development, Policy Document of the Government of the Netherlands* (June 1992).

The document introduced the Multi-annual Multidisciplinary Research Programmes, or multi-annual programmes, as a new instrument. The multi-annual programmes sprang from the desire that developing countries should have their own scientific research capacity to enable them to study their own development problems, and from the broad recognition that the way to achieve this was to utilise a demand-oriented approach to the funding of research in and for developing countries. This programmatic funding was recognised in scientific circles and by a few donors, such as Canada and Sweden, as an instrument that offers a structured and flexible response to a changing society and new areas of research.

The main characteristics of the multi-annual programmes outlined in the policy document were:

- the independent development of a research agenda under the responsibility of a local programme administration team;
- a multidisciplinary approach;
- involvement of policymakers from government and non-governmental organisations and representatives of relevant grassroots organisations in the establishment and targeting of programmes, with a view to facilitating optimal tailoring of research to social needs;
- involvement of representatives of Dutch bodies responsible for development activities and development policy in order to promote the use of research findings and to permit questions for research posed by policymakers and executive bodies.

The multi-annual programmes did not replace existing programmes. A number of existing research activities that had been funded nationally and internationally for some time were continued. They included the work of the Spearhead Programmes on Gender, Urban Poverty Alleviation and Environmental Issues and activities of research institutes such as the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)[1] and the Special Programme for African Agricultural Research (SPAAR).

1 CGIAR is a strategic alliance of countries, international and regional organisations, and private foundations supporting 15 international agricultural research centres where some 8,500 researchers and support staff from over 100 countries work together.

Responses to the new policy

When the new policy was published, there was a general consensus in the Netherlands that to fight the growing knowledge gap between the North and the South it was necessary to strengthen research capacity in developing countries. Generally speaking, there were two approaches to achieving that goal: the supply-led approach and the demand-led approach. The first, which utilised the strengths of Dutch research, dominated until 1990. Up till then the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had allotted most research grants to Dutch research institutes. This resulted in a large number of loose projects, in which Southern researchers performed secondary tasks while Northern researchers determined the agenda, the approach and the entire implementation. The lack of sufficient experience and knowledge within the research bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs prevented a serious and thorough exchange of ideas between the Dutch research community and the Ministry's Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS). To make research activities more policy-relevant and solution-oriented, dialogue between the groups had to be intensified.

The principles underpinning the new ideas of the Minister for Development Cooperation were supported by the Advisory Council for Scientific Research in Development Problems (later called Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council (RAWOO)), although not everyone within the RAWOO shared the same opinions. Some members were of the opinion that the Minister wanted to introduce too many multi-annual programmes too hastily. The ideas and principles of the new research policy were not undisputed. The criticism partially had to do with the policy's high level of ambition, and particularly its demand-driven nature. A major question was who in a developing country would be determining the 'demand'. What should be done if researchers, policymakers and grassroots organisations differed in their opinions about the demand? The criticism came from Dutch scientists, universities and research institutes, which feared losing their grants, and from within the Ministry itself. On more than one occasion, the Minister provoked institutes, individual researchers and ministry staff with his ambitious policy goals.

Organisation

The tripartite organisation for the implementation of the new policy was announced in the 1990 policy document *A World of Difference*. So, a Spearhead Programme on Research, the position of Chief Scientist and the special Committee for Research Projects were created in 1991 even before the publication of the 1992 policy document *Research and Development*. This structure lasted until

1996, when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was reorganised following a major political reorientation. The Spearhead Programme on Research was downgraded to a Research Bureau called DCO/OZ (Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department / Research and Developing Countries Division) and from 1999 onwards DCO/OC (Directorate Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research/Research and Communication Division).

The initial tasks of the Spearhead Programme were: 1) policy development, 2) sectoral and thematic renewal, 3) technical advising, 4) financing of activities, and 5) research registration and information provision. The staff of the Spearhead Programme spent a lot of time on the start of the multi-annual programmes, contacts between multi-annual programmes, methodological and organisational matters, and relations with the Dutch and international academic world.

A Chief Scientist was appointed to the top ranks of the civil service. He was a direct advisor to the Minister and liaised with the academic world in the Netherlands. He had a key position. After the departure of the first Chief Scientist in 1998, no successor was appointed. The Committee for Research Projects was new. Under the chairmanship of the Chief Scientist it assessed project proposals on the basis of policy intentions and characteristics and advised the Minister, who personally decided on the funding of each individual project.

Financial resources and funded activities

In all, some 4,600 activities were funded between 1992 and 2005. However, the number of related research projects and programmes is much lower. It has been estimated that only about 300 to 400 were '100%' research activities.

The IOB has estimated the total expenditure on research for development between 1992 and 2005 at almost one billion euros, but the amount may have been between EUR 1 billion and EUR 1.6 billion (see supporting tables in Chapter 10). Nearly EUR 600 million of that went to fund some 1,400 direct (i.e. 100%) research activities.

The Spearhead Programme on Research only funded a relatively small portion of all research activities: between 20 and 30% per annum. The remaining 70 to 80% was financed by other components of the Directorate-General for International Cooperation. Until the 1996 reorganisation of the Ministry, the Spearhead Programme on Research served as technical advisor and guardian of points of departure.

Most of the money was used to finance agricultural research (EUR 273 million, or 46% of the EUR 596 million) and to support research institutes (EUR 175 million, or 29%).

The geographic distribution of the research funds is noteworthy: more than EUR 250 million or well over 40% was spent 'worldwide', i.e. the allocation cannot be attributed to a specific country, region or continent. Most of it – EUR 150 million, or one quarter of the total funds spent on research – went to the CGIAR. In 2003-2005 that was one-third. Of all the continents, Africa benefited most, receiving a just under EUR 200 million, which means one out of every three euros went to Sub-Saharan Africa.

Almost half of the 1,400 activities were a variety of research projects and programmes, among them cooperation programmes and new-style multi-annual programmes. The four most important cooperation programmes were the Indo-Dutch Programme on Alternatives in Development in India (IDPAD); the Biodiversity Research Programme in the Philippines; the Health Research Programme in Ghana; and the South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on Alternatives in Development (SANPAD).

Subsequent developments and changes in research policy

The ministerial change in 1998 did not initially result in a change in research policy. The new Minister for Development Cooperation was strongly in favour of long-term financing, mutual respect and ownership, and viewed the role of the Dutch scientific world with suspicion. Though she supported the continuation of the multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes, the flagship of the research policy and programme of the 1990s, the importance of research diminished in bilateral cooperation. The minister reduced the number of recipient countries and introduced a sector-wide approach. Education and health were high on the political agenda, but agriculture became less prominent. There was no special place for research in this sector-wide approach. This adversely affected the number of funded research activities, since traditionally much of the research had been related to agriculture and rural development.

With the arrival of a new minister in 2002/2003 a new era began and new policy was introduced. The focus shifted to sustainable poverty alleviation, with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as guiding principles. There were four priority areas: education, reproductive health, HIV/Aids and environment/water. The new minister's policy documents said little or nothing about research for

development policy. This changed late in 2005 when the policy document *Research in Development* was presented to parliament. It was the first policy document on research since 1992.

The central objective became '*the effective use of knowledge and research for poverty alleviation and sustainable development*'. Research should occupy a broader embedded position in policy and practice and should also be better integrated into development cooperation programmes supported by the Netherlands. Relations between policymakers and the academic world in the Netherlands were to be improved. The central position of 'demand-led research' was abandoned. Strengthening local research capacity in developing countries – one of the two main goals of the 1992 policy document – was no longer an objective and was scarcely mentioned in the new policy document. The 2005 policy document contains no policy intentions with respect to international agricultural research, which was surprising given the substantial amounts spent on the CGIAR.

The 2005 changes were brought about by the top of the civil service. It was a Dutch-only matter as no experts from the South had been involved in the formulation. This contrasted with the paradigm shift of the early 1990s, which had been the initiative of the minister and aimed at increasing the involvement of the South.

The 2005 policy document called for improvements in the organisation of research activities. Over the years, the research programme had become fragmented and lost touch with the Dutch scientific world. The minister announced the establishment of an International Cooperation Academy to help establish multi-annual contracts between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Dutch universities and research institutes. The idea was that closer contacts between policymakers and scientists would increase the utility of research. The minister wanted to reconsider the RAWOO's role, and eventually dissolved the Advisory Council at the end of 2006.

The new policy of 2005 was more about knowledge than research. Knowledge is not produced solely through research and is not developed exclusively by academic institutions. Research, the policy document states, is just one way to produce knowledge. In fact, the new policy of 2005 was more 'knowledge policy' than 'research policy'.

3 The Multi-annual Multidisciplinary Research Programmes (MMRPs)

The Multi-annual Multidisciplinary Research Programmes became the embodiment of the new policy. The first ones began in 1994 in Bangladesh and Vietnam, followed by programmes in Bolivia, India, Mali, Nicaragua, Uganda and Tanzania. In 1999 Egypt was the last country where a multi-annual programme was introduced. Because of their innovative and experimental nature, the multi-annual programmes were treated as a programmatic unity. Approaches and procedures were not to be seen as a blueprint; the patterns were kept flexible. Preferably a programme would begin small, gradually expand and have a long life, receiving Dutch funding for ten to fifteen years. Orientation missions were supposed to approach potential countries with an open agenda. The most striking differences between the multi-annual programmes and previous supported research programmes were 1) the change from a supply-led to a demand-driven approach, 2) the shift from a project approach to a process approach, 3) the emphasis on capacity strengthening in the countries concerned, and 4) a Dutch commitment for a longer period of time.

Setting up multi-annual programmes proved to be difficult, and required a great deal of 'invention'. The Dutch academic world was kept at a distance, because the minister did not want it to continue dominating the process. Apart from the Chief Scientist, the staff of the Spearhead Programme on Research itself and selected RAWOO members, no other staff from the Ministry in The Hague or Dutch embassies in the countries participated in the orientation and formulation missions. A search for committed and like-minded scientists, policymakers and grassroots organisations started in potential candidate countries. After they had been found, they were brought together and their ideas about research themes

and topics were articulated. The Dutch played an enabling and supporting role in this process.

It was not the intention to set up a new organisation in each country with a multi-annual programme, so affiliation with existing institutions was sought. In practice there were not many of them, and in some cases there was friction between an affiliated institution and the new policy's administration. In Bangladesh this led to a serious deceleration of the programme. In Nicaragua and Uganda a new umbrella organisation of NGOs was set up. In Bolivia and Tanzania new organisations were created to accommodate the multi-annual programme. In Mali and Vietnam the multi-annual programme was incorporated into an existing governmental structure (a ministry). In the end, only in Egypt and India was an existing organisation chosen as an intermediary (host) organisation.

Launch

For most programmes the launch period took two to four years, much longer than expected. Although the minister explicitly wanted each multi-annual programme to select its own research themes, Dutch policy objectives such as poverty alleviation, environmental protection and gender equality were part of many. The themes were discussed in a forum of participating organisations in the countries concerned.

Since many multi-annual programmes attracted mostly inexperienced researchers, the quality of the research results initially was not impressive. Research that could be used at micro-level did not reach policy levels. The principled demand-led nature resulted in fragmentation, tens of small research projects and little accumulation of knowledge.

All the multi-annual programmes depended on Dutch funding. As explained above, this was a conscious decision by the Spearhead Programme on Research, later the Research Bureau, to avoid jeopardising the principles of these programmes by allowing other donor agencies – each with its own agenda and policies – to join in their set up and implementation. Consequently, the rather abrupt interruption in the flow of Dutch funding in 2004 generated considerable indignation among the programme coordinators, some of whom had been fighting against this Dutch position.

Unifying links and joint evaluation

In order to promote coherence among multi-annual programmes, the Research Bureau organised regular meetings of programme coordinators. Six were held between 1995 and 2004; two in the Netherlands, the other four in programme countries. These meetings were the result of the policy and the DGIS funds. Geographically, organisationally and in terms of vision and experience there were major differences among the multi-annual programmes.

Two important subjects were discussed during the second meeting, which took place in 1996: 1) the unifying links between the different multi-annual programmes and the Research Bureau, and 2) the possibility of a joint review of the programmes. After lengthy discussions, six unifying links were defined:

- the multi-annual programmes share a focus on sustainable development;
- they are demand-oriented and involve the end users;
- their research is location-specific;
- their research is multidisciplinary;
- strengthening research capacity and institutional aspects is a central aim;
- they have specific outputs.

The formulation of these unifying links was in fact an aim specified in the 1992 policy document. They became the basis for the first evaluation of the multi-annual programmes. Between 1997 and 2002 joint evaluations took place, the first one in Vietnam, the last one in Egypt. The following conclusions were drawn:

- Focus on sustainable development:
  - characteristic of all programmes, although the research areas differed and most research agendas were fragmentary;
- Demand orientation / involvement of end users:
  - could be improved; it was emphasized that the poor should remain central in the programmes;
- Location-specific research:
  - most research activities took place in areas that were somewhat better off; the context analysis was insufficient; researchers received little support;
- Multidisciplinary research:
  - was practised in some multi-annual programmes, but remained in general insufficient;
- Strengthening of research capacity and institutional aspects:

  - should be done at two levels, between senior and junior researchers, and between institutions and their affiliated researchers;
- Institutional aspects:
  - there was need for more effectiveness and transparency;
- Outputs:
  - in most cases the multi-annual programmes did well, as far as social relevance and use of the research results was concerned; they were weak in terms of publications.

Role of the Research Bureau

From the start the DGIS Research Bureau played an important role and supported the multi-annual programmes and monitored them closely. The eight staff members spent almost half their time on the multi-annual programmes. The research programmes were little known within the Ministry and the embassies in the countries concerned; they were rather isolated and therefore not very popular. As a result, there was no one in the Netherlands to take up their cause in 2003 when a policy change occurred within the Ministry, which eventually led to cancellation of the Research Bureau's funding and monitoring of these programmes in early 2004.

Dutch funding and representativeness of the evaluation

With a total expenditure of less than EUR 35 million during the evaluation period (1992-2005), the nine innovative research programmes were certainly not very costly. The multi-annual programmes in Bangladesh, Egypt, India, Nicaragua and Uganda were funded for a total of EUR 13.5 million.

The evaluation focused on the programmes in Bolivia, Mali, Tanzania and Vietnam. In addition, the evaluators investigated a number of other research projects in these four countries and assessed their adherence to the basic principles of the new research policy as announced by the minister in 1991 and underlying the multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes.

All together, the nine multi-annual programmes, the two research cooperation programmes in Ghana and South Africa, and the other research projects studied in Bolivia, Mali, Tanzania and Vietnam represented a financial outlay of more than EUR 100 million. This is less than 20% of the total expenditure of EUR 600 million (see above) for research in the period evaluated. Although the evaluation examined only a small percentage of research funding, its focus was justified by the central position these programmes occupied in the research and development policy of 1992.

4 Bolivia

Context

Bolivia has three striking characteristics. Firstly, it is one of Latin America's most varied countries, rich in natural resources and agricultural potential. Secondly, it is the most politically unstable country in the subcontinent, with over 200 coups d'état since independence (1821). And thirdly, it is South America's poorest country with an annual per capita income of little more than USD 1000.

Higher education is provided by both public and private universities, most of which are mediocre to poor (with one or two exceptions). Research capacity has always been weak. Most research money is spent on natural sciences, engineering and technology; publications are more often essays than reports of research results. The poor English of most academics contributes to the continuation of this deplorable situation. NGOs do not do much research either, so virtually all research depends on foreign funding. Significantly, many Bolivian students study abroad to obtain an education of reasonable quality.

Bolivia has been a Dutch foreign aid recipient since the 1980s, receiving EUR 27 million in 2005. The Netherlands' diplomatic mission in the capital, La Paz, was upgraded to an embassy in 1993 following a significant increase in Dutch aid. The bilateral aid programme has gradually evolved from a traditional sector-wide approach to support for macroeconomic reforms and political decentralisation. Following the shift in Dutch policy to a sector-wide approach the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had been focusing its aid to Bolivia on education, drinkable water, water management, marketing of agricultural produce and good governance.

4.1 The Strategic Research Programme in Bolivia: PIEB[2]

Selection and preparation phase

In the early 1990s Dutch development cooperation policy in South America focused on five countries: Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru, which were therefore all eligible for a multi-annual research programme. However, in 1992 it was decided that Chile would no longer benefit from Dutch aid and political instability in Peru made the country an unattractive place to establish a new programme. Ecuador was considered too unknown for an experimental research programme. When it became apparent that Columbia would soon share Chile's fate as a recipient of Dutch aid, Bolivia was selected.

Three years of orientation and formulation preceded the start of 'Programa de Investigación Estratégica en Bolivia', or PIEB, in 1995. Within the Research Bureau there were concerns that it might prove too difficult to find an adequate counterpart to set up and implement the research programme. It took two orientation missions before a result was reached. The second mission was carried out by a Dutch, a Colombian and a Bolivian consultant. The Bolivian expert became and still is PIEB's director (Coordinator). During the mission, NGOs, research institutes and individual researchers and government bodies were selected for their interest in demand-led research.

In the preparatory phase friction arose between the Netherlands' Aid Office in La Paz, responsible for Dutch development assistance to Bolivia, and the Research Bureau in The Hague. The Aid Office in La Paz had serious doubts about Bolivia's capacity to implement the programme. It wanted to have more input on the selection of experts and the composition of the research agenda. The Research Bureau, however, was aiming for a real Bolivian approach, wanted to keep Dutch researchers at a distance and favoured more academic long-term research. After the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation personally intervened, the Aid Office withdrew its opposition to the Research Bureau's ideas and activities and adopted a more constructive attitude, but was still made to keep its distance by the Research Bureau.

Soon it was decided that a totally new organisation was needed. At an end users workshop in March 1994, more than 30 experts from NGOs, the government and the academic world in Bolivia defined a research agenda and made

2 The acronym PIEB stands for 'Programa de Investigación Estratégica en Bolivia'.

recommendations on the nature and management of the programme. The Steering Committee emphasised the need to train young researchers and have publication channels, and stressed the importance of subjecting researchers who wished to qualify for a PIEB grant to a thorough, competitive selection procedure.

PIEB then defined four research areas:
- actors and social relations in daily life;
- changes in production processes, social integration and sustainable development;
- democratisation of the State in a heterogeneous and multicultural society;
- cultural changes and communication.

Characteristics of the programme

Finally, the Steering Committee formulated PIEB's aims: to strengthen independent research capacity in the social sciences in Bolivia and promote capacity-building for social-scientific research. Through the years it has not changed these aims, and the PIEB activities have remained remarkably stable too. It is interesting to note that PIEB was never attributed the catalysing role which the multi-annual research programmes were supposed to have according to the 1992 policy document on research.

To set the research agenda, PIEB invited social actors to identify regional and national issues and indicate what knowledge and information was needed to come to policy decisions that would provide a basis for solving problems. Subsequently, it organised competitions to attract good research proposals. To this end, the multi-annual programme in Bolivia developed three modalities:

- a national competition for multidisciplinary teams of senior and junior researchers;
- a national competition for multidisciplinary teams of young researchers;
- a regional competition for multidisciplinary teams of senior and junior researchers.

Between 1995 and 2004, PIEB organised nine national and seven regional competitions. It received 778 research project proposals from 1,882 participants. Of these, 107 proposals (13.7%), involving 381 researchers (20.2 %), were approved. It occurred only once – in a competition on policy alternatives for economic development – that not a single proposal was approved.

The selection criteria for project proposals were:

- academic quality of the research;
- social relevance;
- academic background of the researchers;
- training programme for junior researchers;
- plan for distributing the research and its results;
- reasonableness and feasibility of the budget.

Though a successful programme, at times PIEB has been criticised for being overly concentrated in La Paz (the seat of government) and Cochabamba (a major regional capital) and being too demanding in terms of the academic quality of the research projects. Another criticism was that too few of PIEB's research activities were relevant to development.

Results in terms of the new research policy's characteristics

Demand-led research
The research agenda was not set by the Government of Bolivia, civil society organisations or the Dutch embassy. PIEB allowed the intended end users of the research results to influence the agenda, but took an independent, autonomous stand in deciding on the research topics through a system of open national and, in particular, regional competition for multidisciplinary research teams.

Ownership
The PIEB Steering Group and the organisation's Executive Secretary have local ownership of the multi-annual programme. Where this collided with views from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, e.g. concerning the institutionalisation of its training component ('Universidad PIEB'), the Bolivian view prevailed in the end.

Multidisciplinary character of research
Multidisciplinary was a criteria for awarding grants. Though it produced somewhat artificial multidisciplinary teams in some cases, this condition enabled many researchers to cooperate with colleagues from different disciplines.

Capacity strengthening
In the first ten years of its existence, PIEB trained 353 researchers (60% men; 40% women) in 31 workshops. The training sessions covered not only academic skills, but also teamwork, interaction with end users, presentation of research results

and management of research funds. As mentioned briefly above, the Dutch donor (the Research Bureau) did not support PIEB's intention to institutionalise its training component, but PIEB proceeded, thereby demonstrating its autonomy. In 2002 PIEB established the PIEB University exclusively for training researchers, with the authorisation of the Bolivian government.

Institutional strengthening

PIEB has improved the material resources of documentation centres and libraries and provided training to documentalists and librarians all over Bolivia. It supplied researchers with computers and other materials. They were not allowed to keep them after their research was completed, but had to cede them to their research institute. As a result, 27 libraries and documentation centres saw their visitor numbers increase and the quality of their services improve. Since 2000, PIEB has offered training to five documentation networks.

Dissemination of results

PIEB contributed to the dissemination of results through publications, colloquiums, seminars, workshops, the media and lobbying activities. The following example serves as a good illustration. A 1998 research report on national conscription by Juan Ramón Quintana et al. was extensively quoted in the local media. The 'Association of Parents of Soldiers' used it to lobby against harsh conditions for conscripts. As a result, the Bolivian Ministry for Defence took measures to improve the situation and prepare vocational training for young illiterate soldiers. It also took measures to improve the human rights situation in the army.

Policy or social relevance

PIEB's research activities were socially relevant, researchers and end users consulted with each other, much of the research was interdisciplinary and local research capacity was strengthened. PIEB now has a complex national network and is recognised as the leading social sciences research institute in the country. An invitation from PIEB to contribute is highly regarded in Bolivia. In hindsight it can be said that PIEB has profited from the Research Bureau's trust and protection. The disadvantage of the relationship was felt in 2004 when the funding was interrupted and PIEB had never looked for alternative funding.

PIEB's experiences prove that the demands which multi-annual programmes have to meet can clash. The programmes have preset and fairly strict characteristics, but they are also demand-driven. The demand for academic-quality research

results may conflict with the need to strengthen capacity. The characteristic of autonomy was implemented to such an extent that it led to the programme becoming isolated.

Costs of the multi-annual research programme

DGIS's expenditure on PIEB totalled EUR 8.3 million. The preparation costs (1992-1995) were relatively low: 2% of total expenditure. During Phase I EUR 3.2 million was spent (1995-2000) and EUR 4.9 million in the second phase. After the ending of the Research Bureau's funding of the programme, the Royal Netherlands Embassy in La Paz took over financing of this successful research programme.

4.2 Other research projects supported by the Netherlands

In the period when PIEB was being established, the Netherlands was also funding other research projects in Bolivia. Three of them were examined to determine whether they reflected features of the new policy. The projects have in common that they were approved and implemented after the introduction of the new research policy in 1992.

Zonification and Geographic Information Systems, 1993-2001 (ZONISIG)

This research project resulting from Bolivia's 'Tropical Forestry Action Plan' took four years of preparation. The aim of the project was to systematically collect data on environmental issues and regional planning. As in the case of PIEB, there was disagreement between the Dutch and Bolivian stakeholders regarding the institute that would host the research project. The Bolivian's preference for a governmental institution did not materialise. The five members of the project's supervision group were Dutch. Though the consultant team doing the research had three Bolivian expert members, the team leader was Dutch, and the other two members were Argentinean and Dutch.

In 1997 the Dutch embassy staff concluded that ZONISIG was not up to its standard. In all, nearly one hundred Bolivians had been trained. One of them was briefly Minister for Sustainable Development. The maps produced by ZONISIG have been used at local level and even by farmers. The project cost a total of EUR 3.1 million and ended in 2001.

Livelihood strategies in the Andes 1994-1997 ('PIED-Andino')

The initiative for this research project came from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It wanted to know whether interventions it was financing were grounded

in sufficient knowledge of Indian farmers' households. The project aim was to improve matching between development interventions and livelihood strategies in the Andean plateau. Also in this case there was disagreement about the staffing of the project. The project started in 1994, after the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation personally intervened to ensure more Bolivian participation and ownership.

The project's research results were disseminated via an international seminar on farmers' strategies, two publications, two videos and a CD Rom with pictures. Moreover, a Dutch and a Bolivian researcher used the research findings to write a doctoral thesis.

Total cost: less than EUR 0.3 million.

Sustainable Forest Management (1995-2003)

This cooperation project between a Bolivian and a Dutch university started on a donor-driven basis but developed into a major research programme in Bolivia, with eleven Bolivian and eight foreign researchers. The initial donor-driven character of the project led to an 18-month internal discussion within the Dutch ministry and to several personal interventions by the Minister for Development Cooperation. The programme was approved once the Minister determined that Bolivian control was sufficiently visible. The project enabled some 50 Bolivian students to write their thesis, and four Bolivian and four Dutch researchers wrote their Ph.D. thesis on the project's results. However, the project's contribution to institutional strengthening of local research capacity was negligible. The project was discontinued due to the introduction of the sector-wide approach.

Total cost: EUR 1.8 million.

Assessment

In general, the three projects' performance and implementation of the new research policy's main characteristics were very modest and did not compare favourably with the achievements of PIEB. They were scarcely based on demand-driven research, and as a result there was little local ownership. The forest management project, however, was a good example of successful cooperation between Dutch and Bolivian researchers. All three projects succeeded reasonably well in disseminating the research results and in lobby and advocacy work. Two of the three projects helped strengthen local research capacity, though this benefited individual researchers more than local institutes.

5 Mali

Context

From the second half of the 1970s Dutch aid was prominently visible in Mali. Most projects funded by the Netherlands were located in the south (rural development) and in the Niger delta (irrigated rice production). A relatively high proportion of the money – in some years as much as 30% of all Dutch ODA to Mali – was spent on research, particularly agricultural research, usually through the Institut d'Économie Rural (Rural Economy Institute, IER) of the Ministry of Agriculture. Also, a great deal of support went to the Office de Niger for research on irrigated rice cultivation. Researchers from the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam and from Wageningen University played an important role in these projects.

The Netherlands established bilateral aid relations with Mali in 1988 and was Mali's second largest bilateral donor after France. Dutch aid amounted to nearly EUR 40 million in 2005.

In general, the research in Mali focused on agriculture. Not surprisingly therefore, the Rural Economy Institute harboured 85% of all research capacity and money. External donors, notably the World Bank and a few bilateral donors, have always had an important say in research activities in the country. Mali has had a strategic plan for agricultural research since 1992. At national level, all research activities were formally coordinated by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (National Centre for Scientific Research and Technology, CNRST) of the Ministry of Education.

5.1 The Niger Delta Research Programme

Selection and preparation phase

The desire to also have a multi-annual research programme in the Sahel Region led the Research Bureau to explore the options in four Sahelian countries in 1992. Niger and Senegal were not regular recipients of Dutch aid and an important

regional research programme was well underway in Burkina Faso, so Mali was selected. Additional arguments in favour of Mali were that it's research capacity was relatively strong and Dutch research institutes and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs were familiar with research institutes in the country.

The preparatory phase was characterised by lengthy discussions, frequent missions, several workshops and a widening gap between the Research Bureau and other staff of the Ministry, including the embassy in Bamako. The initial consensus between the two gradually disappeared because the Minister mandated that promoting and developing multi-annual programmes was (almost) exclusively the Research Bureau's affair. The Research Bureau held the position that the multi-annual programme in Mali should not be incorporated into one of the existing institutes, which were already receiving Dutch support, as this would be inconsistent with the basic characteristics of the programme, in particular its demand-led orientation. Therefore, the CNRST was seen as an interesting counterpart, despite the fact that this was contrary to the underlying philosophy of the multi-annual programmes. The Dutch embassy in Bamako and other staff at the Ministry in The Hague disagreed with these conclusions.

The selection of research themes was a participatory process which included the intended beneficiaries in several villages. It was a lengthy process which took nearly three years (1994-1996). When the multi-annual programme finally started and Dutch funds became available (1998-1999), many of the subjects were outdated, as nearly five years had passed.

In early 1997 a management structure was set up with an Assembly of Participants, a Steering Committee and an Executive Secretariat. At the end of that year a programme document was prepared with a list of 44 selected research themes, but without a timetable or aims and indicators to measure progress. During discussions between the Research Bureau and the embassy, the embassy confirmed that it could scarcely support the initiative.

In July 1998 the Minister for Development Cooperation gave the green light for the multi-annual programme, which had been named the Niger Delta Programme. The Programme was accommodated at the CNRST. The main objective was to implement research that would contribute to the understanding of development processes in the Ségou Region of Mali. In the case of the Niger Delta Programme no mention was made in the programme's objectives of the catalysing role which the multi-annual programme was meant to have in accordance with the

1992 research policy. Funds were approved for a period of four years, though the Netherlands envisaged a ten-year funding period, as was explicitly mentioned in the contract between the CNRST and the Netherlands. The first funds arrived in December 1998, after nearly seven years of preparation.

Characteristics of the programme

At the end of 1998 the Niger Delta Programme was launched with much publicity. In July 1999, the first invitation to submit tenders was published in the newspapers. Two other public calls for proposals followed. Of the 221 project proposals received, 44 were approved on the basis of a set of criteria established by the Steering Committee.

After briefly using individual contracts, the Niger Delta Programme decided it preferred to establish cooperation contracts with research institutes. Researchers at these institutions began to implement the approved project proposals. The Rural Economy Institute ended up as the main recipient of research funds from the Niger Delta Programme. This is interesting in light of the controversy between the Research Bureau and the Bamako embassy during the preparatory phase. Moreover, since the Institute also was a recipient of other Dutch project monies (see below, 'Other research projects') the organisation did not really need the Niger Delta funds to implement its research programme.

The Niger Delta Programme had three categories of research themes: 1) ecology, environment and biodiversity, 2) sociology, demography and health, 3) production systems. They covered all the priorities of the Netherlands' development policy except gender. Most activities were more thematic and unidisciplinary than multidisciplinary. The Mali programme put a great deal of effort into the organisational set-up and procedures, the selection of research teams and the preparation of field activities. It organised several workshops to strengthen the reporting capacity, statistical processing of research data and monitoring of research quality.

In 1997 it was decided that the Assembly of Participants would consist of representatives of the population (to be selected by the CRNST), local authorities, regional NGOs and researchers. This highest body of the programme met only once, in July 2001, 34 months after the Niger Delta Programme started. The Steering Committee usually met six times a year. In the *de facto* absence of the Assembly, the Steering Committee took most decisions. Several members of the Steering Committee helped the Executive Secretariat in its work.

Initially, the research sector in Mali was positive about the multi-annual research programme and actively participated in its establishment. As the new approach was not deeply embedded and the research outcomes were generally weak, the Niger Delta programme did not strengthen the network of national research institutes. Internationally, it did not expand its network further than the multi-annual programmes in the other countries. The overall financial management of the multi-annual programme remained weak.

By the end of the (prolonged) first project phase, only five research projects had been completed and some EUR 1.2 million had been spent. In late 2003, the Ministry abruptly decided to halt the funding of the Niger Delta programme. The nearly forty ongoing research projects had to be stopped for lack of funds. As this occurred abruptly and unexpectedly, there was no opportunity to wind up the programme in a logical and proper manner. This damaged the good reputation of the Netherlands as a trustworthy and reliable development partner in Mali.

Staff at the Ministry's Sub-Saharan Africa Department and the Dutch embassy in Bamako differed strongly from the Research Bureau in their opinions on the latter's plans for a multi-annual research programme in Mali. Although some adjustments were made to accommodate the embassy's concerns, the Research Bureau kept emphasising the autonomy of the multi-annual programme and donor's limited control over the design and main outlines of the programme. The Research Bureau's interpretation of 'autonomy' was so strict that all direct support to the CRNST and the Niger Delta Programme to improve quality was avoided. Ownership was considered more important than partnership. Yet the Malian ownership was actually also limited, as the programme had to fit the design, policy goals and management structure which characterised the new approach but which it had not helped to design.

The managers of the programme were expected to be sufficiently equipped to realise this new approach. The capacity strengthening, which had been necessary in Mali and in which both the Embassy and the Research Bureau could have played a positive role, did not occur. Also, the Research Bureau's expectation that such capacity strengthening could have taken place via South-South cooperation (with other multi-annual programmes) did not materialise. Thus, the Niger Delta Programme never benefited from the experiences of e.g. PIEB/Bolivia and REPOA/Tanzania in training young researchers.

Results in terms of the new research policy's characteristics

Demand-led research
Though the issues studied represented real problems and had been selected through a participatory process, many of the projects were more like pre-extension activities than research. In fact, they could hardly be called research projects, which renders any assessment of their demand-led nature futile.

Ownership
Malian ownership of the Niger Delta Programme existed *de jure*, though Malians had had no input into the structural design. Furthermore, it was an empty shell due to the CNRST's passive attitude and lack of initiative. Due to the pre-extension nature of the activities, there was a low score on local ownership of the projects.

Multidisciplinary character of research
Most of the research concerned agriculture, was carried out by the Rural Economy Institute and was not multidisciplinary.

Capacity strengthening
The Niger Delta Programme did not have a distinct training component. Considering its low output, it most likely did little, if anything, to strengthen local research capacity.

Institutional strengthening
Neither the CNRST nor the beneficiary research institutes have had any long-term benefit from the Niger Delta Programme.

Dissemination of results
Virtually absent, mainly because dissemination of results was potentially possible in only four of the mere five projects completed. In addition, many projects lacked any practical relevance. Furthermore, monitoring of the projects was fragmentary. Finally, the premature and sudden end of the projects following the withdrawal of Dutch funding prevented any future action in this respect.

Policy or social relevance
None due to the nature of the activities, the near-absence of completed projects and the isolated position of the host organisation (CNRST).

Costs of the multi-annual research programme

Total expenditure (1998-2003) amounted to EUR 1.2 million, preparatory costs accounted for less than EUR 0.1 million (1992-1998).

5.2 Other research projects supported by the Netherlands

Long before the Niger Delta Programme was set up, the Netherlands was already supporting various research projects in Mali, some of which continued after the multi-annual programme started. These three were examined to determine whether they had or had developed the characteristics of the 1992 research policy:

- support for the research unit Division de Recherche des Systèmes de Production Rurale (DRSPR) of the Rural Economy Institute (Institut d'Économie Rural, IER);
- a research project for irrigated rice cultivation in the Niger Delta;
- a programme supporting the Rural Economy Institute.

Research on rural production systems

The IER research unit DRSPR was for a long time the 'heart' of Dutch support for research in Mali. The Netherlands began its funding back in 1977. The research aim was to map and improve production systems in the south of Mali, where cotton is the main cash crop. The intervention passed through many stages and through the years had established a very firm and positive reputation in Mali. The DRSPR project was not demand-driven, and initially local ownership was weak. But contacts with end users have improved through the years, and a certain level of partnership has developed as well. Capacity-strengthening activity focused initially on individual researchers and at later stages on the institute. Through the years there has been a great deal of interaction between research, policy and implementation.

Dutch support for this project lasted well over 20 years and totalled about EUR 25 million. In 2002 it was integrated into the support programme for the Rural Economy Institute (see below).

Irrigated rice cultivation

The irrigated rice cultivation project was part of the *Office de Niger*, a state-owned rice production scheme in the Inner Delta of the Niger River. The origin of this research project goes back to the mid-1980s. This donor-driven, applied agricultural research project was intended to increase paddy production. In

the beginning the project had many weaknesses. In 1993, after a number of improvements, the Netherlands decided to continue its support for another four years, partly within the context of wider Dutch support for rice cultivation in West Africa.

Here, too, the question was posed: what is demand-driven, and whose demand is driving the research? In this case it was the local authorities and researchers, and not the local rice growers. The project cost EUR 4.6 million in total.

Support for the Rural Economy Institute

The Institute contributes to sustainable socioeconomic development through improved agricultural research. To make all the Institute's research efforts more self-supporting, the following principles were agreed in 1998: increased participation of end users in formulating, implementing, financing and evaluating research activities; decentralisation of decision-making and research management to regional agricultural research centres; focusing research on regional production systems; capacity strengthening; and increased financial self-reliance.

User committees were set up in order to apply these principles, although it is unclear to what extent they represented the target group. Mali increased its ownership of IER projects, although donor supervision is still strong. The IER's capacity was strengthened, but it suffered from macroeconomic measures that led a 50% cut in the number of personnel. The research activities proved very useful for applied research and results were published frequently, albeit mostly by Dutch researchers.

Assessment

The Niger Delta Programme had little influence on the other Dutch-supported activities in Mali. It was the IER that influenced the multi-annual programme. Demand-led research has become a common phrase in Mali, but Malian researchers often just pay lip service to this principle. Local ownership is, in fact, low, following a period of extreme dependence on external funding. Individual capacity building has progressed, as has institutional reinforcement, although to a lesser extent. Macroeconomic conditions, however, have undermined the gains. Dutch support for research in Mali has had a significant impact on the formulation and implementation of Malian research policy and generated a great deal of publicity. Research results have been disseminated, but mainly by Dutch

researchers. The concrete application of research results depends heavily on favourable macroeconomic conditions.

6 Tanzania

Context

The Netherlands has provided aid to Tanzania since the 1960s. Of the Dutch partner-countries, Tanzania is the no. 1 recipient of Dutch aid in Sub-Saharan Africa. In the 2001-2005 period it received amounts fluctuating between EUR 41 and EUR 76 million. In the 1990s Dutch aid to Tanzania was fragmented and heavily donor-driven. Since the late 1990s aid has been concentrated in the education and health sectors. Due to its importance in the bilateral aid programme, Tanzania is a popular destination for ministers and members of the royal family.

Until the mid-1980s research at the University of Dar es Salaam had a good reputation. As a result of economic crisis and following Structural Adjustment Programmes, quality and standards diminished and many academics had to do consultancy work to supplement their income. In that period the Netherlands supported the university's Economic Research Bureau, which focused on policy-related matters, and a number of agricultural research projects, including soil conservation and farming systems, plant nutrition and people participation. In general, research agendas were heavily donor-driven. The Netherlands also supported the sugar sector. Most research funding dried up in the later half of the 1990s. This withdrawal from most research projects coincided with the substantial Dutch co-financing of the multi-donor financed Tanzania Agricultural Research Programme (see below, 'Other research projects supported by the Netherlands').

6.1 The Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation: REPOA

Selection and preparation phase

Tanzania was selected for a multi-annual multidisciplinary research programme because of its prominent place in Dutch bilateral development cooperation and the related Dutch support for research in the country.

From 1992 to 1995 an inventory of development-related issues and research activities was made and researchers, policymakers and end users were identified. After a committee composed of Tanzanian and Dutch stakeholders agreed in 1993 to make poverty alleviation the main research theme, five sub-themes were distinguished: 1) consequences for national policies, 2) relation between poverty and ecology, 3) role of technology, 4) gender relations, 5) socioeconomic factors relevant to poverty alleviation. Subsequent workshops were held in The Hague and Dar es Salaam. The Economic Research Bureau (ERB) and the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF, a Tanzanian research organisation) played an important role in the workshop in Dar es Salaam. Among the participants were academic researchers and representatives of the public and private sector, civil society, NGOs and the donor community.

Three Dutch and three Tanzanian experts played a key role in the phase leading up to the formal creation of the Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation. On the Tanzanian side, there was the Director of the Economic and Social Research Foundation, the Director-Coordinator of the African Economic Research Consortium and a university professor who would become REPOA's first director. On the Dutch side, there was the Head of the Spearhead Programme on Research, the Chief Scientist and a consultant Tanzania expert. The two Tanzanian directors wrote the basic document and REPOA, the multi-annual multidisciplinary Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation, became an independent foundation in 1995.

REPOA's main aim was to increase understanding of the root causes, nature, scope and different faces of poverty in Tanzania. Sub-aims were to:

- strengthen local research capacity;
- set up an autonomous poverty research network;
- increase knowledge and understanding of poverty among grassroots organisations, local researchers and research institutes, policymakers and development practitioners;
- contribute to the development of poverty alleviation policies;
- disseminate research results and link up researchers with potential research users.

As in the other multi-annual programmes, no mention was made of the catalysing role referred to in the 1992 policy document on research.

Characteristics of the programme

Learning by doing was an important element of REPOA's approach. Apart from financing research activities, it organised technical and training workshops, coached young researchers and was rigorous in its selection, through competitions, of research proposals. It is interesting to note that REPOA developed very differently from the other multi-annual research programmes – although there was a great deal of friction with The Hague. Like the other programmes REPOA financed small research projects, but it also developed other activities. It did research at the request of others; it employed its own researchers, who carried out specific research activities; it became a key player in the Research and Analysis Working Group, which monitored the implementation of the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP), and it had started to develop a new 'grassroots research programme' when financing became precarious following the Dutch government's 2004 decision to stop funding. One of REPOA's important achievements was that it helped create a more favourable research climate in Tanzania.

Given the uniqueness of REPOA's organisational development, there is good reason to take a closer look at the different 'windows' that REPOA created over the years.

Window 1: Window 1 is a competitive system in which independent researchers are invited to submit research proposals. In addition to funding, REPOA offers support to young researchers through a peer review process and some annual training. The latter support proved indispensable due to the lack of qualified researchers, the low level of the junior researchers and the poor quality of the proposals submitted. An evaluation done in 1997 showed that the mentor and coaching systems and annual training were highly appreciated.

Window 2: On the basis of its experiences, REPOA decided to employ experienced researchers to safeguard the quality the research funded under Window 1 and to conduct research on topics that it found relevant. This adjustment caused serious friction with the DGIS Research Bureau in The Hague. Demand orientation was a key issue in the discussion: whose demand was the research supposed to meet? Window 2 almost automatically included the option of research at the request of third parties. This also led to a heated debate with The Hague because the Research Bureau felt this created the risk of REPOA becoming a consultancy agency instead of a research institute. In particular, the Research Bureau preferred to remain the only funding agency in order to safeguard the conceptual integrity

of the multi-annual research programme. After many discussions the Research Bureau accepted in 1999 that REPOA could take funding from other sources.

A new controversy arose when REPOA wanted to accept the invitation of the Government of Tanzania to head the secretariat of the Research and Analysis Working Group, responsible for monitoring the implementation of the country's PRSP. The Research Bureau feared that REPOA's research agenda might be dominated by PRSP-related issues. Moreover, it feared that REPOA would thus become a government instrument, and that this position might jeopardise its political independence. REPOA stuck to its position and finally, in 2002, the Research Bureau agreed.

Window 3: As some research sub-themes were underrepresented, REPOA opened a third window to work with civil society, including NGOs and volunteer organisations, in order to strengthen their capacity for research and action for poverty alleviation. This led to yet another dispute with the Research Bureau. The latter considered the shift to more action-oriented activities a deviation from the principle of 'demand-led research' and opposed REPOA's plans. Again REPOA won. However, before it could implement its plans, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced the end of the Netherlands' financing of all multi-annual research programmes, including REPOA (2004).

Research activities

From 1995 onwards REPOA selected and funded about 106 research projects, spread over Windows 1 and 2. Almost 90% consisted of small-scale research activities by junior researchers and slightly more than 10% were carried out by REPOA senior researchers. Most projects were multidisciplinary and involved more than one researcher. In total, 163 researchers received funding. Considering the limited research capacity of the country, this is a remarkable achievement. Women, who made up just 14% of the researchers, were heavily underrepresented. In addition, hundreds of researchers, government staff and civil society representatives participated in training workshops and courses. An estimated 30% of the projects led to publications in the REPOA Research Papers series. REPOA has a library and computer and conference facilities, which are also open to the general public.

Networking and organisation

From the start, REPOA built both an internal network among local researchers, academics, politicians and officials, and an international network with like-

minded researchers and research institutes. The latter often contribute to workshops and courses. There was almost no interaction with the Netherlands research world, partly as a consequence of the new policy's principle of autonomy for the South. REPOA has a General Assembly, a Board, a Technical Advising Committee and a Secretariat. The Secretariat is the nucleus of REPOA. It carries out administrative and logistical tasks, networks and maintains contacts with researchers, policymakers and other key people.

Role of the Research Bureau

To protect REPOA's autonomy the Research Bureau shielded the programme from the rest of the Ministry and the Dutch embassy in Dar es Salaam. Initially the Research Bureau staff kept the embassy well informed, but this changed later on and friction arose.

Results in terms of the new research policy's characteristics

Demand-led research

There is no doubt that the research agenda was set by Tanzanians though their choice coincided with the Dutch policy priorities in development cooperation. Initially, REPOA went for a demand-led approach determined by researchers, shifting later to an approach driven by end users. During this process, REPOA's Executive Director demonstrated that he had his own ideas about demand-led research, which were not without risk of potential conflicts of interest.

Ownership

REPOA was in control and its Executive Director took all major decisions, supported by a few Tanzanian scientists and researchers. Ownership was therefore certainly in Tanzanian hands, but this sparked some conflict with the Dutch financers.

Multidisciplinary character of research

Most research was multidisciplinary, notably in Window 1. There were implementation problems, however, partly because the appropriate research methodology for one particular sector/discipline could not automatically be applied in a multidisciplinary approach and REPOA failed to adequately address this problem.

Capacity strengthening

REPOA did not escape the dilemma that characterised virtually all multi-annual programmes: the objective of enhancing local research capacity versus the objective of delivering high-quality research. It resolved the problem by creating different windows. The first objective was realised by providing opportunities to junior researchers (Window 1); the second objective was realised by funding high-quality research carried out by senior researchers (Window 2).

Institutional strengthening

Over the years, REPOA has become a multi-faceted organisation: a scientific organisation with experienced senior researchers; a partner of the international donor community and the Government of Tanzania through its role in monitoring the implementation of Tanzania's Poverty Reduction Strategy; and an organisation that carries out research, provides training and publishes reports on the faces of poverty in Tanzania. REPOA's contribution towards improving the research climate in Tanzania is also noteworthy.

Dissemination of results

The REPOA Research Papers series publishes the results of research funded by the organisation. In addition, research reports are written on request (Window 2) and the work disseminated within the framework of the Research and Analysis Working Group monitoring the PRSP process. REPOA's role in publishing Tanzania's Human Development Index is also noteworthy. However, REPOA puts its independent position and professional integrity – and thus the application of research results – on the line by accepting paid assignments from third parties and, in particular, by engaging in a politically sensitive exercise like monitoring the PRSP implementation.

Policy or social relevance

The relevance of REPOA's work to policy was remarkable. It focused on a broad range of poverty questions and has connections with a wide range of stakeholders in the country. In its research activities REPOA did not reach international standards, because it devoted so much attention to capacity strengthening. REPOA offered most project holders a laboratory where they could do research and improve their skills, but it played an important role in strengthening Tanzania's research capacity.

Costs of the multi-annual research programme

Expenditure totalled EUR 5.5 million, nearly EUR 2 million of which was spent in Phase I (1995-1999) and more than EUR 3 million in Phase II (1999-2005). After the Netherlands stopped supplying funds, negotiations with donor representatives in Dar es Salaam resulted in multi-donor basket funding in which the Dutch embassy also participated.

6.2 Other research projects supported by the Netherlands

Three research projects were studied to determine whether they had or had developed characteristics of the 1992 research policy. Two of them started before 1992, the third is a consolidation and follow-up of these two.

Research into farming systems

The National Farming Systems Research Project – Lake Zone began in 1988. The Netherlands supported the project with EUR 8.8 million until 2002, when it was ended. The National Research Plan required agricultural researchers to use the farming systems research approach. The results were to be used by extension workers to help farmers adapt to modern technologies, increase production and respect the natural environment. Several reviews in the 1990s showed that the project was highly donor-driven, too technical and did not sufficiently consider institutional aspects or the participation of male and female farmers. Project adjustments were made and the slogan 'client-oriented research' introduced. Ultimately the project was integrated into phase II of the nationwide Tanzania Agricultural Research Programme (TARP-II, see below). The Netherlands supported it until 2002 in order to:

- increase food security;
- develop tailor-made agricultural extension programmes; and
- conduct socioeconomic studies to identify potential markets.

Strengthening National Farming Systems Research

The project started in 1989 and the Dutch contributed EUR 1.9 million to it. The major goal was to develop national capacity to implement farming systems research. The focus was on the poor rural population, and national research staff would assist. There was a national coordinator with a small office and a regional team for each eco-zone. On the whole, the programme helped build and strengthen the national farming systems research capacity.

Tanzania Agricultural Research Programme (TARP-II)

This vast and expensive multi-donor programme was supported by the Netherlands (contribution EUR 8 million; EUR 3 million of which was technical assistance), the World Bank and several other donors. It was characterised by decentralised research management, client-oriented and demand-driven research based on the farming systems approach, a key role for the private sector and reinforcement of the connections between research, extension work and farming. The programme looked promising, but because of a change of policy on the Dutch side – the introduction of the sector-wide approach – Dutch funding of agricultural research in Tanzania ceased in 2003.

Assessment

The Farming Systems Research programmes were based on the principle that farmers' needs determined the research agenda. However, in fact it was the researchers' and local politicians' perception of these needs that played a dominate role. In this sense these programmes displayed a traditional project approach, including a technical assistance component which determined the research agenda, concepts and methodology. The technical assistance component was substantial until the end of the programmes. The local farmers who were to benefit from the research never became programme partners, although efforts were undertaken to improve this situation and enhance the demand-led character of the projects. Before this change of approach could bear fruit, Dutch support was ended. In general, local ownership was very limited.

The programmes made a positive contribution to national research capacity, albeit almost exclusively at the individual level. Tanzania's extreme aid dependency raises doubts about the sustainability of these achievements. Due to organisational and financial obstacles the programmes' impact on national agricultural and research policies was weak, hindering improvement of relations between researchers, farmers and extension workers.

7 Vietnam

Context

The Netherlands is among the ten biggest investors in Vietnam and is a medium-seized donor. Since 1997 Vietnam has been a structural recipient of Dutch aid. Dutch aid in 2005 amounted to some EUR 30 million. The Netherlands provides budget support and support programmes for good governance, water management and environmental protection, and public health care. Since 2005 Vietnam has a Netherlands Education Support Office (NUFFIC).

Education has always been important to the Vietnamese. In the 1950s and 60s the pro-Communist North and pro-Western South developed different educational systems. Since the end of the war in 1975, the Northern system has been applied in the South. Today, the literacy rate among Vietnamese aged ten and older is 93%. Nevertheless, secondary and tertiary education are considered a failure. The government has been reorganising the educational system, including the universities, since 1992.

In the new system universities are part of the Ministry of Education, and research institutes are directly accountable to the government. The most important research institutes are the National Centre for Natural Sciences and Technology (NCNST) and the National Centre for Social Sciences and Humanities (NCSSH). Universities and research institutes have gained more autonomy in the last couple of years. This trend is accompanied by growth in the number of semi-independent research centres, mostly foreign funded, and private educational institutions. Many Vietnamese are willing to pay substantial amounts of money for their children's education.

The government recognises that rapid economic growth and ecological, demographic and social changes make stepping up social research imperative and there is scope for external assistance for academic research. However,

research in Vietnam is still haunted by the country's socialist statist past and the domineering role of central government.

7.1 The Vietnam-Netherlands Research Programme: VNRP

Selection and preparation phase

The Minister for Development Cooperation wanted to intensify bilateral relations with Vietnam despite parliamentary opposition to his plans. The possibility of a multi-annual programme in Vietnam was being investigated even before the policy document *Research and Development* (1992) was published. This was a departure from the rule that multi-annual research programmes were only to be set up in countries which were structural recipients of Dutch aid. A bilateral aid programme covering a limited number of cooperation areas started in 1990.

A series of visits to Vietnam by the representatives of the Spearhead Programme on Research, Dutch scientists and occasionally a RAWOO representative began at the end of 1991. They met with representatives of research institutes although this proved to be impossible without including government representatives, notably from the State Committee of Sciences. Two workshops were held to discuss the research agenda and research management and four research areas were defined: 1) economy in transition, 2) environmental issues, 3) rural development and 4) women and development.

There was a long discussion on which institution would host the new programme. The Vietnamese government wanted to host it for several reasons, but the Spearhead Programme on Research hesitated as it feared that the programme would never be autonomous and only governmental agencies might benefit from the programme. Nevertheless, the contract between the Dutch and Vietnamese parties was signed in 1994 after agreement was reached and the secretariat of the multi-annual programme, named the Vietnam–Netherlands Research Programme, was consigned to the National Institute for Scientific and Technological Planning of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment.

The challenges were evident since the multi-annual programme's characteristics were diametrically opposed to the Vietnamese context: social sciences were undeveloped and the concept of multidisciplinary research unknown, no coherent database was available and most research institutes were part of a ministry. Moreover, the concept of independent research did not mesh well with Vietnamese culture and the political climate. Consequently, though the VNRP was a

Vietnamese organisation there was no broad social support from academics, civil society and representatives of government, so local ownership was very limited. It also proved to be a weak basis for demand-led research as it was unclear who the client was.

VNRP's main aim was to finance strategic research for poverty alleviation. Participative research in particular would be eligible for funding. No mention was made of the catalysing role the multi-annual programmes were meant to have, as set out in the 1992 policy document.

Characteristics of the programme

Activities included the selection and funding of research proposals, applying specific criteria; supervising researchers in writing research proposals; training them in research methodology; and acquisition of literature, other documentation and equipment.

VNRP's first call for proposals in 1994 generated 427 proposals of which only 21 were approved. Basically, this pattern remained unchanged until 2001 when 1,036 proposals were submitted and 128 approved. After 2001 no new calls were made. To be approved proposals had to 1) fit in with VNRP's priorities, 2) be of acceptable academic quality, 3) be practicable, and 4) produce usable research results. After a first check by the Secretariat and a second one by three experts, the assessment was submitted to the Steering Committee for approval. Until 2000 this happened only after a brief consultation with the Dutch embassy.

Payments were made only after the project leader sent in a progress report. The Secretariat monitored the activities closely, albeit mainly in a technocratic and quantitative fashion (e.g. number of books collected, number of seminars organised, etc.). A project leader would present his research results in a seminar with members of the Steering Committee, the Vietnamese academic community, policymakers and end users. After an assessment by two experts, the Steering Committee would give its final judgment. In the Vietnamese context it was important to distribute research activities equally over regions. The disadvantage of this approach was that the VNRP remained fairly fragmented.

The VNRP was subjected to two reviews, in 1996 and 1997. The first was an internal evaluation and the second was part of the Joint Evaluation of the multi-annual programmes. Both concluded that the programme had been well received in Vietnam, that the overall quality of research proposals was low and that it was

difficult to combine academic quality and the need to strengthen capacity. The second review also concluded that the Secretariat had failed to help researchers share information and experiences. The role of end users and non-researchers had not yet taken shape.
Between 1997 and 2003 six training courses were held on issues such as research and sustainable rural development, research methodology and participative research. In this second phase, VNRP opted to work mainly with young researchers, who received refresher courses, if necessary.

In 2004 there was another internal evaluation, in which the VNRP rated the quality of over half the research activities as either good or excellent. Slightly less than half was moderate. An external evaluator came to less positive conclusions. Research results were published via the VNRP Newsletter. In general, the second phase was more successful than the first, partly as a result of personnel changes at the VNRP Secretariat.

Organisation, management and networking

The Secretariat was based within the National Institute for Scientific and Technological Planning of the Science Ministry in Hanoi. This was contrary to the concept of the multi-annual programmes but considered unavoidable, given the Vietnamese context. Influenced by the Dutch stakeholders, the Steering Committee had a balanced composition, with representatives from different disciplines and geographical regions. Initially, there were also two Dutch representatives in the Steering Committee, at the specific request of Vietnam. Most of the Vietnamese members were members of the Communist Party of Vietnam, and this meant implicit control of VNRP's activities. Most members were respected academics though none of them belonged to the academic elite. The fact that the VNRP was embedded in the civil service had negative consequences for the quality of research.

Although the VNRP enjoyed a relatively high degree of freedom within the Ministry, having its base there kept it from becoming influential in the Vietnamese academic world. The VNRP has not strengthened institutional ties between research institutes in the country. It has offered individual researchers a platform to meet. Some of these research institutes had much stronger national and international contacts. The VNRP made little use of the contacts with other multi-annual programmes.

The role of the DGIS Research Bureau

Contact between the Research Bureau and VNRP were intensive, and included several visits. The Bureau was an observer in the Steering Committee, a role that was assumed later by the Dutch embassy. Progress reports were discussed extensively. The Bureau may also have influenced the choice of research themes, which coincided with Dutch policy priorities. Following the 2004 decision to stop financing the multi-annual programmes contacts between the VNRP and the Dutch embassy intensified. As the VNRP had not exhausted its budget the second phase was extended without additional funding.

VNRP and the new Dutch research policy

The Steering Committee and the Secretariat drew up a research agenda without much consultation with researchers. With demand orientation as the guiding principle, the priorities of the Ministry came first. Activities beyond the control of the government or the Party were unthinkable. Despite the initial check on research proposals by the embassy, the VNRP controlled the programme from the beginning. In that sense the principle of local ownership was met. The end users did not participate much in the activities. In Vietnam participation is a sensitive and political issue. Multidisciplinarity was rare. Initially, almost no social scientists participated in the research activities. Capacity strengthening in the second phase was particularly beneficial to individual researchers. Fifteen project leaders started PhD research and twelve researchers began a Master's degree. Publication of research results was modest. Whether the results have had any impact on development policies is not clear. Unsolicited advice is not readily given in Vietnam.

Results in terms of the new research policy's characteristics

Demand-led research

As a result of the VNRP's interpretation of the principle of demand-led research, the priorities of the Ministry came first. It was therefore the Steering Group and the Secretariat, and not the researchers, who determined the research agenda. The Party/government controlled this process indirectly.

Ownership

The programme was definitely Vietnamese-owned, though important decisions were taken by a small group of people within the Ministry.

Multidisciplinary character of research
Project leaders frequently organised multidisciplinary research teams, but in reality this approach did not work. Initially social scientists were sparsely represented in research teams, though there was gradual improvement.

Capacity strengthening
The enhancement of research capacity was important for individual researchers. Notably in the second phase, junior researchers were given priority. Also in the second phase more attention was given to training, especially for researchers in the social sciences.

Institutional strengthening
The VNRP did not tackle the issue of capacity strengthening in a systematic manner by developing relations with universities or other institutions. Its sphere of action was virtually limited to the Ministry.

Dissemination of results
Research results were published in the VNRP Newsletter and also discussed in seminars. In general, the scale of dissemination of research results was modest.

Policy or social relevance
It is difficult to say whether policy-makers made use of research results. Certain, however, is that in the Vietnamese context it is not the practice to give unsolicited advice.

Costs of the multi-annual research programme
The total cost of the VNRP programme was nearly EUR 4 million, of which EUR 1 million was spent on Phase I (1994-1997) and EUR 2.5 million on Phase II (1997-2005). The slow pace of spending in Phase II made it possible for the VNRP to continue its activities after 2004 when Dutch government funding ended.

7.2 Other research projects supported by the Netherlands

Three research projects carried out in the 1990s were investigated to determine whether they had the characteristics of the 1992 research policy. One project concerned the development and production of an anti-malaria drug, another was a survey of contraceptive use in rural areas and the third supported the institutional strengthening of fish cultivation.

Research into, development and production of an anti-malaria drug

The plant from which artemisine, an important component of an anti-malaria drug, is extracted, grows in Vietnam. This attracted the attention of Vietnamese and foreign researchers. For years, several Dutch solidarity organisations had been involved with anti-malaria measures and research in Vietnam. The World Health Organisation also supported malaria research in Vietnam. In the early 1990s the Netherlands funded a number of research projects in this field, and also hosted an important international conference on the subject.

Between 1991 and 1995 three artemisine cocktails were prepared and tested. This was repeated between 1994 and 1998 in another region. More studies followed and training was provided. Also three Vietnamese were funded who wrote their PhD dissertation on the research. Overall, the Dutch contribution amounted to EUR 1.5 million.

The use of contraceptives in rural areas

Because of the discord between the government's family planning policy (limited number of children) and its economic reform policy (emphasis on family as production unit, so many hands needed), and between, say, modernity and tradition, Care International Vietnam submitted a project proposal to the Dutch embassy in 1995. In the project, a group of Vietnamese and international researchers analysed the behaviour of target groups in rural areas and external experts provided on-the-job training. The approach taken was participatory and multidisciplinary. In the implementation of the research project, friction arose between Vietnamese and Dutch researchers on methodologies and strategies. The impact of the research results on policy is unclear, although Care's position in the country offers certain guarantees. The Netherlands contributed EUR 0.1 million to the research project (1996-1997).

Institutional strengthening of fish cultivation in South Vietnam

This project involved several parties from different countries and from different research institutes in Vietnam. The aim was to improve the integration of aquaculture in farming. The Dutch Research Bureau rejected the first proposal as it was overly oriented towards thematic research and training, and neglected application of the research results through counselling. The project preparations took a long time and the proposal was occasionally adjusted. The involvement of a large number of partners and stakeholders complicated the process. After four years, a proposal was accepted. The aims were to: 1) strengthen research, education and counselling with respect to aquaculture, 2) improve access

to related relevant knowledge and experience, and 3) enhance institutional cooperation both nationally and internationally. An external evaluation in 1996 found that considerable progress had been made, despite the project's complicated structure. The project produced a number of workshops, a pilot farm and a newsletter. Cooperation among the parties was not always smooth, though they all agreed on the importance of a multidisciplinary approach. The Netherlands contributed EUR 2.0 million to the project (1994-1999).

Assessment

The malaria research project and the family planning survey scored much better than the aquaculture project regarding demand-led character and Vietnamese ownership, but the artemisine projects had the best score for both aspects. The malaria research project also showed positive results for capacity enhancement, as did the aquaculture project. The family planning survey did not aim to strengthen local research capacity. Little is known about the impact of participatory research or the multidisciplinary nature of the research. The malaria project produced high-quality research and its results were disseminated well. The status of the other two projects is unclear in this respect.

8 Symmetric Research Cooperation Programmes

8.1 South Africa-Netherlands Research Programme on Alternatives in Development: SANPAD

Context

After the collapse of apartheid, South Africa began a new period of international relationships. Contact between the Netherlands and South Africa had been frequent among citizens and civil society organisations but not at official government level. Formal relations of international cooperation began around 1994 and the Netherlands actively set out to identify the possibilities for a multi-annual research programme.

The idea that South Africa is both a 'first' and 'third' world country holds true with regard to the sciences. Highly advanced and longstanding research in technology exists alongside a marginally developed social sciences sector which continues to display characteristics inherited from the apartheid era. The fragmented and uncoordinated tertiary education system, with its white Afrikaans and English-language universities and its ethnic universities in the 'Bantustans', has left its mark on the quality, size, focus and composition of the social sciences sector. The government has neglected the social sciences: a mere 10% of its budget for research and development goes to the social sciences and humanities.

Social science research has been dominated by white male academics, many of whom are now reaching retirement age. Efforts to promote the emergence of a new group of researchers (with more blacks and women) are hindered by the unattractiveness of working at universities in general. In addition, those who choose the academic profession do not automatically become researchers. As the country needs research to find solutions to the problems of poverty and inequality,

there is clearly a demand for a programme that can stimulate social science research.

Selection and preparation phase

The first steps towards collaboration were made in 1994 when the Head of the DGIS Research Bureau visited South Africa. At the end of his trip he concluded that a research programme with South Africa should have another character than the multi-annual multidisciplinary programmes that his bureau was initiating elsewhere. An MMRP model, he felt, might be too vulnerable to white domination, and the Netherlands preferred a programme that would primarily support groups that were previously subjected to discrimination in South Africa. The option of a cooperation programme was pursued.

Following the initial contact, officials from the Research Bureau made other visits to South Africa, culminating in concrete actions after the third visit in March 1996. An inventory was taken of existing contacts between universities in the two countries, Interim Committees were established in South Africa and the Netherlands and a secretariat was set up at Leiden University to prepare a workshop. In South Africa, the Foundation for Research and Development was asked to help with the preparations for the workshop.

In 1996, an advertisement was placed in South African newspapers to alert scientists to the new opportunities for research. It requested suggestions for research themes and announced an upcoming workshop to discuss the new research programme. Some 80 people attended the inaugural workshop in November 1996. The themes selected were: 1) new approaches to economic development, 2) social development for empowerment, 3) natural resources and their management, 4) governance for democracy and 5) culture, identity and a new society. After a review in 2003 the original five themes were maintained, though their titles were altered slightly, and a sixth topic – poverty reduction – was added.

After the 1996 workshop, the programme document was drafted and submitted to DGIS in May 1997. In spite of a general freeze on approvals for programme funds at the Ministry due to budgetary problems, SANPAD's request was honoured in October 1997. SANPAD was launched with a five-year funding commitment totalling EUR 5.7 million from the Netherlands.

Characteristics of the programme

SANPAD has had two broad categories of activities: 1) stimulating research through grant awards and 2) research capacity building through a separate programme of courses to strengthen the research proficiency of academics.

Research grants programme

Researchers could apply for grants through a system of annual calls for proposals. Between 1997 and 2004, 110 were approved, 20% of the 550 proposals received in total. To be approved a proposal had to meet academic standards, be relevant to policy and contribute to capacity strengthening. The research projects were divided over the five themes (some are categorised under more than one theme):

- new approaches for economic development (19%);
- social development for empowerment (38.5%);
- natural resources and their management (21%);
- governance for democracy (13.5%);
- culture, identity and a new society (30.5%).

Within the themes, a variety of topics were addressed, ranging from problems caused by witchcraft accusations to factors affecting the success of female business owners, from how to prevent sexually transmitted diseases in the sex industry to how to raise income in rural areas, from the identity of older persons in family and community to the results of government poverty reduction programmes.

Research projects were usually conducted in small teams of 3 to 12 junior and senior researchers. The project leader was an academic with a PhD. In practice, most of them were attached to the Historically Advantaged Universities (7 out of 10) and the majority were male and white. This conforms to the present situation in South Africa's tertiary education institutions. In 2002 there was an increase in the number of female project leaders, black and white equally. This rise was not sustained for black women, but the number of white women was high again in 2004. Consequently, the relative numbers of white men went down, first in 2002 and again in 2004.

Research capacity building

SANPAD recognised the lack of research capacity and established the Research Capacity Building Initiative (RCI) in 1999. This is a course specially designed for individual researchers and staff and students of institutions of higher education

to teach them about research theory and methodology and help them develop research skills. Over the years, there have been four RCI cycles, involving a total of 119 students.

SANPAD has been successful in attracting participants from its primary target groups: women and blacks. The preference that they be linked to the research projects was less successfully realised. Since 2003, measures were taken to find suitable candidates with the potential to become researchers. The measures include a mandatory official statement from the candidates' institutions that they grant leave to RCI candidates to attend the course and conduct research.

The RCI programme intended to prepare students for a PhD. Due to lack of monitoring, there is no way of telling how many students are actually pursuing a PhD or have successfully completed it. Nevertheless, the RCI is a unique programme that boosts research capacity in the social sciences in South Africa, filling a gap that nobody has addressed until now. Since 2004, the course has been certified by the Dutch CERES Research School. This underlines its professional standards and reflects its international dimension. Interviews with students from the 2003 and 2004 groups showed that, without exception, they were very enthusiastic about the course.

Institutional aspects

The character of cooperation is expressed in the joint governance of the programme. There are national committees in each country, which are represented in the Joint Committee, SANPAD's main decision-making body. There are also two secretariats, one in Durban and one in Amsterdam. As SANPAD is a programme and not an institution with a legal status, the funding contract is with a third party. The contracting party used to be a Dutch organisation, but ownership has moved more and more towards South Africa, so a South African agency became the third party in 2004.

Intensive interaction was a new experience for both parties and, unsurprisingly, the growth of an institutional partnership has been a process of ups and downs. There were confrontations at various levels: between the National Committees, between the contract holders and between the secretariats. In addition to the teething problems associated with the establishment of a new programme and structures, difficulties were caused by feelings of domination, doubts about each other's agendas, differences in views about systems and procedures, and the mere complexity of finding balance in the new partnership.

The difficulties showed that cooperation between people from different backgrounds and operating from different settings requires perseverance, flexibility, vision and a sense of humour. The fact that they were ultimately resolved showed that SANPAD is fortunate to have people around with these characteristics.

Costs of SANPAD

The total cost was EUR 8.6 million. Of this amount EUR 0.2 million was for preparations, EUR 5.2 for Phase I (1997-2003) and EUR 3.2 for Phase II (2003-2008; expenditure covers 2003 and 2004 only).

8.2 Ghana-Netherlands Health Research Programme: GHRP

Context

The initiative for a research cooperation programme on health came from the RAWOO. In recommendations to the Dutch government in 1994, the RAWOO expressed its support for the principle of demand orientation in research policy and for implementing this principle in multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes. But the Council also suggested setting up research cooperation programmes in the Netherlands and countries in the South, health being one of the research areas specified. The idea got the support of the Minister for Development Cooperation and opportunities for cooperation with an African country were investigated, leading to the selection of Ghana.

Health research in Ghana is carried out at various medical schools, their focus being on biomedical issues. Despite a tradition of research in the sector, research findings had no impact on health policy and health care. In an effort to change that, the Ghanaian Ministry of Health established a Health Research Unit in 1990, hoping a research body within its own environment would improve the situation. A major problem is brain drain, internally from rural to urban centres and externally to wealthier countries. About half of medical doctors trained in Ghana work abroad. Almost half of health care in Ghana is in the hands of NGOs, mainly church-based organisations.

Selection and preparation phase

Ghana was selected out of a group of three countries (the others being Benin and Mozambique) because of its well-developed and decentralised health policy and the Ministry of Health's efforts to link research and policy. For the same reason, the RAWOO saw the Ministry as its logical cooperation partner.

While the first steps towards establishing the GHRP were taken in 1994, it was not officially launched until seven years later, in August 2001. The long incubation period was mainly due to differences between the Dutch partners in the project. The RAWOO's submission of a proposal for health research in Ghana coincided with a request for long-term health research funding for Ghana from the NWO (Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research) and WOTRO (Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research). The Minister for Development Cooperation suggested they work together. After 18 months and 12 meetings the two groups were no closer to working together, the stumbling block being the location of the Dutch secretariat. More fundamentally, there was a clash between those advocating demand-driven research and those in favour of equal treatment of Dutch and Ghanaian researchers.

The Ghanaian Ministry of Health had its first proposal for research cooperation ready in 1997. The document mentioned priority areas for research and also proposed to have a Joint Programme Committee (JPC) of Ghanaian and Dutch experts and a secretariat in the Netherlands. Because of disagreements in the Netherlands, the NWO withdrew from the project in early 1999, but rejoined in 2001. Progress was so slow, that the RAWOO requested a budget-neutral extension five times. In Ghana it turned out to be more difficult than expected to make an inventory of all existing healthcare research.

A final project document was submitted to DGIS in June 2000 entitled *Five-year Research Programme of Work in the Context of the Medium-term Health Strategy for Ghana: The Ghanaian-Dutch Collaboration for Health Research and Development*. In a meeting earlier in 2000, key persons from the Ghanaian health sector had discussed the research agenda and identified the following research themes:

- communication and participation of the community;
- quality of health care;
- financial management;
- decentralisation of the healthcare sector.

The main aim of the programme was to get research results that could lead to better health and health care for the people in Ghana. In addition to dealing with the four research themes, more specific aims were to strengthen capacity, improve access to and use of research results and set up monitoring mechanisms.

At the end of 2000, DGIS approved the programme. With a grant of EUR 3.4 million the GHRP could begin the first phase of its programme (2001-2006).

Characteristics of the programme

Two forms of research were planned in the programme: 1) research initiated by individual researchers or small teams, for which grants of up to EUR 20,000 were available, and 2) research commissioned by the programme with a maximum subsidy of EUR 70,000. The second form had not yet materialized at the time of the evaluation.

Research grants

In the first category, the GHRP received 213 Letters of Intent between 2001 and 2004, in which researchers showed their interest with a brief explanation of their research ideas. In 120 cases researchers were invited to submit a proposal. Of these, the Joint Project Committee approved 48, or 40%. All were research projects planned to be executed in one year's time. At the time of evaluation in 2005, 19 research projects had been completed, but none had been accepted by the JPC.

The distribution of the 19 completed research projects over the four themes was as follows:

- communication and participation: 3
- quality of health care: 11
- financial management : 5
- decentralisation of the healthcare sector: 0

Geographically speaking, the majority of the projects were implemented in the Greater Accra and Western Region.

A small sample of these 19 projects showed that they were quite basic, more descriptive than analytical, more quantitative than qualitative. Despite their elementary character, some projects did lead to action. A study on treatment of tuberculosis patients showed that the daily medicine use improved if treatment centres were closer to patients' homes. Consequently, the number of treatment centres in the city concerned was increased from 1 to 7. The example shows the ambivalence of the programme, as the finding is well-known in literature. With better access to literature the researcher might have based his research on such a finding, instead of repeating it. Improvement of research facilities, crucial for

raising the level of research, was a goal of the project but had not yet materialised at the time of the evaluation.

Research capacity building
Capacity-building activities are an integral part of the programme and are carried out mainly by programme staff. They include providing training in writing research proposals for those whose Letters of Intent were accepted, support in methodology for research implementation and data analysis. For this purpose, GHRP staff has regular contact with individual researchers, and organises workshops for groups of researchers. Interviewees were highly satisfied with the help they had received.

In addition to the methodological workshops, workshops were organised to discuss certain themes, such as aid financing and the role of the community in the HIV/Aids pandemic. Researchers from the Netherlands usually participated in these workshops. Twice seminars were held in the Netherlands to give Ghanaian researchers the opportunity to present their research. The seminars were meant to strengthen the ties between researchers in the two countries, but in numbers Dutch participation fell short of expectations.

Institutional aspects
The highest authority in the GHRP is the Joint Programme Committee (JPC). It consists of six people, three from Ghana and three from the Netherlands. Its tasks include assessing the Letters of Intent, making decisions on research proposals and approving research results. The JPC is advised by a Scientific Review Committee. Since 2003, approval by the Ethical Review Committee of the research unit of the Ministry of Health is mandatory for all research projects.

The executive secretary in Ghana is accommodated in the Health Research Unit of the Ministry of Health, whose director also manages the GHRP. The Dutch secretariat was initially with the RAWOO, but an independent Support and Liaison Office was established when the programme started officially in 2001. Its tasks were to coordinate the work on the Dutch side, and especially contacts with the Dutch research community. Because of the principle of demand orientation, the secretariat in the Netherlands regarded its role to be supportive and not pro-active.

Cooperation between the Ghanaian and Dutch parties is good, which is partly ascribed to the long preparation period during which they developed a common

understanding of the programme. Yet, the disagreements among the Dutch stakeholders about the principle of demand-orientation in the early years of the programme scarred the implementation of the programme. The Dutch party interpreted the principle very strictly, to the extent that it was reluctant to make simple suggestions, for fear of interfering.

Costs of GHRP

The preparatory costs amounted to EUR 0.2 million and EUR 5.2 million was spent during Phase I (2001-2006).

8.3 Evaluation of SANPAD and GHRP

The research cooperation programmes SANPAD and the GHRP were evaluated in light of 1) the degree of demand orientation, 2) research cooperation with Dutch counterparts, 3) research capacity building, and 4) impact of research on policy.

Demand orientation

The research agendas for SANPAD and for the GHRP were the result of initiatives and consultations in South Africa and Ghana respectively. However, demand orientation had a different character. SANPAD used the latitude it had to develop an independent platform for socioeconomic research in the country and kept the government out of it. By contrast, in Ghana the research themes were taken directly from the country's health policy of 1995 and thus reflected the government's demand for research. It is unknown to what extent the priorities of NGOs and private parties were included, as their participation in the programme remained very limited.

The concepts of demand orientation and ownership were not easy to apply in the context of cooperation. They manifested themselves differently in the two programmes. In South Africa there were clashes between the two parties about the desired degree of autonomy and about decision-making powers. The Dutch party clearly wanted a role in a programme that was to be an instrument of research cooperation between two countries. In the Ghana-Netherlands Health Research Programme the Dutch party had grown reluctant to give input in agenda-setting matters. Wishing to avoid any supply-driven approach, it became quite rigid in its position. The early history of the programme may explain this attitude, but the more supply-driven character of the discipline (medical sciences) may also have increased the fear of error.

Cooperation with Dutch researchers

The dimension of cooperation was prevalent at programme level and at research-project level. At programme level, there were joint committees to govern the programmes and parallel secretariats for administration.

Cooperation at research project level was realised in South Africa where Dutch researchers participated in research projects. Yet, the extent of cooperation fell short of expectations, and it was not always easy to find adequate Dutch participants for the projects. No Dutch researchers had yet been involved In the Ghanaian research projects. The programme management sought an explanation in the Dutch research sector's lack of familiarity with the demand-orientation principle.

A general problem faced by the two programmes was that the implementation of this kind of research activity requires patience and the results offer little scope for academic point-scoring. The dynamics of research cooperation programmes conflict with the increasing focus on output in the Dutch university system, which pressures academics to produce high-quality publications. This requirement makes academics reluctant to invest in work that might not lead to rapid outputs and for which the prospects for further funding are unpredictable.

Research capacity building

The need to educate researchers was recognised in both countries. The main mechanism was on-the-job training of junior researchers by more senior colleagues. This had some effect, but was felt to be inadequate. In South Africa it was complemented by a special course on research theory and methodology. For this purpose SANPAD worked with the CERES Research School for Resource Studies for Development in the Netherlands, which has certified the course since 2004.

A major challenge in the GHRP was to familiarise researchers in the health sector with qualitative research methods. Capacity building was advanced through workshops and supervision by the research coordinators of the secretariat. While this helped strengthen the capacity of individuals on a modest scale, there was no capacity building at institutional level (i.e. in universities and research institutes) in either country.

Interaction between research findings and policy

The research projects have had minimal impact on policy. SANPAD had reservations in this respect and doubted whether policymakers would be impressed at all. SANPAD has been active in distributing the research results, especially to interests groups, the media and people involved in the research. It has also made efforts to disseminate the results through seminars to which policymakers were invited. The 19 completed GHRP studies had not yet been released. They are not expected to have much impact.

Factors inhibiting the potential for impact on policy include the quality of the research, its descriptive character and the limited number and scope of studies on similar subjects, which hindered the development of a critical mass.

Conclusions

The major difference between multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes and these cooperation programmes is that Dutch researchers and research institutes are kept at distance in the former, and involved in the latter. Dutch experts were involved in setting up both SANPAD and the GHRP. They participated in Steering Committees along with their African colleagues. Apart from the initial troubles in SANPAD, cooperation was fairly harmonious.

Dutch participation at research project level fell short of expectations, especially in Ghana. The GHRP projects were not interesting enough – in size or scope – to make Dutch researchers enthusiastic.

Like the MMRPs, the cooperation programmes were demand-oriented, which increased local ownership and strengthened the programmes' connection to local issues. But this characteristic also had some troublesome effects. For example, it was difficult to articulate a focused research question in the absence of methodological skills, knowledge and adequate research infrastructure. The optimism of those who champion demand-oriented research was shallow. In addition, demand orientation led to small-scale, fragmented research projects. As a result not all priority themes were covered. There was only limited interest in decentralisation in Ghana and democracy and poverty alleviation in South Africa.

So far, the two programmes have not been integrated into academia in their respective countries. Capacity building has focused too much on individuals. In spite of some efforts, it has been difficult for both research programmes to combine capacity building with quality research.

9 Final conclusions

From 1992 onwards, the importance the Minister for Development Cooperation attached to research for development was expressed in a new policy, new programmes, a new organisational unit at the Ministry and an increase in financial resources. Dutch researchers were informed that they would no longer dominate research in the South, but their ongoing projects were continued, though many became more demand oriented. The new policy was promoted in international forums too and the Netherlands was praised for it. The multi-annual programmes were the most explicit expression – the showpiece – of the new approach.

This remained so until 1998, when the political priority of research for development diminished. Due to several changes within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Research Bureau gradually lost control over the portfolio of research activities, which were financed by various stakeholders (embassies, directorates) through different budget lines of the budget for development cooperation. In 2004, The Hague decided to quit funding the multi-annual multidisciplinary research programmes from which it had jealously kept other donors at a distance. It imposed this decision unilaterally on its Southern partners, and failed to provide any guarantees or reassurance as to the programmes' financial future.

The 2005 policy document *Research in Development* revived research as a theme. It incorporated some of the 1992 innovations, but there were also changes in vision. The demand-led approach was considered too limited. Its broader embedding in policy and practice was now emphasised. The 1992 aim of strengthening capacity in the South was no longer mentioned as an explicit aim. Nor did the 2005 paper express a view on international agricultural research, which took up one-quarter of all research funding between 1992 and 2005. The 2005 paper proposed measures to improve relations between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Dutch academic world in the Netherlands. The Ministry and Dutch research

institutes established a research academy for international cooperation (IC Academy), which has became the new flagship.

The evaluation set out to answer the following central questions:

1) How relevant (purposeful) was the Dutch policy vis-à-vis research and development, as formulated in 1992 and implemented in the years thereafter? How relevant were the funded research activities?
2) How effective were these activities?
3) How efficient were they?
4) How sustainable are the results?
5) Did the internal organisation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs function satisfactorily?
6) What was the position of the Dutch research world in the development of the new policy, how did it react to this new policy and what was its role in the implementation?

The answers are given below.

Relevance

Relevance of Dutch research policy

The guiding principles and aims were not new and conformed to national and international thinking and decision making. In that sense the new policy was certainly relevant. Between 1992 and 2005 there were a number of accent shifts. The framing of the research agenda by the South and capacity strengthening in developing countries were central aims in the policy documents of the early 1990s. Although the next Minister for Development Cooperation maintained the research policy from 1998 onwards, research for development became less central with the introduction of sectoral policies after 2000. Research reappeared only in 2005, in the new policy document *Research for Development*. The central paradigm of the 1992 paper – the South deciding on key research questions – was considered too narrow and application of acquired knowledge became the main aim of the new policy. The needs of developing countries remained an important starting point. The 1992 aim of capacity strengthening became implicit. Measures were taken to improve relations with the Dutch academic world.

The multi-annual programmes

As to the relevance of the multi-annual research programmes, they were consistent with the innovations and intentions of the 1992 policy. All were relevant to the existing problems in the countries concerned. In some multi-annual programmes there was a high degree of policy concurrence between the donor – the Netherlands – and the recipient country. The Netherlands had been financing research in Mali and Tanzania since the 1970s. In a way, the multi-annual programmes were a logical sequel. There was less policy concordance in the multi-annual programmes in Bolivia and Vietnam. Local research policy was largely absent in Bolivia and the Netherlands had no tradition of cooperation in research with Vietnam.

The cooperation programmes

The cooperation programmes in South Africa, Ghana and some other countries were relevant in that they were consistent with local policies and focused on local issues that research could help resolve. The paradigm shift in the Netherlands to demand-oriented and operational research dovetailed with changing policies in Ghana and South Africa.

Effectiveness

The multi-annual programmes

The answer to the question on effectiveness will be given on the basis of the main aims and characteristics of the Dutch research policy.

Increasing understanding of change processes

In terms of quantity of publications, PIEB in Bolivia was the most successful in this respect. REPOA in Tanzania also has contributed to a better understanding of local development processes. In Vietnam the VNRP failed to deliver quality research and the research agenda was very limited. Moreover, the Vietnamese programme issued no new calls for proposals after 2001. The achievements of the Niger Delta Programme in Mali were negligible.

Strengthening local research capacity

PIEB and REPOA have modestly contributed to the enhancement of the local institutional research capacity but were important for individual researchers. The same for the VNRP in Vietnam though to a lesser extent. With the creation of the PIEB University, the chances for institutional capacity strengthening have increased in Bolivia. REPOA has helped to improve the institutional research

climate in the country. Training courses for and supervision of young researchers by PIEB and REPOA have been important factors. They have contributed to the overall success of the multi-annual programmes in these countries. The programme in Mali did not noticeably contribute to capacity strengthening.

Promotion of interaction between research results and policy
In Bolivia and Tanzania the degree of interaction between research results and policy was relatively high. However, REPOA risks losing its independence due to its consultancy work and close relations with the Tanzanian government. This constitutes a potential threat to its achievements. In Mali and Vietnam there was almost no interaction between results and policy. In Mali this was due to the general failure of the programme. In Vietnam this was partly due to the lack of publications. Another factor was existence of a political culture that is not favourable to unsolicited advice from junior or even senior researchers who rank lower than policymakers in the administrative hierarchy.

Demand-led research and local ownership
The multi-annual programmes in Bolivia, Mali, Vietnam and Tanzania were fully managed and implemented by local partners. In Mali and Vietnam the local partners were government institutions. REPOA had to negotiate and hold tough consultations with the Research Bureau to implement its interpretation of national ownership. It is important to note here that there was no preset definition of national or local ownership.

Local ownership and demand orientation are closely connected. Demand orientation in Vietnam meant that the priorities of the Ministry came first. Researchers were barely involved in drawing up the research agenda. Research activities in Mali were based on real problems, but those who had participated in formulating the problem definitions were not involved in implementing the research activities. PIEB resolved the dilemmas of demand orientation by organising public competitions with open agendas. In Tanzania REPOA's secretariat decided what local ownership meant.

The cooperation programmes
In the cases of SANPAD/South Africa and GHRP/Ghana it is too early to draw definite conclusions about their effectiveness, although there are serious indications that SANPAD will be more successful than the Ghanaian programme. In South Africa valuable achievements included some completed research and research training. However, the quality of the research, the research-policy

interaction, and the development of a culture favourable for research, still constitute important challenges.

Efficiency

The multi-annual programmes

It is difficult to answer the efficiency question in terms of a cost-benefit-analysis, as there are almost no hard figures. It is difficult to express the qualitative improvement of the research capacity in quantitative terms. The research outcomes can be quantified in numbers but not in financial or monetary terms.

The multi-annual programmes in Bolivia, Mali, Vietnam and Tanzania have cost some EUR 20 million. These programmes were not expensive. Hundreds of local researchers have benefited from it, in Bolivia some 400, in Mali 40, in Vietnam more than 100 and in Tanzania 160.

All evaluated multi-annual programmes needed long preparatory phases, the one in Mali even seven years. Also the implementation often took more time than planned. Consequently, project phases often were extended without additional financial commitments. The most noticeable case of underspending constituted Vietnam where after 2001 no new research projects started.

One may conclude that the relatively small amounts have been sufficient for considerable results in Bolivia and Tanzania. In general, the important conclusion can be drawn that under certain conditions relatively little money is sufficient to finance useful research activities.

The cooperation programmes

SANPAD seems to be doing better than the GHRP. The latter is characterised by a long period of inefficiency, which can be illustrated by the long preparatory phase – five times extended - and the slow process of approval of project proposals and of completed research reports. Initially, also SANPAD experienced difficulties in running an efficient programme, but most problems were solved at the time of the IOB evaluation.

Sustainability of the results

The multi-annual programmes

Sustainability of the concept

From the recipient's perspective, it cannot yet be concluded whether the multi-annual programmes will remain demand-oriented, multidisciplinary and location specific after the retreat of the Dutch donor. In Bolivia and Tanzania a serious start has been made. PIEB and REPOA have succeeded in raising money for the future. The VNRP has not got guaranteed funding yet, but in a promising development a vice minister was appointed director of the programme. From the donor's perspective, the 2005 policy document is unclear on the sustainability of the concept.

Sustainability of strengthened research capacity and institutional sustainability

In each of the multi-annual programmes research capacity was strengthened at individual level more than at institutional level. Sustainability cannot be guaranteed if no additional money is made available. Sustainable improvement of individual research capacity is also in jeopardy if research activities cannot be continued in the near future. This uncertainty also applies to the PIEB University.

Financial sustainability

Money is the drawback of all multi-annual programmes. Research activities rarely generate income, except for some REPOA activities (Window 2). A constant flow of outside funding is a must for the continuation of the multi-annual programmes. When the Ministry decided to end its financial support for the programmes, it sparked a crisis that could only be abated by using undisbursed project funds or quickly procuring external financing, a difficult task to say the least.

The cooperation programmes

The concept of demand-led research has taken root in Ghana and South Africa. The most remarkable expression of this is a new NWO programme for research in developing countries. A weakness in the GPHR is its close link with the government and its weak connection with NGOs and universities. The link with the government may guarantee future funding, but it will not help it become more broad-based. SANPAD has presented itself as a programme and not as an institute. As such it can bring together the research capacities of different institutions and this might create a critical mass.

The involvement of Dutch researchers is crucial in both programmes. Dutch researchers have been somewhat reluctant to become totally involved in the programmes. To solve this problem the existing university fee system, which provides funds to finance research, will have to be reconsidered.

Did the internal organisation of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs function satisfactorily when implementing the research policy?

This question relates to the institutional embedding of the policy and the goals set. The answer will focus on three objectives: 1) the realisation of the paradigm shift, 2) the catalytic function of the Research Bureau and 3) the research financed by other units of the Directorate-General for International Cooperation.

Institutional embedding

From 1991 to 1996 the Minister for Development Cooperation directed the formulation, development and implementation of research policy. From 1998 onwards the Minister's involvement in research policy became more remote. She made general policy statements and focused on the selection of countries and the sector-wide approach. A new research policy was formulated in 2005 at the initiative of top civil servants, who controlled the whole process; the Minister did not play an active role. She monitored the implementation and occasionally stepped in to deal with practical matters, such as the IC Academy. Southern experts and partners had no input into the formulation of the 2005 policy document.

Until 1996, the organisational set up involved a tripartite structure comprising the Spearhead Programme on Research, the Chief Scientist and the Committee for Research Projects. After the 1996 foreign policy realignment a number of responsibilities were delegated to Dutch embassies, but the multi-annual programmes and some other research programmes were exempted. The Spearhead Programme on Research was downsized to a Research Bureau, the Committee for Research Projects ceased to exist and the Chief Scientist was not replaced after his retirement in 1998. This did not fundamentally change after the 2005 policy document, except that a new position of Science Counsellor was created. The main task of the Science Counsellor relates to knowledge management within the Ministry, so he is not a member of the Research Bureau.

Realisation of the paradigm shift

Initially, the shift to a demand-driven research policy was an exclusive domain of the Minister, the Research Bureau and the Research Coordinator, to the exclusion

of embassies and regional directorates in The Hague. After 1998 the Research Bureau continued this task alone. This approach complicated the introduction of the new policy, which had an adverse effect on the organisation's efficiency. Furthermore, the exclusive role of the Research Bureau in this matter resulted in an opaque process in which a small number of people took all the major decisions, which, moreover, could not be questioned. This was not good for the short-term continuity of the programmes or for the long-term sustainability of the results. On the positive side, however, it is also important to note that this small group of core people were able to act swiftly and vigorously and play a decisive role in the creation of nine multi-annual programmes.

The discontinuity of Dutch research for development policy constituted the biggest threat to the future of the multi-annual programmes, which were meant to run for 10 to 15 years. The Hague's unilateral decision in 2004 to stop funding these programmes and its failure to indicate financial alternatives exemplified bad partnership.

The catalytic function of the Research Bureau

After the 1996 realignment the Research Bureau lost its position as technical advisor for research projects financed by other Directorates of the Ministry, as this responsibility was shifted to the embassies. This situation contributed to the Research Bureau's lack of control and the absence of an overview of the overall research programme financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is one of the reasons why a new research policy document was written in 2005.

The Research Bureau played an important positive role in the design and implementation of the research activities in Bolivia, Mali, Tanzania and Vietnam that were evaluated. The subsequent policy renewal trend was halted after the sector-wide approach was introduced in 2000, leading to the discontinuation of many research projects.

Other research financed by DGIS

The targets set in 1992 to spend at least 5% of the budgets of the other Spearhead programmes and 10% of the budgets of the regional departments on research projects were, generally speaking, realised. As a result of the 1996 realignment and subsequent reorganisation, these policy targets creased to exist.

The conclusion is that in this respect the Ministry functioned satisfactorily. However, it is also true that through the years the internal organisation of the

Ministry has not always functioned optimally, in particular with respect to the realisation of the paradigm shift, the catalytic function of the Research Bureau and the coordination by the latter of the overall research programme.

Role and position of the Dutch research world

Dutch researchers and research institutes played an important role in the policy discussions that preceded the 1992 policy document. However, after 1992 they feared being brushed aside and put up strong resistance. The RAWOO, a leading advisory council, was internally split over the policy proposals, in particular with respect to the multi-annual programmes.

In the policy document Dutch researchers and research institutes were attributed a role in the set up of the multi-annual programmes but this never materialised. The policy document also announced funds for thematic and policy-oriented or strategic research and several Dutch institutions were allotted funds for development research. The expenditure for these other activities was considerably higher than the EUR 35 million spent between 1992 and 2005 on the multi-annual programmes. The same amount was spent on the cooperation programmes involving researchers from developing countries and the Netherlands. Important recipients in the Netherlands were the Royal Tropical Institute (EUR 13 million) and WOTRO (EUR 16 million), although the latter also finances researchers from developing countries. Research programmes in Kenya, Tanzania and Mali, in which many Dutch researchers were involved, received tens of millions of euros. Also, in 2005 alone, EUR 55 million was allocated for fellowship programmes that allowed students from developing countries to study at Dutch universities.

Through the years the Dutch research community was excluded from policy dialogue but still benefited from DGIS research funding. The ministerial change in 1998 did not alter this, but the new policy document of 2005, which explicitly aimed to improve relations with the Dutch research institutes, did. Most Dutch researchers and research institutes therefore welcomed the new policy. This was not the case with the RAWOO, which was dissolved as of 1 January 2007. With its disappearance the contributions of researchers from developing countries who participated in this advisory body were also lost.

An important issue for the future: conceptual uniformity

Over the years it became apparent that several basic concepts in the 1992 policy document were not defined clearly enough. This created confusion and impeded the overall realisation of the objectives set. If the valuable elements of the 1992

policy are to remain, the following points deserve the attention of policymakers and researchers:

Demand orientation
The central questions as to who determines the demand, who decides on the research agenda and who owns the implementation of the research have not been answered sufficiently. Is it the researchers, the policymakers or the end users whose needs determine the direction of research?

Local ownership
It is obvious when there is no local ownership or autonomous programme, i.e. when the donor is in the driver's seat. It is less clear, though, when the principle of autonomy has been met. Again the question crops up: is it the autonomy of the researchers, the policymakers or the end users? And if it is of all of them, how can the right balance be struck?

Strengthening local research capacity
Does this entail strengthening individual or institutional capacities? Can the latter be realised without training individual researchers?

Academic quality
It has turned out to be very difficult to combine the involvement of young researchers with high quality research outcomes. It is a matter of choice. Quality can also be at stake in the selection of research themes and issues. Again, choices have to be made.

10 Overview of expenditure on research, by category and region (1992-2005)

Table 3.1 Direct research expenditure 1992-2005 (in EUR million)

Year	Research expenditure*
1992	26.9
1993	35.4
1994	37.8
1995	40.7
1996	39.1
1997	60.1
1998	45.3
1999	44.1
2000	42.9
2001	46.7
2002	43.6
2003	46.4
2004	45.9
2005	41.0
Total	**596.0**

* expenditure reported with CRS code 'Research' only.
Source: Midas and Piramide, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Table 3.2 *Expenditure with a research component, 1992-2005 (in EUR million)*

Year	Total expenditure*
1992	267.4
1993	284.7
1994	302.6
1995	303.8
1996	331.9
1997	354.4
1998	342.7
1999	184.0
2000	238.8
2001	252.6
2002	
227.9	
2003	142.9
2004	199.0
2005	116.2
Total 1992-2005	**3,549.5**

* to 2002: Dimension Research; from 2002: Policy Marker Research.
Source: Midas and Piramide, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Table 3.3 *Total research expenditure 1992-2005 (est., in EUR million)*

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
'CRS-Code Research' (Table 3.1)	596.0	596.0	596.0
Research component (Table 3.2)	354.9	1,064.8	709.9
Total research expenditure (estimate)	950.9	1,660.8	1,305.9
Average per annum	67.9	118.6	93.3

Source: Midas and Piramide of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and DCO Memo to R, dated 22 June 2005, reference DCO-137/05 regarding 'Expenditure on research'.

Option 1: conservative estimate IOB (10%)
Option 2: estimate based on inventory taken by the Research Bureau (DCO/OC) (30%)
Option 3: the average of options 1 and 2

Table 3.4 (a) *Expenditure - activities with CRS code 'Research', by category 1992-2005 (in EUR million [1])*

research	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total
agricultural	17.7	19.1	18.8	19.1	17.8	20.5	22.2	23.0	20.0	22.1	17.4	19.7	19.0	16.5	272.8
research/scient. inst.	4.6	7.2	8.6	9.1	8.1	26.4	10.3	11.2	11.8	14.8	18.7	16.7	15.0	12.1	174.7
forestry	0.9	2.1	3.2	3.8	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.5	5.1	5.2	6.4	3.7	3.5	55.4
environmental	0.6	3.7	3.9	5.0	4.6	5.3	3.9	3.8	4.8	2.4	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	41.3
medical	1.5	1.9	1.5	2.2	3.1	1.7	1.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.5	5.4	6.7	28.9
livestock	1.6	1.3	1.6	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.6	0.3	*	0.1	*	0.4	0.3	0.0	10.6
fisheries	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.9	0.9	1.6	1.4	1.4	10.0
tech. research & development	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.1	*	0.1	0.2	1.5
educational	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	0.0	*	*	0.1	*	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.6
energy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	0.0	0.1	0.0	*	*	0.0	0.1
Total	**26.9**	**35.4**	**37.8**	**40.7**	**39.1**	**60.1**	**45.3**	**44.1**	**42.9**	**46.7**	**43.6**	**46.4**	**45.9**	**41.0**	**596.0**

** < € 50,000*

1 rounded figures

Source: Midas and Piramide of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Table 3.4 (b) *Expenditure - activities with CRS code 'Research', by category 1992-2005 (%)*

research	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total
agricultural	65.8	53.9	49.6	46.9	45.5	34.1	49.0	52.1	46.6	47.3	39.9	42.4	41.4	40.3	45.8
research/scient. inst.	17.0	20.3	22.8	22.5	20.7	43.9	22.7	25.3	27.6	31.7	43.0	36.0	32.8	29.5	29.3
forestry	3.4	5.9	8.5	9.4	10.2	7.3	10.1	9.2	10.4	10.9	12.0	13.8	8.1	8.4	9.3
environmental	2.3	10.5	10.4	12.3	11.7	8.8	8.6	8.7	11.2	5.2	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.6	6.9
medical	5.4	5.4	3.9	5.5	7.9	2.8	4.0	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.1	1.1	11.8	16.2	4.9
livestock	6.1	3.6	4.2	2.8	2.8	2.1	3.5	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.0	1.8
fishery	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.7	1.2	0.8	1.5	2.1	1.6	2.0	2.1	3.4	3.0	3.4	1.7
tech. research & development	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.5	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.3
educational	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.1
energy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Source: IOB.

Table 3.5 *Expenditure - activities with CRS code 'Research', by region (%)*

Region	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total
Worldwide	**36.0**	**34.7**	**42.0**	**42.7**	**42.5**	**28.4**	**38.5**	**36.4**	**37.4**	**40.1**	**47.3**	**57.5**	**56.3**	**64.5**	**43.6**
Central and East Africa	16.5	23.6	18.1	13.5	12.8	8.5	13.5	12.4	9.0	9.2	3.4	3.9	3.7	2.9	10.9
Regional Africa	10.3	10.9	10.9	9.0	8.9	7.9	7.1	8.3	7.7	16.2	19.0	14.0	16.1	13.4	12.1
West Africa	2.8	3.8	6.5	10.5	7.1	5.7	8.2	10.4	7.7	7.8	5.4	4.2	3.4	2.4	6.5
Southern Africa	5.2	4.1	2.2	2.3	2.6	1.6	3.4	2.8	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.1	5.1	4.3	3.7
North Africa	2.3	1.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.6	1.1	1.1	0.7
Total Africa	**37.0**	**43.8**	**38.2**	**35.3**	**31.4**	**23.9**	**32.5**	**34.6**	**28.1**	**38.0**	**32.7**	**26.8**	**29.4**	**24.1**	**33.8**
South Asia	3.9	2.8	3.1	3.7	5.3	7.3	7.8	10.0	11.5	9.5	6.2	7.4	6.3	5.6	6.6
Regional Asia	1.6	2.0	1.9	0.7	2.7	0.9	1.8	0.9	1.8	1.6	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.2
South-east Asia	2.4	0.8	0.4	0.7	1.4	1.5	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.5	1.2	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.9
East Asia	0.0	0.8	2.1	2.1	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5
Central Asia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oceania	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Asia	**7.9**	**6.4**	**7.5**	**7.2**	**9.9**	**9.8**	**10.5**	**11.6**	**14.5**	**11.6**	**8.1**	**8.2**	**7.0**	**5.6**	**9.2**
West Europe	8.2	7.4	6.6	6.7	8.1	31.3	6.5	3.8	3.7	2.6	1.8	1.1	2.3	2.7	4.5
South-east Europe	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.9	2.1	0.2	0.6	1.2	3.2	1.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Central Europe	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Total Europe	**8.2**	**7.4**	**7.0**	**7.9**	**10.6**	**31.4**	**7.1**	**5.0**	**6.9**	**3.6**	**4.2**	**1.1**	**2.3**	**2.7**	**5.6**
South America	3.3	2.2	0.5	3.9	2.6	3.9	7.1	7.5	8.7	4.7	5.7	5.3	4.3	2.3	4.6
Central America	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.7	1.3	0.8	0.9	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.8
Regional LA	2.0	1.1	1.4	0.0	1.1	0.3	1.4	1.1	1.9	1.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Caribbean	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Americas	**6.1**	**3.7**	**2.2**	**4.2**	**4.6**	**5.0**	**9.5**	**10.2**	**11.9**	**6.6**	**7.4**	**6.4**	**5.0**	**3.1**	**6.3**
Middle East	**4.9**	**4.1**	**3.2**	**2.7**	**1.1**	**1.4**	**1.9**	**2.2**	**1.2**	**0.0**	**0.3**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**1.6**
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

www.minbuza.nl

Ministry of Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 20061
2500 EB The Hague
The Netherlands

www.minbuza.nl/iob

May 2007
ISBN 978 90 5328 353 0

OSDR6611/E