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BACKGROUND

1 IDRC management has initiated external reviews of its Program Initiatives (PIs) and Corporate Projects. In 2003, six ‘Environment and Natural Resource Management’ PIs and three ‘Social and Economic Equity’ PIs are scheduled for review. One of the three Social and Economic Equity PIs to be reviewed is the Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (‘MIMAP’). The last external reviews, involving twelve PIs, took place in 1999, in preparation for IDRC’s Corporate and Strategic Framework for 2000-2005.

2 The external reviews are designed to provide an independent, informed view about how programs are performing, the extent to which they meet their objectives and the results and effectiveness of programs. They supplement the information available from other forms of evaluation and feedback on program effectiveness and results. Used in conjunction with other monitoring and evaluation findings, external reviews improve the credibility of information about performance, verify internal findings, provide dialogue about program effectiveness, and inform decisions about current and future programming. The results of the external reviews, along with other evaluations, are reported to the Board of Governors of IDRC. The results of the current external reviews will also be used as input into decisions about future programming directions for the next Corporate Strategy and Program Framework 2005-2010.

MANDATE and METHODOLOGY

3 The MIMAP PI review was arranged to be conducted by a team of three reviewers. Their mandate was to:

   (i) assess the extent to which the MIMAP PI (and particularly MIMAP II!) is meeting its objective and aims as set out in its Prospectuses, and identify any evolution in objectives;
   (ii) document results of the MIMAP PI, i.e. outputs, reach and outcomes; and
   (iii) offer reflections on the strength and weakness of MIMAP’s thematic approach and strategies in relation to the current state of the field(s) in which MIMAP operate.

4 A common review framework was set for all external reviews, in order to facilitate the use and management of the reviews. The reviews were to look beyond individual projects and focus on how the Program Initiative as a whole is performing. The reviewers were to draw from both program and project level data sources and seek to triangulate the data from multiple sources, in order to answer the review objectives and questions. Those sources include a review of program and project documents, interviews with program team members and with a sample of project leaders, and more

---

1 Which started in October 2000.
detailed studies of some projects based on a specific strategy determined in consultation with PI Team Leaders and the IDRC’s Evaluation Unit.

5 Two of the three reviewers, including the ‘lead’ one, attended an orientation and methodology workshop held at the IRDC offices in Ottawa in mid-April 2003. The purpose of the workshop was to meet with other reviewers, the IDRC’s Evaluation Unit, and IDRC Management, to discuss the review, expectations and methodologies. The three reviewers also attended a MIMAP planning workshop held in Paris in mid-June 2003, during which they received extensive information and briefings on past, current, and proposed MIMAP activities.

6 In approaching their work, the reviewers were mindful that MIMAP is a complex and large undertaking with a history going back a good number of years and which has unfolded in a wide variety of geographical and institutional contexts. Thus we have attempted to put together in this Report a reasonably ‘stand alone’ document which would be understandable by itself even to someone not fully familiar with the history of IDRC in general and of MIMAP in particular.

7 As will be noted elsewhere in this Report, it was clear from the outset that a technically rigorous assessment of MIMAP in the traditional sense would not be feasible, given that the stated objectives of MIMAP hardly lent themselves to quantitative assessment through measurable indicators - nor is this a criticism of those objectives or of the way in which they are stated. Our assessment has rather been based on qualitative considerations, using internal and external documents as well as in situ interviews and observations. We do not consider such a qualitative approach as intrinsically inferior to, or necessarily less rigorous than, a quantitative one.

8 We were comforted in that view because it is consonant with the innovative ‘Outcome Mapping’ evaluation methodology developed by IDRC, which we were able to apply in part. The important originality of that methodology is in its shift away from assessing the products of a program (e.g. policy relevance, poverty alleviation, etc.) to focus on changes in behaviours, relationships, actions, and/or activities of the people and organization with whom a development program works directly. The program’s contributions to development are assessed based on the influence on the partners with whom it is working to effect change within its sphere of influence. The central concept is that, at its essence, development is accomplished through changes in the behaviour of people. The methodology thus focuses on one particular category of ‘results’, namely changes in the behaviour of people, groups and organizations with whom a program works directly - the program’s partners. It concentrates on assessing its results in terms of the influence of the program on the roles those partners play in development, having equipped them with the tools, techniques and resources to contribute to the development process. At the same time, it recognizes the complexity of development processes and the importance of the broader context in which they occur, and accepts
that while a program can influence the achievement of outcomes, it cannot control them because ultimate responsibility for change rests with what the methodology calls the ‘Boundary Partners’².

9  IDRC management and the three reviewers agreed that one of them (Dr Cielito F. Habito, based in Manila ³), would focus particularly on the Asian activities of MIMAP, that another (Dr Dominique Njinkeu, then based in Nairobi⁴), would focus particularly on the African activities of MIMAP, and that the third (Mr Andre Saumier, based in Montreal), would be responsible for the integration and preparation of the final Review Report. Mr Saumier participated with Dr Habito in an extensive survey of the Philippines MIMAP activities, including a field trip to Palawan Province. It was agreed also that the following ‘MIMAP’ countries would be visited: Philippines, India, Burkina Faso, Benin, and Senegal⁵.

IDRC PROGRAM INITIATIVE ‘MICRO IMPACTS OF MACROECONOMIC & ADJUSTMENT POLICIES’ [MIMAP]

10  The MIMAP program initiative is an important part of IDRC’s current programming and should be understood within the historical and programmatic contexts of IDRC. A capsule description of those contexts will be found in Attachment I.

MIMAP

11  In the 1980s, developing countries were pushed into adopting strong measures to deal with their often severe macro-economic and structural imbalances, usually through IMF-sponsored ‘structural adjustment programs’. Those normally included inter-related measures such as reducing public spending, devaluing local currencies, developing export-oriented crops and industries, and liberalizing the trade and financial sectors. While those policies overall did correct the targeted imbalances, the consequent macroeconomic changes had severe, if unintended and unforeseen (and long undocumented) effects on the poor and vulnerable. Thus, for instance, the three African countries covered in this Report underwent structural adjustment programs from the 1980s and overall received high marks in terms of their implementation of the

² ‘Boundary Partners’ are those individuals, groups and organizations with whom the program interacts directly to effect change and with whom the program can anticipate some opportunities for influence.
³ Professor of Economics and Director, Ateneo Center for Economic Research and Development, Ateneo de Manila University.
⁴ At the time Deputy Director of Research, African Economic Research Consortium (AERC).
⁵ Viet Nam had earlier in 2003 been the object of a field study of IDRC programming in that country (including MIMAP) by Mr Saumier and can thus be considered as having been ‘visited’ as well.
mandated programs. Positive growth rates were secured over several years, but without much improvement in well-being\(^6\).

12 The prevalence of such counterintuitive results was finally documented in important pioneering studies by UNICEF, OECD and the World Bank. Those investigations led to the development of more effective tools for measuring poverty at the household and community levels and for modeling national economies in order to measure and address the differential impacts of structural adjustment policies. However, it soon became apparent that those tools suffered from an unduly limited involvement of local researchers, policy advisors and policy makers. It also became clear that local capability and knowledge bases were essential in order to sustain efforts at poverty measurements, to analyze the impacts of macroeconomic policies and shocks, and to define consequent remedial policies and programs. It was to address those new and complex issues that IDRC launched in early 1997 a major program by the name of *Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies* [MIMAP].

13 The overall objective of the MIMAP Program Initiative is the enhancement of the research-based capacity of developing countries to analyze the impact of macroeconomic policies on their citizens, and particularly on the poor and disadvantaged, and consequently to devise better adapted policies and programs. Thus MIMAP aims at helping developing countries design policies and programs that meet important economic stabilization and structural adjustment targets (at the macro level) while at the same time alleviating poverty and reducing vulnerability (at the micro level), and that offset those negative economic impacts which cannot be avoided. MIMAP has fostered over the years the development of what became known as the ‘MIMAP Network’, which tries to connect developing country researchers, policy officials, NGOs, and international experts. The MIMAP Network seeks to better understand the human costs of macroeconomic policies and shocks, and to design improved policies and poverty alleviation programs. The first phase of MIMAP [MIMAP I] was approved by IDRC’s Board in March 1997 and Phase II, which is to run until 2005, was approved in October 2000.


14 The main focus of MIMAP I was on institutional and, later, Network capacity building in two areas: (i) poverty measurement, analysis and monitoring (‘monitoring’, for short); and (ii) impacts of macro policy and of other macro shocks on the poor (‘modelling’). It fostered dialogues among government researchers and local-level stakeholders, and a knowledge base on important aspects of poverty reduction. MIMAP I was in some ways a program in transition, which accelerated in its last two years. The

---

\(^6\) Indeed, the prevailing view in those countries was, and perhaps still is, that structural adjustment had caused poverty. That view led to considerable reluctance subsequently to engage in policy reform.
MIMAP Network matured; the demand for MIMAP methodologies increased, particularly in Africa and in the context of the HIPC (Heavily Indebted Poor Countries) and PRSP (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers) initiatives. During the same period, several key institutions involved in the early days of MIMAP faltered or failed, while a plan for an external Secretariat to provide most of the Network support and coordination had to be abandoned. By the end of Phase I (and still today), the MIMAP Network included over 40 teams engaged in the following components:

COUNTRY PROJECTS in 13 Asian and West African countries.

15 Much of the initial attention and resources of MIMAP I were directed at the development and support of Country Projects, aimed at building capacity in selected national institution(s) for (i) measurement / analysis / monitoring of poverty, for frequent and rapid poverty assessment; (ii) participatory community-level poverty monitoring and its use in local planning and development programs; (iii) assessment of household-level impacts of macroeconomic policies and shocks through economic modelling; and (iv) sector / issue-focused studies The countries, the year of inception of MIMAP\(^7\), and the local counterpart in each country are as follows:

- **Philippines**, 1990\(^8\) - Angelo King Institute, de la Salle University\(^9\);
- **Bangladesh**, 1992\(^{10}\) - Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies;
- **India**, 1994\(^{11}\) - National Council of Applied Economic Research;
- **Viet Nam**, 1995-96 - Institute of Information Technologies\(^{12}\) and Socio-Economic Development Centre\(^{13}\);
- **Nepal**, 1996\(^{14}\) - National Labour Academy;
- **Laos**, 1997 - NERI;
- **Pakistan**, 1998\(^{15}\) - Pakistan Institute of Development Economics;
- **Benin**, 1998\(^{16}\) - Universite Nationale du Benin;
- **Morocco**, 1998\(^{17}\) - Institut national de statistique et d’économie appliquée;
- **Burkina Faso**, 1998\(^{18}\) - Centre d’études, de documentation et de

\(^{7}\) The dates are taken from ‘Overview of MIMAP Closing the Loop (CTL) Activities’ Revised Draft, May 2003; there are some discrepancies in the dating of the various projects. For instance, the ‘Report to the Board of Governors on IDRC in Sub-Saharan Africa’ (Sept 2002) says that Benin and Burkina Faso started in 2001.

\(^{8}\) The Philippines were in many ways the ‘birthplace’ of MIMAP.

\(^{9}\) Essentially Community-Based Monitoring Systems (CBMS)

\(^{10}\) Essentially Computable General Equilibrium models (CGE)

\(^{11}\) Essentially CGE and Social Accounting Matrix (SAM)

\(^{12}\) Essentially CGE.

\(^{13}\) Essentially CBMS

\(^{14}\) Essentially CBMS

\(^{15}\) Essentially CBMS

\(^{16}\) Essentially Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). L’Universite fut eventuellement remplacée par la ‘Cellule d’analyse des politiques économiques’ (CAPE)

\(^{17}\) This is the only MIMAP project in North Africa. It has five main elements: (i) poverty monitoring; (ii) evaluation of the national strategy of social development; (iii) study of links between growth, equity and poverty; (iv) modeling behaviour of households; and (v) some thematic studies.

\(^{18}\) PRSP and some CGE; CBMS starting in 2002
Country projects tend to be similar in structure and in the methods they use. Most undertake poverty monitoring through light surveys and related tools, for frequent, rapid assessment of poverty and well-being. Many also call on economic modeling techniques aimed at assessing the impacts of macro policies on households and analyzing how various groups of people are differentially affected. However, there is not a uniform template for country projects and each one is tailored to its own domestic realities.

**Thematic Network Projects** in crosscutting areas.

It was found that MIMAP country projects often required more in depth investigations ('focus studies') to support monitoring and modelling efforts, address policy issues in greater detail, and inform the programming activities of governments and donors. Since many countries were seen to share ‘focus study’ issues, thematic networks were launched to delve more deeply into such areas of common concern. MIMAP gradually provided support to six thematic networks. Those networks listed below, have had a very wide range of outputs; they gradually became, and remain, a major focus of, and vehicle for, MIMAP research and programming.

- Gender Dimensions and Impact of Macroeconomic Policy (‘Gender’);
- Macroeconomic Policy, Adjustment and Health Systems (‘Health’);
- Macroeconomic Policy, Adjustment and the Environment (‘Environment’);
- Macroeconomic Policy, Adjustment and Labour (‘Labour’);
- Macroeconomic Policy and Micro Credit (‘Microfinance’); and
- Gender Dimensions of Public Budgets (‘Gender Budgets’).

The thematic networks on Environment, Gender, Health, and Labour were started under MIMAP I; the Microfinance and Gender Budgets ones began under MIMAP II. As these thematic networks have become a key element of MIMAP II, a brief description of each Network appears below, and a fuller one will be found in Attachment II.

---

19 Essentially PRSP
20 Mostly Training.
21 There has been important methodological progress in that area, particularly in the linking of ‘micro simulation’ and computable general equilibrium [CGE] or macro level modelling. It is now possible to draw the links between macro policies and the microeconomic behaviour of households and individuals more clearly and in greater detail.
22 Some of those networks emerged also as issue areas identified by existing and new partners, and requiring in-depth analysis across countries and regions.
Environment (started in 1996)
18 Intended originally as a multi-country network, this has become a network of activities and specialists in the Philippines, interacting with the rest of the MIMAP Network. The network has sought to examine and quantify the environmental effects of changes in macroeconomic policies in the Philippines. The project is basically completed.

Gender (started in 1998)
19 Designed to initiate coordinated research activity in South Asia on the gender differentiated impact of macroeconomic policy reforms. Phase III, just started and with a 2-year time frame, will concentrate on: gender modeling, gender impact of the growth of information and communication technologies in the countries of the region, linkages between economic growth, income inequality and gender, the qualitative dimensions of differences among men and women in the experiences of, and reactions to, poverty, and the policy implications of the findings of the three phases of the Network. The Network will assist the newer MIMAP countries in West Africa.

Health (started in 1998)
20 Designed to look at relationships between macroeconomic and adjustment policies, health sector reform, and accessibility, utilisation & quality of health care in the South. A framework was formulated to conceptualise the influences of adjustment and sector reform on the supply of, and demand for, health care, and on the quality, utilisation and accessibility of health services. Subsequent work focuses on (i) means to improve access of poor households and individuals to health care; (ii) means to optimize sectoral health spending in different regions to achieve best health outcomes; and (iii) integrating important findings into national monitoring, modelling and policy development mechanisms.

Labour (started in 1999)
21 Describes the main features and macroeconomic role of labour markets in Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and examines the links between labour markets and growth & poverty and in channelling the impacts of the Asian crisis. Three phases and a book have been completed. Future directions for the Network remain unclear, as the lead Institute (Phnom Penh-based CDRI) has yet to submit a proposal.

Microfinance (started in 2000)
22 Microfinance has emerged as a key poverty reduction issue. In the absence of ‘formal’ financial services, substitute informal mechanisms (Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries – COFI), are put in place by communities themselves. The Microfinance Network looks at the provision of microfinance to micro enterprises (as opposed to individuals), with a research program focusing on certain novel key ideas.
Gender Budgets (started in mid-2000)

23 This is a more informal network funded mostly by UNIFEM ((initially with Belgium funds) and the Commonwealth Secretariat. MIMAP and country teams participate but do not manage the Network. MIMAP would like to expand its work on improved provision of public services, particularly in areas of education and social security/protection. This will require expansion of financial and human resources through partnerships and co-funding.


24 These separate undertakings build on the ‘focus studies’ mentioned above. They came out of the development of the still informal MPIA, PMMA, and CBMS networks rather than from the national project focus studies as such. They involve MIMAP partners and country projects in the analysis of issues of common interest through scholarly and more structured comparative research projects across countries. One such topic so far has been the impact of trade liberalization on poverty.

25 The dissemination of MIMA outputs and products (‘Closing the Loop, Dissemination & Networking’) is a high priority for MIMAP. Related activities during MIMAP I have included network meetings, policy recommendations to policy makers, results of CBMS used by local governments (Philippines, Nepal, Viet Nam), participation of MIMAP team leaders in Gender Budgets workshops and meetings of Commonwealth Finance Ministers, books on modelling, books and articles by MIMAP researchers, the eight MIMAP Websites, PRSP courses for the World Bank Institute, collaboration with the World Bank for the 2000 World Development Report on Poverty, and cooperation to the White Paper on International Development issued by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID). MIMAP has also generated a series of working papers, technical papers and policy papers, all of which are scheduled ultimately to be on the various MIMAP websites. Many MIMAP projects have a working papers / discussion papers series distributed to policy-makers and other interested parties in several countries. Primary data and indicators of well-being at the community level generated in the three ‘senior’ MIMAP countries are available.

26 Some important constraints became apparent in MIMAP I programming, and many remain in MIMAP II. Those were particularly felt in East and South Africa, where good and credible institutions are overwhelmed by government demands for policy analysis and policy advice. In addition, rich donors pushing for a policy agenda will corral the best researchers and research institutions, while at the same time good and credible researchers are extremely busy and mostly unavailable for new projects. The initial skill conditions of researchers are important for successful programs. Where such

23 These acronyms and the networks they refer to are described later in the Report.
conditions are poor, as in most Sub-Saharan African countries, effective supervision of young scholars becomes an important ingredient for success. We have concluded that, on a comparative basis, MIMAP has performed better in Africa than most other programs undertaken in the countries considered, especially in involving lower skilled researchers. Some issues remain, such as how to train researchers to the level achieved by the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) in macroeconomic policy, and then how to retain them, if that is desired, as part of MIMAP teams. The second is more an incentive problem, but the former is still difficult to achieve given its resource intensity.

Several important lessons were gathered from MIMAP I, which were to influence the design and delivery of MIMAP II:

- there is a need to focus more on individuals and teams rather than institutions; that lesson had an important impact on the development of the MIMAP program in Africa;
- comparative research, with training and technical support at Network level, are efficient and effective ways of enhancing capacity, quality and visibility;
- MIMAP should focus on methodologies / technologies of advantage, and stay on the cutting edge by integrating gender analysis in all projects\(^\text{24}\) and incorporating large household survey data in economic modelling\(^\text{25}\);
- community-based monitoring and local development mechanisms are needed for those poverty reduction efforts which are missed by national sectoral policies and can only be done by very micro interventions;
- e-mail support is feasible, with more support to be focused on training of trainers and dissemination on Web sites,
- more dissemination is needed, including high-quality peer-reviewed outputs;
- each network should be the vehicle for intra-network support and training, instead of their being provided / organized from outside the network, e.g. directly by MIMAP;
- the principal functions of network support and coordination are leadership and organization of comparative network-level studies, of network meetings, of training sessions, and of website development\(^\text{26}\); such support can be delivered in different ways; and
- the impact of MIMAP country projects varies from country to country and is related to the strength of recipient institutions as well as to the degree of attention given to vertical networks of stakeholders within countries.

\(^{24}\) Pursued via sessions at Network meetings (vg Sept 2000 in Palawan), dissemination on the new MIMAP web site, encouragement from persons providing technical support to MIMAP teams.

\(^{25}\) MIMAP and Laval University are among a few leaders in that area. Applications developed in all monitoring activities and implemented in the stronger modelling groups (Philippines, India, Pakistan, Vietnam, Ghana, Benin, perhaps Senegal.)

\(^{26}\) Plans made in '99 to devolve these to the Philippines with small nodes in South Asia and West Africa (and a possible Secretariat) did not come to fruition.
The two major overall conclusions were that (i) MIMAP should be moving away from large country projects and toward network activities, and (ii) national policy impact should become the responsibility of the domestic partners, as opposed to being entrusted to the ‘foreign’ MIMAP team members. It was also agreed that the extension of the PI to Africa, which had been started under MIMAP I, would be aggressively pursued.

In October 2000, thus towards the end of MIMAP I, Mr Vijay S. Vyas tabled his Review of the PI, which was generally very positive. He made a number of suggestions concerning what we might call the substantive aspects of the PI as well as some of a more ‘administrative’ or ‘managerial’ nature. Among the former, for instance, were the introduction of more complementarities between modeling exercises and poverty monitoring, and the need for better sequencing of research activities. Among the latter were comments to the effect that the program was being run by an increasingly overstretched ‘support’ staff; that ‘capacity building’, which stands at the heart of the program, could be better attuned to the actual expertise of the local researchers; that the rapidly enlarging PI had generated needs for coordination and decentralization (and that more responsibility should be devolved); that greater emphasis should be placed on publishing, particularly the results of poverty monitoring, in local languages; and that thematic networks should be encouraged. We have observed a strong convergence between the Vyas comments and suggestions, and the ‘lessons learned’ listed above: it can be concluded MIMAP has responded well to the key points made by Vyas.

MIMAP II (2000-2005)

The general objective of MIMAP Phase II, which is to run from October 2000 until 2005, remains to assist developing countries to analyse and create their own policies and programs that achieve the goals of economic stabilization and adjustment while reducing poverty and softening impacts on vulnerable groups. Six subsidiary objectives have been identified for MIMAP II:

- enhance the research capacity of developing countries to analyse the impact of macroeconomic policies on their citizens
- provide new instruments for policy and program design and analysis, by developing rigorous analytical tools and poverty monitoring systems

---

28 For instance, the introduction of complementarity between modeling exercises and poverty monitoring, and the need for better sequencing of research activities.
29 Whether however the ‘overstretched’ staff situation has been remedied is less easy to determine.
30 That objective does not appear substantively different from the one set out for MIMAP Phase I: “to enhance the research capacity of developing countries to analyze the impact of macroeconomic policies on their citizens, and particularly on the poor and disadvantaged, and to devise more adapted policies”, despite differences in details. The same applies to the subsidiary objectives.
• assist the development of community-based monitoring and local development mechanisms
• strengthen the ability of policy makers to negotiate with international players, such as the international financial institutions and other multilateral and bilateral organizations
• bring together researchers, politicians, government officials and NGOs in policy dialogues at national and regional level
• promote policy dialogues and the exchange of knowledge, tools, research results, among countries, institutions and donors.

31 At the same time, MIMAP II has a more explicit goal of poverty reduction and attention to poverty reduction programs at national and local levels, as well as of improved macro-level policy. It intends to play a more strategic and technical support role in project design, implementation and resource expansion, as opposed to more direct and substantive involvement in country projects, broad training, and networking within member countries. Gender issues have become a major focus for MIMAP II: the Gender Network has produced important results, including methodologies and best practices for monitoring and modelling, and all of the MIMAP teams have been exposed to that work; also, new developments in modelling methodologies increase the power for gender analysis. One stated challenge for MIMAP II will be to ensure the spread of best gender analysis methods across the activities of MIMAP as well as to develop these methods further.

32 While the above general and specific objectives do not diverge in fundamental fashion from those of MIMAP I, they evince changes in orientation from MIMAP I which reflect certain major perceived shifts in the external environment, particularly the HIPC and PRSP agendas, as well as the renewed attention and resources devoted to poverty reduction strategies and programs. Thus MIMAP II proposes to more explicitly include (i) the community-based monitoring mechanisms; (ii) the network-level research, training, technical support and dissemination activities; and (iii) leading-edge methodologies and technologies in modelling and monitoring.

33 The thrust and structure of MIMAP have therefore changed, as network-level activities increase and national project components either decline or become increasingly funded by governments themselves and other donors. The three-year MIMAP work plan contains more emphasis on network-level activities and on resource expansion for partial funding of country projects. The main areas of project development for MIMAP II are stated to be:

• **Country projects**: subsequent phases for most of the thirteen country projects, in collaboration with other donors wherever possible, and with projects becoming smaller if they have to rely solely on IDRC resources;
• **Thematic networks**: further phases for two or more of the four previously existing thematic networks (Gender, Health, Labour, Environment) and for the two new thematic projects (Gender Budgets and Microfinance);
• Projects and research support activities covering the principal network-level activities: training and technical support, training workshops, Network meetings, website development;

• Comparative studies with the same methodologies but with results and impacts targeted at international as well as national levels. Topics of comparative studies will include modelling analyses of impacts of trade liberalization and poverty (six countries), and comparative poverty profiles (nine countries), which could be repeated annually. Those investigations will lead to publications and dissemination in 2001. It is planned to have two or more studies in progress at any point in time, with an annual or biennial cycle.

34 MIMAP, like all IDRC activities, is a research-oriented and science-based program dedicated, inter alia, to the advancement of knowledge. In line with this and as noted above, MIMAP projects have from the outset included (i) modelling exercises that make macro-micro links and generate empirical policy-based results; (ii) data gathering or monitoring exercises that try to go beyond conventional income- or consumption-based welfare indicators; and (iii) special or focus studies that serve the dual purpose of dealing with MIMAP issues not amenable to modelling and of widening the constituency of MIMAP. MIMAP II builds on all this.

MODELLING

35 Three leading edge development are in progress:

(i) incorporate ever-larger household survey data sets into the structure and calibration of the model, enabling a richer picture of policy impacts. The MIMAP support team at Laval University has developed basic methodology and software to that end and MIMAP had plans to develop at least three country applications. After some delays, these exercises have gathered considerable steam and nine surveys are either completed32, ongoing or proposed. (ii) incorporate gender dimensions into modelling, including women’s reproductive or family work as well as paid labour. The results are striking in concept, giving value for family activities and clarifying the tradeoffs (which can be life-and-death issues for poor women); and (iii) intrahousehold modelling and its incorporation in CGE models, reflecting different preferences, roles and decisions by specific members of the household.

31 MIMAP prefers larger and more disaggregated models incorporating more historical data, rather than ‘smaller’ models specific to each kind of policy simulation.

32 Nepal (completed in 2001), Senegal, Benin, Philippines (two versions.)

33 Zimbabwe.

34 Tunisia, Ivory Coast, Burkina Faso, Nigeria.

35 All models used currently in this area, notably the ‘bargaining’ ones, have proven hard to apply empirically. New methods offer powerful insights on households collective preferences and sharing rules.
Two MIMAP teams are pursuing these approaches with the aim of developing pilot applications.

MONITORING

36 Two new approaches are becoming very important.

(i) *community-based monitoring* and *local development mechanisms* are needed to catalyze poverty reduction efforts which are missed by sectoral and national policies. Those can normally be accomplished only by micro interventions, leading to use in local planning and poverty reduction programs. They involve monitoring of poverty and the development of indicators by communities, and the use of that information, for resource allocation and development activities, by the communities, local government, districts, provinces etc. That approach was implemented in the Philippines, Viet Nam, and Nepal (plus a pilot project in Burkina Faso) from 1997 to 2000[^36], This has been the most visibly successful face of MIMAP and MIMAP II plans to expand coverage to the maximum degree possible.

(ii) *including gender in monitoring systems*. The MIMAP Gender Network has collected conventional indicators by gender and developed a recommended methodology for national poverty monitoring systems. It has also developed non-conventional indicators of stress, violence and mental health. MIMAP plans to disseminate these methods widely and to incorporate them in all MIMAP-supported monitoring activities.

FOCUS STUDIES

37 The principal areas across all national projects have been:

(i) gender; youth employment and child labour; demographic & fertility transitions; ethnic & regional development;
(ii) environment; labour & unemployment; social security, health, education; agriculture & food security; rural non-agricultural activity;
(iii) public expenditures, including gender impacts and micro credit, and other sectors including industry, transport, energy, the informal sector.

Four of those areas emerged during MIMAP I, and two more during the transition from MIMAP I to MIMAP II, in the form of *Thematic Network* projects, as described above.

38 The dissemination of outputs and products remains a high priority. Activities of the type already engaged in with varying degrees of effectiveness or success under

[^36]: Most complete is in Palawan province of the Philippines.
MIMAP I (and described above) are scheduled to continue *mutatis mutandis*. Journal articles are emerging from several teams, books are in progress on methodology and comparative research subjects, and each of the Thematic Networks is expected to produce a book. Plans, facilities and resources are in place to develop a new and ambitious MIMAP Network website (anticipated to be operational in the second half of 2000 – but see below) which will hopefully link to the existing eight MIMAP sites and serve both as a repository for, and interface linking to MIMAP outputs, training materials, tools, data, project documents, information on partners, contact details, links, and MIMAP-related reference materials. The MIMAP Network website is to be based on technology and design features that enable all partners to easily contribute inputs to the site as well as directly manage sections of the site on their specific projects. The PEP website already responds partially to those objectives and has been operational for more than six months. At the technical and policy levels, MIMAP has generated a series of working papers, technical papers and policy papers, which continue to be posted on the MIMAP websites. Similarly, primary data and indicators of well-being at the community level generated in the three senior MIMAP countries and already available, will be posted on the Network website. Each MIMAP senior project has a working paper or a discussion paper series distributed to policy-makers and other interested parties in several countries: these publications will continue and indeed expand, as the number of outputs and the MIMAP circle widens. At the capacity building level, the more experienced teams have continued to transfer the poverty monitoring and modelling technologies, the Philippines being the most advanced. In other teams, the emphasis has been on the improvement of the capacity of researchers and decision makers to analyze policies using modern economic tools and techniques.

**POVERTY AND ECONOMIC POLICY (PEP) NETWORKS**

39 An important development, indeed in some ways a watershed, within the orbit of MIMAP II is the setting up, now in progress, of the ‘PEP Networks’. The goal of PEP, congruent with MIMAP’s, is broadly speaking to assist developing countries to reduce poverty through better macroeconomic policies and micro-level interventions. The PEP networks are not intended to replace the existing networks, which will carry on; however, they concretize a new orientation of MIMAP and are designed to bring MIMAP to its next level of activity. They are thus becoming a key component of the PI, perhaps even *the* key component.

40 The specific objectives of PEP are:
- Better understand the causes and consequences of poverty
- Propose alternative / accompanying policies to reduce poverty
- Improve monitoring and measurement of poverty

---

37 Note for instance the workshop held in Rabat (Morocco) in March 2003, which involved policymakers of the country and benefited from extensive press coverage.
- Develop local research and training capacity in these areas
- Develop new concepts and methodologies through fundamental research

Three interrelated networks are being put together. They existed prior to PEP, albeit somewhat informally: PEP consolidates them within one umbrella network and under a devolved (i.e. outside IDRC) management.

**MPIA - Modeling and Policy Impact Assessment**

This is dedicated to using economy-wide models and analysis as a laboratory to draw links between specific policies and shocks and their eventual impact on poverty. It aims to develop high-quality national and comparative research, capacity, and new concepts and methodologies in the modeling and assessment of the impacts of macro policies and shocks on poverty and equity at household and intrahousehold levels. It hopes to arrive at a critical mass of researchers on common issues to develop network interaction and research of high international standards, encourage comparative analyses across countries, provide systematic and focused training as well as technical assistance. The MPIA network will focus initially on labour market modeling and on consequences for poverty and equity; it will also look at the impacts of public spending (particularly health and education) on poverty and its distribution, of non-trade dimensions of globalization (e.g. technology diffusion, foreign investment), of changes in sectoral policies and international arrangements (notably agriculture, textiles and garments), and of poverty reduction policies. It will disseminate to national and international policy analysts and will share with other PEP and MIMAP networks and national projects, and with related national and international initiatives. The network has already adopted a first thematic focus (impacts of trade liberalization on poverty and income distribution), which will lead to a book of comparative research.

**PMMA - Poverty Measurement, Monitoring and Analysis**

This is dedicated to the development and application of tools to monitor, measure and analyze a wide range of poverty issues. It aims to develop high quality national and comparative research capacity and new concepts and methodologies in measuring, monitoring and analyzing poverty. It hopes for a critical mass of researchers on common issues to develop network interaction and research of high international standards, to encourage comparative analyses across countries, and to provide systematic and focused training and technical assistance. The network will focus thematically on public spending and its impact on poverty and equity, the impact of macroeconomic poverty reduction policies, the micro modeling of the labour market, the intra-household allocations of well-being, poverty dynamics, and the reliability of poverty and equity analysis. It will increase the visibility of networks and researchers,

---

38 A literature review has been prepared and a first workshop was held in June 2002 in Quebec City.
and disseminate to national and international policy analysts. It will share with other PEP and MIMAP networks and national projects, and with related national and international initiatives.

**CBMS - Community-Based Monitoring Systems**

43 This is dedicated to the designing and piloting of community-based monitoring of poverty in its multidimensional senses, and of local development systems. It aims to assist its members develop and institutionalize community-based monitoring systems in their respective countries, share experience and exchange lessons learned in community-based monitoring, build the knowledge base on CBMS, make available existing CBMS literature through web sites, fora, and briefings, provide advice and technical support to CBMS-related initiatives and support new CBMS initiatives, promote awareness and use of CBMS as a tool for poverty monitoring and local governance. The Network is also planning publications synthesizing material from its extensive database. The network will interact with other PEP and MIMAP networks and projects, and with related national and international initiatives.

44 As can be seen, the three networks have close links one with the other, which justify their grouping within the umbrella ‘PEP network’, and many of the same researchers have been involved in two or three networks. All three share a common interest in studying poverty issues, and their different viewpoints (micro, macro, and community-based) are seen as complementary. Researchers can learn from one another, including through annual general, national and regional meetings, interaction at national level, and possible formal collaboration.

45 The basic activity of each network is to finance and support, on a competitive basis and based on submissions received, an annual cycle of policy relevant and methodologically rigorous research (including comparative research) by local researchers. Research is to be predominantly of an applied nature, focusing on a limited number of themes, with a working paper expected at the end of each project. Other activities include scientific support (from CREFA and the University of Western Ontario - UWO), basic and advanced training, documentation, study visits to CREFA and UWO. Dissemination will take place within and without the network through regional and international conferences, web sites, working papers, etc.

**Organization**

46 Each PEP network is ‘run’ by a steering committee composed of the network leader, one IDRC person, and two outside members. There is an overall PEP Steering Committee, comprised of core members of the individual network steering committees, that will assist the networks, provide scientific guidance, evaluate proposals and reports, etc. Prof John Cockburn (Laval University) is the overall PEP leader /
coordinator; Prof. Bernard Decaluwe and Prof. Jean-Yves Duclos (both from Laval University) are the leaders respectively of the MPIA and PMMA networks; Prof. Celia Reyes (de La Salle University) is the leader of the CBMS network. 

The PEP Networks are undoubtedly a complex and to a large extent novel formula: it embodies a new approach for MIMAP and represents an important new thrust for the PI. It calls for a major commitment of MIMAP human and financial resources; in fact, it will speak for the lion’s share of MIMAP II for the rest of the current Prospectus. Much will ride on their success, and more will be said on this below.

ASSESSMENT

As noted, MIMAP MIMAP II and I have been active over the years in thirteen countries. A first question, then, is the extent to which MIMAP II has achieved its main and subsidiary objectives. One crucial limitation here is that those objectives as defined do not lend themselves to clear quantitative assessment through measurable indicators. Because of this, it has not been possible to arrive at the outset at clear and time-defined targets of achievement. The achievement of the PI’s objectives can however be assessed qualitatively. Qualitative assessment based on interviews with MIMAP stakeholders and examination of MIMAP documents lead us to conclude that, for the most part, the answer to the question is ‘yes’. While the degree of its prominence and actual impact varies across the countries concerned, it is fair to say that MIMAP not only has made a significant contribution but also has made its own mark in the development policy research community in each of the countries it serves. We elaborate below on the various aspects of this contribution and impact, referring in turn to the various objectives of the PI spelled out in its Prospectus.

Enriched policy analysis

MIMAP has clearly contributed to richer policy analysis, and therefore more informed policy-making, in several ways. First, it has called attention to a wider set of criteria by which macroeconomic adjustment policies must be assessed. As such, it has made a concrete contribution to the general trend towards more holistic and integrative analysis of development that marked the 1990s, especially after the Rio Earth Summit and Agenda 21 highlighted the need to examine the interrelationships among the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. By its very name, the PI has pointed to the need to recognize that economy-wide policies must have a human face, i.e. must be ultimately directed at improving the lives of individual people.

Laval University has requested a budget of $1.4 million per year for MPIA and PMMA; de La Salle University has requested a budget of $650,000 per year for CBMS.
Second, it has made possible the acquisition of a richer base of information and data on the well-being of people, and helped ensure that such information is put to good use. In India, for instance, MIMAP’s first major (and perhaps best known) contribution was a nationwide household sample survey that documented the well-being of Indian households; that survey has become a valuable asset to the entire development research community in the country. India’s Central Statistical Organisation acknowledges this important contribution of MIMAP, which filled a gap that the agency itself was unable to fill. In the three African countries visited, the increased used of data in support of policy has enabled researchers to contribute to the improvement of the quality and accessibility of economic data produced by the national statistical departments. The interface between data producers and users has significantly improved. As a result there is now a better appreciation in the policy community for surveys implemented and processed on a timely basis. MIMAP has supported, through community-based monitoring surveys (CBMS) the collection of rich databases of information on human welfare indicators at the community level in Bangladesh, Nepal, Viet Nam, the Philippines, Senegal and other MIMAP countries.

Apart from helping guide central and local authorities on priorities for development, these data collected at the community level are now helping empower local communities to define their priority needs in the allocation of public resources for local development. In Palawan province in the Philippines, local officials have acknowledged that the community-based monitoring system (CBMS) made possible by MIMAP has helped depoliticise and strengthen the local government’s budget allocation process by providing an objective basis for budget prioritization. Similarly, the Indian government (through its Planning Commission) has found in the household sample survey an important basis for public investment allocation. Although CBMS is still undergoing testing in Senegal it has already helped in local community planning and policy dialogue, and has attracted the attention of parliamentarians who have requested that the program cover more regions.

Third, MIMAP has been highly instrumental in the development and enhancement of analytical tools and innovative methodologies that put to good use the information described above, while permitting a micro-oriented analysis of economy-wide policies. The capability to formulate and enhance computable general equilibrium (CGE) models for policy analysis has been a key contribution of MIMAP in most of the countries it serves (e.g. Philippines, Bangladesh, India, Vietnam, and to a lesser extent Burkina Faso, Senegal and Benin.) Analysts have been able to identify the relevant questions that need to be asked in a comprehensive assessment of the impact of economy-wide policies. These have in turn challenged and guided researchers in the MIMAP countries and at Laval University towards formulating and testing more
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40 Such as non-conventional indicators for gender equality, composite poverty indexes, specialized software such as DAD which has since become a standard tool for poverty and distributional analysis.
innovative modeling techniques, thereby pushing the frontier in disaggregative economic modeling approaches. Researchers in Benin and Senegal have used these tools in non-MIMAP projects, and attempts have been made by the Benin team to contribute in the identification of alternative modeling techniques.

At the same time, and as will be noted below, MIMAP is in fact better known in Africa for its poverty measurement work than for its other major components. There are several reasons for that situation. In the case of CGE (an important component of MIMAP), its introduction is still recent and, given the level of modeling literacy in the countries examined, the generalization of CGE among researchers and its broader utilization by policy-makers will take time. It remains nonetheless that there is now in Africa, thanks to MIMAP’s successful hands-on approach to capacity building, a much better understanding of the nature of poverty and of its dynamics, as well as of the relationships between poverty and key human capital determinants such as education, public spending, microfinance and gender. More recently, the accumulated knowledge has come to include links between poverty and macroeconomic policies and trade liberalization. It would appear that MIMAP has performed as well as, if not indeed better, than many other similar programs active in the three African countries; AERC, for instance, has had little impact in Benin and in Burkina, and even in Senegal. Over and above the more demanding entry level for AERC and the more competitive nature of its process which did not help its impact on those countries, MIMAP’s success flows in very good part from its approach to capacity building, including close mentoring of researchers by MIMAP and Laval University, and oversight at the country level.

**Improved national development policy research capability**

By initially working with specific key institutions, MIMAP has been notably instrumental in the creation of a critical mass of development policy researchers with the capability to analyse the human welfare impacts of economic policies and examine poverty in its multi-dimensional nature within the countries it serves. In this endeavour, MIMAP not surprisingly has enjoyed a mixed record in its choices of partner institutions. In most cases, it has found good partners. The National Centre for Applied Economic Research, its key partner institution in India, is widely seen as among the most respected and influential research institutions in that country. The Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), the original partner institution in the Philippines through its private arm Policy Development Foundation, Inc. (PDFI),
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41 This over and above the standard ‘problem’ of closer collaboration between model builders and potential users to ensure the relevance of CGE work; that is not really happening yet in the three countries examined.

42 The Philippine partner institution has since been replaced by the Angelo King Institute of Economic and Business Studies at the De La Salle University (Angelo King Institute for short), with the same key persons from PIDS still running the country project in an affiliate capacity within the Angelo King Institute.
was the foremost policy research institution in that country, widely respected and influential in shaping development policy. The same may be generally said of partner institutions in Bangladesh and Nepal.

55 The Centre de Recherche en Economie Appliquee (CREA) in Dakar is the lead policy research institution in Senegal and in West Africa generally, and has contributed papers that shaped major public policies\(^43\). Likewise is the CEDRES in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso.) The institutional situation in Africa remains nonetheless rather complex. In Burkina and Senegal, MIMAP is housed in policy research institutions (CEDRES and CREA) previously supported by IDRC; in Benin, on the other hand, no such institution exists and the Cellule d’analyse de politiques economiques (CAPE) appears to many as not being the ‘ideal’ institution, for a variety of reasons outside the scope of this Report. Even in Senegal, CREA may be reaching its capacity; however, its ‘research’ component still remains the only one sufficiently developed, as opposed to its ‘interface’ component (between research and policy) which is rapidly gaining in urgency because of the demands of the PRSP process. This points to a general issue of a better convergence of research and policy impact in Africa, including taking potential policy impact or relevance into account when determining research priorities. While this is admittedly a thorny and complex issue, to which there is not one ideal solution, it has to be addressed. It appears here, without being needlessly critical, that more importance has in fact been given to the quality of research and to the corresponding capacity building needs, than to dissemination, however key an objective of MIMAP that may be claimed to be. This may reflect a sort of structural problem within MIMAP, in the sense that MIMAP (and perhaps IDRC itself) does not appear yet to have made a clear priority decision between knowledge production and knowledge dissemination. Be that as it may, neither the researchers nor the policy-makers seem to have had a clear strategy for deciding on the level of efforts to be allocated to each aspect of the program. It is possible that the situation is not helped by the presence in each country of multiple focal points for various MIMAP thematic research programs, such as microfinance, CBMS, etc. Such a multipolar approach, to some extent inevitable if not even desirable, does have implications, which have to be considered, with respect to dissemination and to a potential strategy of having ‘one’ core group in each country with sufficient skills to impact on, or assist in, policy making.

56 This being said, it has to be underlined here that MIMAP has been strongly instrumental in enhancing the quality of economic data produced by national statistical departments in the African countries where it has been active\(^44\). While this may appear a mundane achievement, one has to remember that until recently quantitative analysis was not valued in those countries and that funds invested in national censuses only led to the eventual production of simple cross tabulations of some results. Thus statistical

\(^{43}\) One pre-MIMAP such study was an investigation of returns on education.

\(^{44}\) There have been important contributions as well to the improvement of command over complex models and methodologies.
data gathering was seen as a costly and in many ways pointless exercise undertaken at great expense to satisfy the demands of the statisticians themselves and of some foreign partners. Moreover, the statisticians did not have any counterparts using the data and providing feedback on its quality and timeliness. As a result, surveys were never processed to a level usable for analysis and often became altogether inaccessible. Now however, as a result of queries and feedback from MIMAP researchers, survey instruments and data quality have been significantly improved, particularly in Benin, Senegal and Burkina Faso. It must be noted also that the more experienced African teams are now involved in the transfer of poverty monitoring and modeling technologies. Local researchers have served as resource persons in MIMAP workshops, and some have been invited to serve as resource persons in workshops organized by other institutions. The impact of MIMAP here is clear, since several of those ‘invited’ researchers are called upon to assist in areas where they had little knowledge previous to joining MIMAP.

On the downside, some of the originally chosen partner institutions (e.g. in Nepal, Philippines, Benin) subsequently experienced problems. In Asia these problems were mainly internal to the host institution and more or less forced the discontinuation of MIMAP’s relationship with, and institutional support for, them. Where a similar situation was observed in Africa, the lack of MIMAP management team cohesion was also a contributing factor. As a fairly direct and reasonable consequence of its negative experiences in Asia, and as noted above, MIMAP as a whole shifted its support away from institutions and towards individuals researchers. This refocusing, particularly through the Poverty and Economic Policy (PEP) thematic networks, is aimed at enabling a wider reach of support within the research community in MIMAP countries and beyond. An added element is the exchange of knowledge, experiences and methodologies (cross-fertilization) that is starting actively to take place among MIMAP researchers from different countries through the networks. This provides a mechanism for a form of “South-South” cooperation (an important if elusive MIMAP objective) directed at strengthening domestic capacity for development policy research, particularly in the area of poverty monitoring and analysis.

On the other hand, the new ‘researcher’ focus may reflect too much MIMAP’s ‘Asian’ experience and could to some extent work to the disadvantage of African MIMAP countries. Indeed, MIMAP in Africa deliberately started in countries that had not participated fully in existing networks such as the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC). That weak participation reflected (among others factors) low skill levels, which are not conducive to strong participation in ‘researcher’ networks. Such a situation calls for an early hands-on approach to capacity building; something for which
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45 Michel Kone, who has benefited from MIMAP training, now occupies a senior position in the Burkina Statistical Office.
46 However, the effective functioning of the PEP (and other) Networks does require a degree of institutional support. Thus reliance on institutions has not been discontinued altogether, far from it.
MIMAP performances are exemplary but which has not been as available in Africa as it was in Asia. That situation has consequences for African participation in PEP which will be examined later. The ‘African’ institutional strategy of MIMAP has been to attempt to maximize the benefits or working with institutions without, as in Asia, tying itself too closely to those institutions, i.e. without MIMAP team members having necessarily to be attached to them or part of their staff. Thus in Benin no member of the MIMAP team is part of the institution which legally or formally hosts the project. This being said, MIMAP has succeeded in creating a core group of poverty analysts in the three African countries examined (Benin, Burkina and Senegal.) These analysts are respected by their fellow researchers and by policy-makers in the three countries. Consistent with its original focus, MIMAP in Africa seems at this juncture to be better known for its poverty-oriented work and less for its other components. Work on CGE is known by some fellow researchers and some policy-makers closely connected to the research process, while the microfinance component (implemented so far only in Benin) is little know even by fellow researchers.

Equally, the focus of MIMAP II on individuals has its own corresponding disadvantages, including possible loss of continuity and institutional memory, dissipation of research support (i.e. spreading support more thinly), and loss of complementarities and of economies of scale. These issues are discussed more fully below (‘MIMAP’s Reach’).

**Strengthening of the negotiation capacity of countries**

An explicit objective of MIMAP is to strengthen the ability of policy-makers to undertake negotiations with multilateral institutions (e.g. World Bank and regional development banks, International Monetary Fund), bilateral partners, and other financial institutions, whether public or private. Presumably, the context of this aim is in negotiations for program loans and structural adjustment programs that involve policy commitments, and dealings with creditors, fund managers and credit rating agencies who must be convinced of the soundness of policy directions and of measures undertaken by the government. This is an ambitious undertaking with understandably strong internal political overtones.

In this regard, it is clearly not the intended function of MIMAP to impart stronger negotiation skills as such to policymakers themselves. Rather, this objective aims indirectly to strengthen their negotiating postures by equipping them with sound policy directions and positions to bring to the negotiating table, and with a clear understanding of their implications for the economy and the people, as well as with a fuller and perhaps more critical understanding of the proposals likely to be put forward by the other sides. As such, attainment of this objective is impossible to assess. Short of observing the conduct of actual negotiations, there is little basis for judging whether policymakers have in fact become more effective in such negotiations as a result of
MIMAP. Nor is it even possible satisfactorily to judge whether they have truly attained better understanding of the implications of alternative policy directions and measures.

62 At best, some qualitative assessment might be made of policy shifts and enhancements made by governments resulting from MIMAP interventions; but even so attribution would be difficult. While the idea behind that ‘objective’ is indeed laudable, it should be seen more in the nature of a wish or a hope than as a true objective. Qualitative assessment can also rely on what the beneficiaries of MIMAP claim as a contribution. Thus, the MIMAP team leader in Bangladesh was the main writer of that country’s PRSP. Similarly, the officials involved in the Senegalese PRSP preparation acknowledged that the ease with which their program was negotiated and ultimately approved by the boards of the World Bank and the IMF is largely because the data provided by MIMAP had helped them address the main questions raised in the Joint Staff Assessment of country PRSPs. In Senegal, the MIMAP research team is now a bona fide member of the PRSP process and its members are systematically invited to attend PRSP meetings. The view of donors covering more than one country also provides indications. In Benin and Senegal, World Bank and some bilateral donor officials attributed the quality of the country’s PRSP to the research produced by MIMAP. Some of the informants and analysts in the donor community had initially been involved in MIMAP and they assert that the capacity received in the program is extremely useful to their job.

63 At the same time, the actual contacts of MIMAP have generally been much more with advisors to policymakers than with policymakers themselves. That approach was explicit in the country-institutional orientation of MIMAP I. That was not surprising and has proven more productive in both the short and the long run than trying to gain a degree of direct influence on policymakers, which would have called for a stand in the internal affairs of host countries. Such a course of action is generally counterproductive when attempted by outsiders. That is why the more recent thrust of MIMAP II, which is to leave such influencing to the local partners, should be applauded. MIMAP-Africa has provided some interesting instances of this: as noted above, local MIMAP teams have played a direct role in the preparation of country PRSP documents, which in turn have guided the discussions with the IMF-World Bank. Such direct influence, however exhilarating, carries clear and potentially severe risks in case of changes in political leadership: MIMAP has to be cognizant of those risks and must stand ready to bear them. It should be possible to establish a distinction between the ‘country MIMAP’ providing the research input into the formulation of policy, and individuals associated with MIMAP who can serve in the formulation and implementation of policy. This distinction could help ensure that both the capacity building and capacity utilization functions of MIMAP are realized at the desired level. Skills required for good research are not necessarily the same as those for policy assistance. For example, in all African countries the MIMAP project at least indirectly has involved the ACBF-funded policy support institutions. It might be possible to specialize the current MIMAP teams in
capacity building while these ACBF-funded institutions would use MIMAP research and researchers in the policy process.

Promoting multi-stakeholder policy dialogue

64 MIMAP’s direct contacts in the participating countries have been primarily with the research and academic communities and to some extent the government bureaucracies. Involvement with the private business sector and non-government organizations (NGOs) – i.e. of the action-oriented kind rather than research-oriented ones – appears to have been limited. This has primarily come in the form of occasional gatherings to disseminate research findings and policy recommendations. It is in this manner that MIMAP has addressed that particular objective. Given the wider scope for multi-stakeholder cooperation and partnership that has marked the 1990s and recent years, especially in the aftermath of the Rio and Johannesburg Summits on sustainable development, MIMAP has a potentially more meaningful role to play in promoting such partnerships.

65 An important aspect here is the need to recognize that civil society can be a potent channel for exercising policy influence, apart from any direct influence on policymakers themselves. In a world where civil society advocacies have increasingly determined actual policy outcomes at various levels of governance, MIMAP could consider the value of stronger and wider linkages especially with advocacy-oriented civil society organizations. To the extent that MIMAP can be instrumental in wider understanding of policy options by these groups, additional influence on public policies at various levels of governance (including at the international level) could be achieved. That is, NGOs should be seen by MIMAP as potential important allies and partners in the advocacy for sound research-grounded public policies, and could therefore be more directly addressed by MIMAP’s closing-the-loop and dissemination activities.

Focus on poverty impacts of trade and fiscal policies

66 Through the years, MIMAP policy research has focused on a closer understanding of poverty, including its gender and health dimensions, and on the examination of the impacts of macroeconomic adjustment policies, particularly trade and fiscal policies. Other important elements of macro adjustment policies like monetary and exchange rate policy, financial sector liberalization and privatization, etc., remain largely unexplored in MIMAP research. The explanation for this appears to lie in the choice of the analytical tools on which MIMAP has primarily based its macroeconomic policy research, principally the CGE modeling technique.

67 It is recognized that the choice of CGE modeling was made on the basis of what tools can rigorously make the link between macro policies and poverty and income distribution, and what are the important policies impacting the poor. That choice has
some important trade-offs, which have to be recognized. While trade and tax policies lend themselves readily to simulation and analysis in a CGE modeling framework, most CGE models shy away from an explicit simulation of the interaction between the real and financial markets, for reasons of theoretical complexity and data difficulties. Thus, direct examinations of monetary policies, exchange rate management, and financial sector reform have not been commonly undertaken with this analytical tool. Privatization issues have likewise not been significantly explored under a CGE framework, as these models are better able to distinguish between ownership of factors of production, as against ownership of firms.

68 Given MIMAP’s dependence on CGE models, it is to be expected that the above policy issues have remained largely unexplored within MIMAP. The other inherent limitation of CGE models as a methodological approach is that they tend to miss the institutional dimensions of development and poverty issues. For example, governance weaknesses, which current discussions on poverty and sustainable development have come to recognize as crucial, cannot be captured in a CGE analysis. Still another element missed with a CGE approach is the geographical dimension, as geographically disaggregated (i.e. at the sub-national level) CGE models are extremely difficult to build. For a large country like India, for example, a nationally aggregated model is of limited usefulness, and more operationally useful results would be obtained through a geographically disaggregated analysis. Much scholarly insight in poverty analysis is therefore missed because of this methodological constraint. It is for this reason that suggestions have been made for MIMAP to consider more active pursuit of partial equilibrium approaches to modeling macro-microeconomic interactions in addition to (but not necessarily in lieu of) CGE models. This could widen the scope of macroeconomic policies that MIMAP research addresses. It would also enrich the analytical insights to be gleaned from the research, as many of the welfare impacts of macroeconomic policies do not arise simply out of changes in relative prices in the economy, which is actually what a CGE approach boils down to.

69 All this is not to say that such partial equilibrium analytical tools are not being employed in MIMAP’s work. Partial equilibrium household models and macro econometric models are in fact used in the analysis of macroeconomic policies in some country projects (notably in the Philippines and in Viet Nam). Still, it is the CGE analyses that have received more prominent attention especially in the capacity building for analytical methods that have been provided to other MIMAP country project partners.

70 The above discussion begs the question of whether it should be MIMAP’s aim to be comprehensive and encompassing on the kinds of macroeconomic policies and measures it analyses, or whether it should be content with its currently dominant focus on trade and fiscal policies. The latter may be motivated by an assertion or hypothesis that the other elements of macroeconomic policy mentioned might have more limited
poverty implications – a matter that is actually debatable and precisely warrants empirical analysis. Alternatively, it may very reasonably be motivated by the argument that MIMAP cannot be all things to all people and should not aim at covering the whole spectrum of econometric research as it relates to poverty. That would indeed be an immense - and costly - intellectual undertaking which could transform MIMAP, and perhaps IDRC itself, into too much of an academic institution. MIMAP has already made a signal contribution by introducing CGE modeling to its host countries. Moreover, it can legitimately confine its attention to some more prominent or more specific elements of macroeconomic policy in the policy debates. Finally, trade liberalization and fiscal policies, on which MIMAP ‘focus studies’ have concentrated, appear to be the main elements of macroeconomic adjustment policy packages that have common features across most developing countries, while other elements like privatization and financial reforms may have more country-specific features that preclude insightful cross-country impact analysis.

**Deeper understanding of the phenomenon of poverty**

71 In reality, the greater part of the research which has distinguished MIMAP has not dealt directly with macroeconomic policies, but has sought to examine and explain the phenomenon of poverty more closely. Along with this is a closer examination and deeper understanding of sectoral issues and interventions that are thought to have the most critical influence on the poverty of households. This became more important as development thinking (and ODA funding) started increasingly to select poverty reduction as the key focus of development policy, as exemplified by the official adoption of the so-called Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) process as the major framework for country assistance by the development community. For the PRSP process to work and ensure that policy stimulates growth and leads to poverty reduction, a country needs a sound characterization of poverty as well as of the institutional features which can hinder or foster improvements in well-being. Once an adequate information base is in place, analysis can be done and inform policy. While the need for poverty measurement and assessment methodologies was felt everywhere, it was particularly acute in Africa. The three African countries visited had neither the data for adequate poverty assessment, nor the analysts capable of working on such data when it became available. Thus the formulation of PRSP in those countries was very problematical and it has been recognized by all concerned that MIMAP played a critical role in that respect.

72 Original proponents of the program have indicated that characterizing the “MI” of MIMAP even without relating it directly to the “MAP”, had in fact always been considered an equally important concern of the PI. In line with this, some members of
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47 A further discussion on how MIMAP should focus on defined niches will be found in a later section of this Report.
the team have opined that, at the end of the day, macroeconomic policies, while having important poverty impacts, are not necessarily the most crucial drivers of poverty. Thus, the PI needs not concern itself entirely or even mostly with analyzing the causal links between MI and MAP: it could do well enough by undertaking studies that only seek to characterize the “MI” more fully. MIMAP has made major contributions to knowledge and to poverty reduction policies in this particular area of inquiry, even without fully tracing the impacts of macroeconomic policies on poverty. This makes the lack of attention to other elements of macroeconomic adjustment policies as described in the previous section much less of a shortcoming, if at all. In cases where the skill level is still low, as in some African countries, it could even be said that moving beyond the “MI” would be problematical.

Influencing the Regional and Global Development Research Agenda

Another key channel for influencing national policies is the international development institutions that governments must deal with in various contexts. These include international development bodies (e.g. United Nations bodies and conferences like the Regional Commissions, UNESCO, ILO, UN Commission on Sustainable Development, WTO, etc.), and international financial institutions like the World Bank, the IMF and the regional development banks. They deeply influence national policies through policy-based program loan negotiations and conditionalities, through technical assistance provided to governments, and through the discussions and recommendations in the many policy conferences they sponsor. These institutions play an important role in shaping the development research agenda at the regional and global levels. Their research results often ultimately find their way into the conventional wisdom that is invoked in efforts at international policy harmonization, or in crafting policy commitments associated with program loans. These mechanisms can exert a strong influence on national policy directions of developing countries and on specific policy measures, often as strongly (if not more) as domestic advocacies supported by national-level development research.

It is therefore important for MIMAP to influence the development research agenda at the regional and even global levels, if its research results are to find ever wider use in guiding national policies. In particular, this can become a way for MIMAP’s policy influence to extend well beyond the countries it directly works in and with. This implies that MIMAP must be visible and make its mark in respected international research forums like the World Bank’s Annual Bank Conference on Development Economics (ABCDE), the Global Development Network (GDN), the OECD Forum, or even in influential though less technical gatherings like the World Economic Forum. Team members indicate that it has been a conscious decision so far for MIMAP to maintain limited presence, if any, in these forums, especially during MIMAP I. But by doing so, it has missed and may still be missing important opportunities to expand the beneficiary base of the wealth of research that MIMAP has
supported through the years. One mechanism for influencing the development research agenda is to collaborate more closely with regional institutions with converging interests. In Africa, the natural partners are the AERC and CODESRIA. At the level of researchers and resource persons such collaborations have been effective for several years; Laval University, for example, serves as lead twinning institution for AERC poverty projects in Benin and Burkina Faso. MIMAP could encourage those African researchers who have acquired the skills to apply in the more competitive AERC network. This will expose them to larger pools of resource persons and probably ease their graduation to senior professional poverty specialists.

**Evolution of Objectives and Emphasis**

Through the years, MIMAP’s professed objectives have remained relevant and attuned to the needs of the development community at various levels. At the same time, there has been a shift in emphasis between the goals of improving the quality of development research on one hand, and ensuring policy relevance and actual policy impact on the other. Understandably and properly, a major concern of MIMAP in earlier years was the building of research capability where it was weak or absent. The approach of strengthening selected national institutions by supporting the establishment of a corps of skilled researchers appeared then to be, and indeed was, a logical intervention. It appears also not to have been of paramount concern in those earlier stages whether the research results, which perhaps were not yet of the highest quality, actually found their way into the formulation of national policies. In the case of Africa, the initial research capacity was very much weaker than what prevailed in Asia at the beginning of MIMAP. To this day, save for the Senegal team, MIMAP researchers in Africa are concentrated at the lower panel of the academic hierarchy in their countries. Only a limited number of them have the required degree that would allow them to focus their efforts on achieving adequate career development, and senior colleagues by and large do not provide much meaningful supervision. The devolution of MIMAP in Africa should take these factors into account. Possible solutions include a regional network with an adequate mentoring scheme for those young researchers that need supervision, the provision for effective policy advisory committees, and the regular organization of “retreats” bringing together junior and senior poverty scholars in a given country.

The greater emphasis appears to have recently shifted towards policy relevance and actual policy impact, especially given the significant improvement in development research capability that has already been achieved in the MIMAP countries. The PEP and other networks, in particular, claim to place a higher degree of emphasis on policy relevance than was the case for earlier MIMAP projects, as policy relevance is an explicit criterion in the selection of recipients for PEP funding support.
This brings to the fore the issue of the importance which should be attached to pushing the frontiers of knowledge and of analytical methods. While the development of cutting edge methodologies is critical to the advancement of knowledge, which is a key goal of IDRC itself and thus of MIMAP, such an endeavour calls for the deployment of specific strategies and for considerable efforts in its own right. At the same time, however, advanced methodologies are not necessarily required for policy relevance and policy impact. Those normally call on more mundane bodies of knowledge easily understood by policy makers, but do require the sustained deployment of their own very specific strategies and resources. The inevitable and recognized trade-off or tension between the legitimate goals of policy relevance on the one hand and of enhancement of cutting-edge knowledge on the other is one that will continue to require thoughtful consideration by the MIMAP team, based on recognition of the fact that it has no easy or permanent solution. This has clear implications as well for MIMAP’s program of scholarly publications, as discussed below. Another dimension of the problem is the balance between continued capacity building of researchers to such a point that the individual has matured enough to engage in policy work and serve as policy advisor. Given the entry level of several African researchers it would require mentoring, over several projects, for the required level of maturation to be attained.

Networks

Another important direction is the programmed reliance on networks and the intention to devolve to developing country institutions the leadership role in administering the several MIMAP networks. The existing networks have on the whole been quite successful: they have played an extensive and positive role, in many ways irreplaceable, in the rapid development and deepening of MIMAP and in the dissemination of its approaches and conclusions. However, as will be discussed below, networks are now proposed to be assigned a much larger and more central role in the continued unfolding of MIMAP and in the delivery of its outputs. On devolution, the CBMS network is in fact already under the leadership of the Angelo King Institute at the De La Salle University in the Philippines. While PEP as a whole and the MPIA and PPMA networks are currently being run from Laval University, there is an expressed intention to eventually transfer the responsibility to a suitable developing country partner. Among other things, this move would help provide improved reach and coverage of MIMAP and ensure that all appropriate experts in the research community could be brought within the MIMAP circles. PEP has prepared a strategy document, shared with research partners, for the devolution of the management of the MPIA and PMMA networks to Southern institutions. The document provides the basis for concrete steps to be taken towards a timely transition.

48 More on this in the section of the Report entitled ‘MIMAP’s Reach’.
Nevertheless, a successful transition cannot be taken for granted, nor will it necessarily happen smoothly. A major and senior MIMAP effort will have to be mounted to identify new ‘receiving’ institutions, bolster and support their credibility and capacity, orchestrate the transfer of management responsibility from Laval University, and ensure continued access to the rich accumulated expertise lodged in both Laval and the University of Western Ontario. Absent such support, there is likelihood either that the transfer will in fact not take place, or that it will prove a partial or even total failure. In either case the effectiveness and survival of the various networks and of the PEP ones in particular could be compromised. Also, while cross-fertilization across developing countries scholars is essential, the devolution should take into account the required background knowledge of the broader environment. On that point, identifying an African or Asian institution with enough knowledge of the other regions could prove a challenge.

Indeed, the new MIMAP II thrust hinges to a very large extent on the continued development and effective functioning of networks. Such networks can offer valuable opportunities for a successful (and needed) reconfiguration of relationships between foreign experts as ‘givers’ of funds / knowledge, and aid recipient as ‘receivers’, driven by rapid advances in global communications, the emergence of Southern institutions with considerable resources to offer, and a consensus in the development world for the need for ‘partnership’ and ‘participation’. Not all networks are automatically successful and without problems, however. Angeles and Boothroyd, for instance, point out

\[\text{‘(…) That the degree of autonomy (of the LPRV network in Viet Nam) was not seen as positive by all active participants; some of them still have well-founded concerns about accountability, effectiveness, and follow-through problems inherent in the network approach’}\]

Vandergeest et al. report that

\[\text{‘Although the flexible network of international partners had many advantages (…) problems did occasionally emerge with international communications and coordination. In particular, there were moments when there was friction due to the international network participants not being able to respond quickly enough to changing perceptions of training priorities, changing National University of Laos timelines, and at one point delays caused by security concerns. It proved difficult at times for all the international participants to keep abreast of changes in project priorities and work plan, due to wide geographical dispersion, extensive commitments (work and non-work related) of international network partners, and logistical difficulties of getting partners to Laos. (…) All this points to the importance of clear mechanisms for ongoing monitoring of the}\]

---

49 See Vandergeest P. et al., Flexible Networking in Research Capacity Building at the National University of Laos: Lessons for North-South Collaboration, Canadian Journal of Development Studies, May 2003. Interestingly, that was an IDRC-supported project.

There is some important literature on that question, one key conclusion of which is that while electronic communications do help networks to function, face-to-face meetings remain essential for reinforcing the personal relationships and individual commitments that are essential to the effective functioning of networks. It is not proposed here to challenge, quite to the contrary, the centrality assigned to ‘networks’ (and to hopefully ‘devolved’ ones) in general, and to the more massive PEP networks in particular, in the ‘new’ MIMAP II, nor the timeliness of that approach. That centrality nonetheless raises questions as to the realism of relying on such a large scale and to such an extent on networks to reach the multifaceted goals of MIMAP, and as to the adequacy of the financial and human resources needed for their sustained flowering. This is likely to be even more so within the ‘devolution’ scenario necessary to the sought after reconfiguration of North-South relationships alluded to above, which is a clear, if somewhat implicit, long-term goal of IDRC, SEE, and MIMAP. As the devolved institutions start to really get hold of the networks and to gain in autonomy and self-reliance, the role of MIMAP project officers will have to undergo a delicate redefinition, impacting on the nature of their relationships with the managers and members of the devolved networks, and indeed on the relationships between MIMAP as a whole and its networks. All those ‘managerial’ (as opposed to ‘substantive’) concerns, including the sufficiency of MIMAP’s limited staff complement to the task of keeping those networks really going, need to be addressed through a continuing monitoring and feedback system reporting to senior MIMAP management.

Internal Evaluation Mechanisms

MIMAP has made ample provision for its own internal evaluation mechanisms, as provided in its Prospectus. A first level is regular internal monitoring and evaluation by the MIMAP team itself. Apart from this, an evaluation plan is in place with the primary aim of learning from experience and demonstrating results. As set out in the plan, evaluation exercises are focused on comparative policy impacts among MIMAP projects, integration of knowledge from modeling, monitoring, focus studies and thematic networks, national policy impacts in Africa, and partnership experience and lessons from the Growth and Poverty Reduction Facility.

Specific evaluation exercises have been undertaken in recent years, e.g. MIMAP policy impact assessments in the Philippines (Kirit Parikh) and Vietnam (André Saumier), and a program-wide evaluation (Vijay S. Vyas). Some comments were made

---

51 Vandergeest P. et al., ibid.
52 See for instance the study of five knowledge networks by J.G. Stein et al., Networks of Knowledge: Collaborative Innovations in International Learning, University of Toronto Press, 2001
earlier on the content and impact of the Vyas report. In addition to these, there are project-level internal monitoring and evaluation processes that have been undertaken in the various MIMAP country projects. All these reflect an earnest appreciation of the need for constant self-evaluation to ensure effective achievement of the PI’s goals.

Outcomes, Outputs and Reach: Making a Difference

MIMAP Outcomes

The previous section essentially discussed the outcomes resulting from MIMAP’s work as assessed in relation to the stated objectives of the PI. Based on the above discussions, MIMAP can rightfully claim success in making substantial progress in achieving desired positive outcomes with respect to:

- Improved internal capability in selected MIMAP-supported institutions in partner countries for development policy analysis and research;
- Enriched frameworks for analysis and assessment of macroeconomic policy alternatives facing developing countries;
- Wider and richer information base on the status of well-being of households;
- More informed and less politically-motivated policymaking and public investment programming in developing countries served by the PI;
- More objective (and less political) basis for budgetary allocations at the national and particularly at the local levels;
- Empowered local communities able to assert a stronger role in defining their development priorities and translating these into actual budgetary allocations.
- Increasingly strong networks of development researchers that link together experts from developing countries and Canadian institutions, thereby permitting active and mutually beneficial intellectual exchange and information-sharing; and
- Active involvement of MIMAP researchers in mainstream development policy and poverty alleviation initiatives in the concerned countries, e.g. PRSP processes, development plan formulation, budget allocation processes, etc.

While the reviewers believe that substantial attainment of the above can be rightfully claimed by MIMAP and represents a very impressive achievement indeed, the degree or extent to which these have been achieved cannot be quantitatively established because of the inherent lack of measurable indicators of their achievement, as noted at the outset. Still, the contributions of MIMAP towards the achievement of the above outcomes are palpable, with some outcomes more strongly manifest in certain countries while other outcomes are more clearly evident in others. Most of the above outcomes have been visibly attained through MIMAP in the Philippines, for example. In India, a large country with numerous excellent research institutions, the
most conspicuous contribution of MIMAP has been in the achievement of a wider and richer information base on the status of well-being of households, particularly through the nationwide household sample survey undertaken in the early 1990s. Vietnam, having started with weaker institutions, has clearly benefited from improved internal capability for development policy analysis and research as a result of MIMAP’s presence.

In Senegal, Benin and Burkina several more experienced researchers have served as resources persons in MIMAP workshops along Laval University or World Bank colleagues. MIMAP products have also been attractive to other institutions. Some researchers have been invited to serve as resource in workshops organized by other programs. Since some of these invited researchers are called upon to serve in areas where they had very little knowledge before joining MIMAP, we can comfortably put this to the credit of the PI. One downside is that the involvement of these African researchers as resource persons remains in good part within courses organized by outside partners, including Laval University or the IDRC. Future programs could have more built-in possibilities for wholly African-designed / implemented training courses at the national or sub-regional levels\textsuperscript{53}. There is a need to continue the process, already started, of identifying promising African researchers and giving them increasing responsibilities in a ‘training for trainers’ mode.

**MIMAP Outputs**

Through the years, MIMAP has yielded substantial contributions to knowledge in three main areas:

(i) the nature and extent of poverty;
(ii) approaches to analyzing poverty in its various dimensions; and
(iii) effects on poverty and human welfare of macroeconomic and adjustment reforms, particularly in trade and fiscal policies.

These contributions come tangibly in the form of a number of books and monographs; numerous research papers; journal, newspaper and magazine articles; newsletters and policy briefs; conferences and policy workshops and their published proceedings; Internet websites; and data sets stored in electronic media. These outputs are generally well done and attractively packaged. There is a perceived need, still not fully met, to have more articles out of MIMAP work published in prominent refereed international journals, as most of the journal outputs have been in local, national and regional publications. This is especially important for attracting stronger attention from the international development institutions and influencing their own policy prescriptions to developing countries.

\textsuperscript{53} MIMAP researchers have delivered some training courses, for instance in Mauretania and Morocco, as well as traning sessions on poverty organized by the West and Central African Central Banks.
All of these have helped bring wide attention to the work of MIMAP, and make their results available to the overall development community. In particular, policymakers are reached by these outputs, either through the various print materials produced and disseminated, or through direct communication in consultative forums and policy meetings, including meetings of Policy Advisory Committees that have been included in the design of most country projects. MIMAP’s work also appears to be well within the consciousness of the development research community especially in the MIMAP countries, largely because of the various research outputs particularly directed at this audience. The central MIMAP website and the seven available specific MIMAP websites (e.g. Philippines, Vietnam, MIMAP-Labour, MIMAP-Health, etc.) are informative and easily accessible through popular Internet search engines, and have reportedly attracted large numbers of users/visitors.

It must be underlined however, that the websites remain work in progress, despite their set deadlines: many gaps remain in the links to specific pages within the sites, often leading to blank pages and error messages. A web site without an effective internal search engine loses much of its usefulness and the various MIMAP websites have not yet fully resolved that particular problem. The objective of putting all the locally generated MIMAP papers and outputs on each related website is already ambitious. Whether it will prove feasible to link all those diverse sites together into an overall integrated and comprehensive MIMAP website, and then to maintain and update that site in sustained fashion, remains to be seen. For instance, electronic access to ‘African’ papers which have been available for more than a year could not be secured through the web site. There are also suggestions to produce more research outputs directed at the wider public audience, as in articles for the popular media like newspapers and magazines, and even radio and television. Outputs of this nature have remained limited so far: they call for the application of highly specialized skills which do not really exist within MIMAP at this time.

One important output that has been delayed in coming (but is said to be still in progress) is a compendium or synthesis of the learnings from the experiences of the different MIMAP country projects. MIMAP enjoys here a somewhat unique vantage point not dissimilar from that of multilateral development institutions like the World Bank or the United Nations Development Program, in having possession of research results and data from a wide cross section of countries on certain particular development issues (e.g. effects of trade liberalization and fiscal policy reforms; the nature of poverty). This gives it the capability to undertake cross-country analyses of the micro impacts of these policy reforms, which would be an extremely valuable addition to the literature and body of knowledge on those subjects. Many such books could probably be written providing cross-country analyses on different topics.

---

54The development and maintenance of web sites is a complex undertaking. The main IDRC website is itself not devoid of blank pages, dead links and error messages.
commonly addressed by the various MIMAP country projects. This potentially valuable output of MIMAP must be further pursued and given needed support.

91 At the same time, it must be recognized that those are major intellectual and organisational undertakings which require a considerable amount of highly skilled and dedicated time. They can hardly be carried out effectively and in timely fashion on a part-time basis and while running a complex program such as MIMAP. Those requirements have been recognized on paper but acting effectively upon them is a different matter, which explains why the output of ‘scholarly’ publications has been disappointing. The setbacks suffered by that program through the life of MIMAP illustrate again the tensions between what we might call ‘research’ and ‘action’ which characterize MIMAP (and perhaps much of IDRC), and which gives it a unique flavour. They also represent its particular challenge and it is not clear whether that challenge can be overcome except at costs which may not be really warranted.

92 ‘Adjustments’ have indeed had to be made to the publications program originally contemplated by MIMAP II. A few examples are instructive. It has been recognized for some time that Benin-MIMAP products could be put together in a collection of papers for national circulation: such a book would not be inferior to others available on the market by non-African scholars. While all those involved in Benin-MIMAP coordination agreed to this, it did not prove possible to overcome the financial constraints associated with such an endeavour. The Comparative Studies on Modeling has moved along but it took much longer then expected to make the models comparable. All countries involved had to make significant adjustments to insure the comparability of results; every model then had to be checked line by line by the Laval editorial team to insure that all were specified correctly and did not contain any errors. Prof Cockburn’s comment to the effect that the delays are due principally to the considerable workload associated with the start-up of the PEP Networks is particularly noteworthy. On Comparative Poverty Profiles, an important attempt was made to gather material for a book on ‘Basic MIMAP Poverty Profiles’ in the nine most active country projects. A first round of work was presented in 2001; it was then realized by the leaders of this project (the Angelo King Institute) that it would be very difficult to repeat the effort year after year, for a variety of reasons both practical and theoretical, including divergent views between the key scholars concerned. Thus the project’s future is uncertain. Starting in December 2002, the MIMAP Africa team (in collaboration with CIRPEE) has worked hard to have some of the best research output

55 More recent developments indicate that a locally published book could be feasible in the near future.
56 Here is an update from Prof. John Cockburn who is leading on this publication: ‘La revue de littérature est terminée à toute fin pratique. Le chapitre sur la paramétrisation est terminé aussi. Le chapitre synthèse sera présenté à Manille et doit être terminé la semaine prochaine. La préparation de celui-ci a demandé la révision en profondeur de tous les chapitres pour les rendre parfaitement comparables et pour vérifier en détail tous les aspects. Maintenant que ce travail est terminé, nous demanderons aux auteurs des chapitres-pays de faire la révision finale de leurs chapitres pour tenir compte des changements. Nous devrons pouvoir tout terminer d’ici janvier.’
from MIMAP-Africa published in a special edition of the peer-reviewed *Revue d’Économie du Développement*. That has proven a difficult and time-consuming exercise. A positive reaction was finally received to the effect that four papers were still in line for publication while two other had been sent for evaluation. Of the four papers, one was acceptable without changes, one with minor changes and two with significant changes. The prospects are now good that by April 2004 all papers will be ready for a special edition of the *Revue* on MIMAP-Africa papers. This is an impressive achievement but will have required two years of work.

93 Thus there remains a tension between the knowledge-generating / dissemination orientation of MIMAP and the requirement that the PI be actually and clearly relevant for policy and for policy makers. Those are not easily reconciled priorities and experience tends to show that this is an unequal conflict where the pursuit of knowledge will, and perhaps must, be sacrificed to the requirements of the ‘real’ world. There is no *a priori* reason to think that this should be different for MIMAP. The internal and external management of that tension, so as to render it creative and productive rather than destructive, will be an increasingly crucial task, especially in the context of decentralized networks, and will offer one of the key challenges for MIMAP III. There is indeed a visible need to put together and implement an integrated and practical publication / dissemination program as an integral part of overall programming for MIMAP III.

**MIMAP’s Reach: Internal and External Audience**

94 There are two aspects to assessing the reach of MIMAP. One is its reach within the direct client community addressed by the PI (internal clientele), namely the development research community. The other is with respect to the wider audience, i.e. the greater population which stands to benefit from the outcomes of MIMAP’s work (external clientele).

95 As for its internal clientele, MIMAP’s reach was by design more limited in its earlier years. Having proceeded on an approach that identified particular institutions as key partners and beneficiaries of MIMAP support, the reach of the program was effectively circumscribed within the partner countries to those researchers within the circle of the institutions concerned. This created the possibility that experts in the research community who should most logically be tapped in the areas of inquiry supported by MIMAP would not necessarily become involved in MIMAP work. This is most probably less a shortcoming of MIMAP itself, and more an inevitable limitation

---

57 The MIMAP team has prepared a draft communication-dissemination strategy.

58 In the Philippines, for example, the reviewers found that the economist currently considered to be the foremost expert in poverty research had never been tapped in MIMAP Philippines’ work in any significant way.
on the part of the national partner institutions, which tend to have their own in-house researchers or limited circle of research partners.\textsuperscript{59}

As mentioned earlier, this limitation is now being addressed by the purposeful reorientation of MIMAP support towards individuals (and to some extent small research teams) rather than institutions. This effectively widens the net of MIMAP support and helps avoid the ‘exclusivity’ that institution-based support may have promoted. On the other hand, there are some downsides to this approach. One is the possible loss of continuity and institutional memory. There is a risk that wider reach may come at the expense of loss of depth and / or magnitude of support per researcher, thereby rendering it less effective and less sustainable in its impact. The research support may also become more disparate and may fail to tap complementarities among individual researches and researchers or take advantage of economies of scope that are more likely to occur with institution-based support. In other words, the limited resources of MIMAP may end up being fragmented and spread more thinly than in the former situation where research institutions received substantial support. Because of all these, there is a concern that the quality of MIMAP research may be compromised. Certain respondents interviewed in India, for example, voiced this concern in lamenting what is perceived to be too small a level of support per individual researcher under the new PEP network set-up\textsuperscript{60}. Finally, the management and control of a set of potentially poorly connected networks and of a disparate group of researchers scattered over several countries will likely prove far more demanding and time consuming than the management of a few institutions, however frustrating that can be at times. Whether the proposed decentralization of network management will be a positive or a negative from that point of view, taking into account that the ‘managers’ of the networks will tend to be volunteers without much of a supporting infrastructure, remains to be seen and should be carefully monitored by the MIMAP team.

Another move that can be expected to improve MIMAP’s reach is the intention to devolve the leadership and coordination role in the MPIA and PMMA networks under PEP to developing country institutions, as is already the case with CBMS. Developing country-based institutions are likely to be more familiar with the academic research communities in the developing countries. This puts them in a better position to identify all appropriate research partners worthy of MIMAP support, and would make it less likely that key experts would be omitted from the reach of the research network.

\textsuperscript{59}In fairness, it is not unlikely that such experts are already amply supported by research funds from other institutions, and have therefore not been available for MIMAP work even if approached by MIMAP.

\textsuperscript{60}The counter to this is the argument by the PEP network coordinators at Laval University that it may not be valid to assume the former set-up to have necessarily led to stronger support per individual researcher. They point out that the resources provided to institutions in the past would often be spread thinly within the institution, with a significant part of the support being devoted to overhead and administrative costs. Thus, they argue, the net result could be that individual researchers are actually better supported under the new set-up than in the past.
As for its external clientele, MIMAP’s reach has steadily widened through the years, thanks to the increasing forms of its research outputs, as noted above. Its audience and beneficiaries have expanded beyond the academic research community and government policymakers to include civil society (NGOs), the private business sector, and the public at large. In India, regular contributions to the popular publication *Economic and Political Weekly* have brought MIMAP research to the attention of a wide public audience. In the Philippines, regular policy briefs addressed to a popular audience including government policymakers find wide circulation.

Still, as already suggested above, an even more focused reach towards the NGO community would be warranted, as an alternative channel for having MIMAP research exercise greater influence on policy reform and societal change. This is in recognition of the growing influence of civil society in policy formulation and social transformation. Likewise, it would pay to make a more determined effort to reach out more strongly to the mainstream international development research community, particularly in the research agenda driven by the international development institutions. Attainment by MIMAP of a greater presence and recognition therein would be another important step towards further strengthening MIMAP’s policy impact. The wealth of research findings and the sophistication in analytical techniques already attained through more than ten years of experience do position MIMAP to earn influence and stature in these professional circles. In turn, this would provide MIMAP even greater mileage in its policy impact, especially in countries beyond those in which it has a direct presence.

In Africa, several informants indicated that existing reports could have been better disseminated. The responsibility for making the research results known to the policy community is not clearly defined. There is a need for the PI to arrive at a more coherent publication and dissemination approach: this should become part of the overall programming with the required financial and human resources fully spelled out. Beyond this, it will be necessary to carefully consider whether the three institutions (CREA, CEDRES, MIMAP-Benin), which are made up of researchers several of whom are junior, are capable of handling the expected PRSP demand without sacrificing their search for excellence in poverty analysis.

**MIMAP’s Thematic Approach: Strengths, Weaknesses and Opportunities**

MIMAP’s work through the years in various countries may be grouped under three general themes, which have also defined the three closely-linked branches of the recently-established PEP Network, namely: Poverty Measurement, Monitoring and Analysis (PMMA), Modeling and Policy Impact Analysis (MPIA), and Community-Based Monitoring Surveys (CBMS). In addition, country projects often included a number of focus studies on issues of specific importance for poverty analysis.
Inasmuch as many countries were found to have common focus study issues, and as noted earlier in this Report, six thematic networks, ranging from health to gender and microfinance, have been launched to delve more deeply into these areas of common concern. Some of those networks also emerged as issues requiring in-depth analysis across countries or regions.

102 With poverty persisting as the central concern of developing countries in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world, the three central MIMAP themes are quite appropriate and complementary to one another. This is highlighted also by the recent prominence of PRSPs as an organizing framework for development efforts supported by the World Bank in African and Asian less-developed countries.

103 In particular, both PMMA and CBMS are able to address the now wide recognition that poverty is much more than just ‘income’ poverty, but is multidimensional in character, with economic, social, ecological, cultural, political and spiritual dimensions. CBMS has not only permitted the acquisition of a richer body of information and data on the welfare of the poor in developing countries. It has also led to the almost serendipitous result of offering a way to empower poor local communities in asserting their needs to their local and national governments and in influencing budgetary allocations. That was clearly manifested in the barangays (villages) in Palawan province in the Philippines where CBMS has been implemented. As such, CBMS has become much more than a research tool, turning into a direct instrument for empowerment and actual poverty reduction.

104 MPIA is where the direct linkage between macroeconomic adjustment policies and their micro impacts is addressed. Current discussions on the World Trade Organization, especially after the breakdown in the WTO Cancun Ministerial Meeting, highlight the continuing significance of this area of inquiry. In particular, this theme directly addresses the lament that globalization-induced trade liberalization policies have allegedly led to ever larger gaps between rich and poor within and among countries, and even to wider incidence of poverty and environmental problems. The relevance of MIMAP, and of MPIA in particular, as a research theme thus continues to be strong.

105 The same can be said of the six thematic networks, especially the four that directly address sectoral micro impacts of macroeconomic policy (Health, Environment, Labour, and Microfinance.) The challenge to MIMAP, here, is to be responsive also to newer questions that have emerged in current discussions about the adverse micro impacts of globalization policies. This is especially so in light of WTO and the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, and in the aftermath of financial crises in different parts of the world (e.g. Asia and Latin America). Such newer questions include the following:
• What is the exact nature of the damage caused to developing country farmers by the massive agricultural support subsidies of rich countries (especially the European Union and the USA)?
• How would specific countries benefit from various degrees of reduction / outright removal of such rich country agricultural supports? Which specific countries (especially among the MIMAP countries) would stand to benefit most and in what manner?
• Which particular agricultural supports (i.e. to which crops or commodities) in which rich countries matters the most for the welfare of developing countries? On which particular supports in which countries must developing countries focus their negotiating positions?
• How have financial liberalization policies impacted on the most vulnerable groups in society and on the environment?
• How have banking sector difficulties (e.g. the high levels of non-performing loans) translated into effects on the poor and on the environment?
• What might be the micro implications of implementing the ‘Clean Development Mechanism’ under the Kyoto Protocol within particular developing countries?

106 This is admittedly a partial listing, but serves to illustrate that MIMAP could legitimately go farther afield in its analytical explorations if it is to be responsive to the emerging needs of the developing world. It might also be useful to look at the possibility of linking together the various CGE models developed for specific countries into an international CGE model that would also cover developed country economies in order to explore the questions pertaining to rich country agricultural supports. While the GTAP model of Purdue University apparently tries to accomplish the same, MIMAP has the advantage of having a number of national CGE models directly at its disposal that would lend themselves to such an international modeling exercise. It is also likely that the capability to run such a program already exists within Canadian institutions, even between Laval and Western Ontario Universities alone. The MPIA network could move in this direction and explore relationship with the Trade, Employment and Competitiveness Program Initiative in pursuing this area of study. Such an exercise would help MIMAP being recognized as a technical resource that directly supports the WTO, post-Johannesburg Summit and the Millennium Development Goals substantive agenda.

107 The gender networks equally deserve to achieve wider and deeper coverage. In spite of some two decades of focus on the topic from the development community, there remains much to do if one is to fully understand the gender dimensions of poverty and welfare, especially as they are influenced by the macroeconomic policy environment. The work of the Institute of Social Studies Trust, MIMAP’s institutional focal point for the Gender Network in South Asia, has come a long way in exploring the gender dimensions of key development challenges in the region. Nonetheless, ISST researchers themselves deplore the continuing difficulty of achieving mainstream status

61 Starting perhaps with Canada – why not?
in the development research and policy arena, for reasons of both data and methodologies. The question has arisen whether the gender dimensions would be better off integrated into the other thematic networks in the spirit of true mainstreaming, or should remain (at least for now) a separate thematic network. Indications point to the latter, inasmuch as a prerequisite to achieving effective mainstreaming would be a much wider and stronger awareness and appreciation of its significance than exists at present in most developing countries. Such increased awareness and appreciation can be better achieved through a distinct network that would nonetheless work towards integration into the work of the other thematic networks. The Gender Budgets network likewise deserves distinct support, as it is through its work that concrete changes in policy making and public investment programming can be effected to serve the objective of mainstreaming gender concerns in effective governance and development work in particular countries. It has to be underlined here that the incorporation of advanced gender methodologies in the work of all thematic networks is a stated goal of MIMAP II, which must be applauded and monitored.

108 As already alluded to, one of the continuing constraints faced by the gender networks is the lack of data, including gender-disaggregated data on various economic and social welfare indicators. This calls for close coordination between the gender network and CBMS / PMMA in particular. Similarly, the lack of analytical methods to satisfactorily address gender-disaggregated analysis continues to constrain the work of the gender network. Thus, constant coordination with the MPIA PEP network is essential.

109 Finally, there is the question of the niche that MIMAP should aim for. Clearly, MIMAP needs not and should not seek to be everywhere and into everything that can be explored in the study of poverty and how that is affected by overall economic policy. Based on the above discussions, there are various dimensions to the scope that MIMAP could aim for in order to achieve an appropriate balance:

- Geographic, i.e. regions of the world it will be present in.
- Levels of analysis, i.e. local, national, regional, global (e.g. build an international CGE model for WTO impact analysis.)
- Kinds of macroeconomic policies and shocks to address (e.g. limit itself to trade and fiscal policies, and to specific kinds of shocks in selected areas.)
- Modeling approaches (e.g. continue focus on CGE and its enhancement relative to partial equilibrium approaches, development dynamics relative to comparative static analysis.)
- Welfare dimensions (e.g. more focus on gender, health, education, environmental, cultural dimensions of poverty and welfare, and on related public management and social services delivery.)
- Development of more optimal policies relative to governance and social policy implementation.
110 In that context, MIMAP has to be careful not to raise expectations too high and then prove unable to deliver, particularly in Africa where needs and challenges are immense. This leads to considering the selection of niches in the two main areas of capacity building for poverty reduction and of involvement in poverty reduction strategies. In the case of Africa, the areas of interest could include the following:

- Ensuring a sustained increase in the number and quality of researchers capable of working in the various fields which emerge as the PRSP process matures.
- Developing new and improved methodologies and practices.
- Ensuring an increasingly sophisticated use of research results in the policy process without neglecting the first area of interest above.

111 Related to this is the question of whether MIMAP should play the role of a ‘gap filler’ or supplementary source of funds: should it support important activities that should normally be funded by national budgets but aren’t for one reason or another, or should it merely play a budget advocacy role? For example, the question has arisen whether MIMAP should directly support a second round of the Indian national household sample survey that it funded earlier, as is being requested by NCAER, or should it simply help others convince the Indian Government of the need to provide the resources for such surveys? The same question probably arises in a number of contexts in other MIMAP countries with national projects, nor is it peculiar to MIMAP or to IDRC. In a way, the question has already been answered by MIMAP in the negative, given the decision for a relative phasing out of country projects in favour of a network approach. Nonetheless, the question may well arise in the context of specific activities that may be defined under the thematic networks. Related to this is the need for MIMAP to secure funding over sufficiently long periods and the corresponding strategy of securing co-funding from non-IDRC sources. By and large, not much seems to be actually planned on that front by most country teams, nor is much outside support being generated. This is not surprising. Fund raising is a highly specialized undertaking in a strongly competitive field: it is certainly not a given, in fact quite to the contrary, that country team researchers and MIMAP officers are the best placed to carry out such activities or should devote much time and energy to them.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

112 In closing, we can quote the last paragraph of the Review of MIMAP tabled by Mr Vijay S. Vyas in October 2000, which still applies three years later:

> ‘MIMAP has acquired a high reputation as a serious program of research benefiting the developing countries, and the more vulnerable groups in these countries. This has been possible by the wise handling of the Program from IDRC end, dedication of the team leaders and the staff,'
It is not within the scope of this Report to offer recommendations on the issues raised in this review, nor on the MIMAP PI in general. However, some impressions and comments may be warranted.

113 First, a major thrust of MIMAP II was, and is, the extension of the PI to Africa, which has been successfully achieved. One does not need to dwell here on the fact that Africa is vastly different from Asia, and particularly from South East and South Asia where MIMAP I was created and from which much of its experience was derived. Given that context, some specific comments on the African ‘strategy’ of MIMAP may be appropriate.

1. Particular attention will have to be given to the African MIMAP national projects, including a continuing assessment of the relevance to Africa of the lessons learned from MIMAP I, as Africa represented at the time a minor component of the PI. The lower skill base in Africa requires a longer maturation period with significantly higher human resources requirements.

2. Institutional problems in MIMAP Africa go beyond those of host institutions to encompass the overall incentive structure, including staff compensation. This will be more so if the twin objectives of capacity building and utilisation of that capacity in the policy arena are given equal importance.

3. The success of MIMAP projects in Africa cannot be dissociated from the mentoring that was provided, including peer review by researchers in their home country and IDRC’s hands-on approach. Those were made available through regular meeting where more advanced colleagues assisted younger ones. As the MIMAP portfolio grows in scope and complexity, the research population must expand as well: there will be a need to build a mentoring content into the program, viz. a responsibility of senior researchers for the capacity building of younger colleagues, regular national workshops / retreats allowing such mentoring to take place, etc.

4. As the demand on MIMAP project teams expands, and given a still very limited supply of researchers with the requisite background, the PI may need sharply to focus its priorities with respect to capacity building and capacity utilisation. In particular, the skill level of MIMAP researchers in individual countries means that choices will have to be made on the level of expectation that can credibly be met. This could entail encouraging local institutions / teams to develop on their

---

own and raise funds for aspects of the program that are in high demand in their countries.

5. A structured MIMAP - AERC capacity building interface would be desirable and similarly one with ACBF-funded policy research institutions for the capacity utilisation component of the program. Those exist already in an ad-hoc manner in several countries: making them more formal at the level of the PI itself could help ensure greater synergies.

Second, on a broader level:

1. The general objectives and approaches of the MIMAP PI (including MIMAP I and MIMAP II) are fully consonant with, and supportive of, the broader objectives and approaches of IDRC and of its SEE program area.

2. MIMAP I was an innovative, bold and ambitious program which successfully addressed still mostly untouched but important new issues in socio-economic development.

3. MIMAP I has been an effective program, despite the modest size of the IDRC human resources involved.

4. There is a strong substantive continuity between the general objectives of MIMAP I and those of MIMAP II, despite legitimate differences in emphasis and in details.

5. The ‘lessons learned’ from MIMAP I, and in particular the two ‘overall conclusions’, have been reflected in the structure and approaches of MIMAP II, which consequently differ in several respects from those of MIMAP I.

6. These differences, and in particular the significantly increased reliance on networks for the pursuit of the objectives of MIMAP II, represent new and major challenges for MIMAP II and for the MIMAP PI in general.

7. MIMAP II has to reconcile (much more than MIMAP I had to) a scholarly knowledge orientation with the heavy managerial demands of the various networks, including the PEP ones, and there will remain a built-in tension between those two equally important requirements. The constructive internal and external management of that tension will be a crucial task, calling for continuing senior level attention.
8. MIMAP II has not surprisingly experienced problems in moving from a ‘hard’ / ‘proactive’ country- and institution-based approach (MIMAP I) to a ‘softer’ / ‘responsive’ individual- and network-based one.

9. The network-based approach is intrinsically difficult to put in place, activate and sustain. Not surprisingly its introduction has proven more laborious than anticipated. The network approach also lends itself less easily to controlled or directed results which can then be measured.

10. The goals of PEP are congruent with those of MIMAP and, if the PEP and other networks are successful, will effectively and efficiently move MIMAP II in the direction the PI is now aiming for.

11. There will be a further complex and continuing challenge in orchestrating the devolution of the various MIMAP-supported networks, and in particular of the crucial PEP networks, and of adjusting to the consequences of successful devolutions.

12. A senior MIMAP effort will have to be mounted to identify new ‘receiving’ institutions for the devolved networks (including crucially the PEP ones), bolster and support their credibility and capacity, and orchestrate the orderly transfer of management / scientific responsibility to them, while ensuring that the networks remain fully functional. None of these will happen spontaneously, yet much of the success of MIMAP II will turn on that.

13. As the MIMAP portfolio expands, especially in the policy arena, the pressure on the PEP steering committee will increase and its organizational effectiveness will become increasingly crucial.

14. The proposed compendium or synthesis of the learnings from the experiences out of the different MIMAP country projects appear a particularly worthwhile if challenging undertaking.
The International Development Research Centre / Centre de recherches pour le développement international (IDRC) was created in 1970 by an Act of the Canadian Parliament as an autonomous agency. Its mandate, as specified in the Act, is

“To initiate, encourage, support, and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions…”

In fulfilling this mandate, the Centre has concentrated on supporting Third World researchers to conduct research in their own institutions and has aimed at assisting the developing regions "to build up the research capabilities, the innovative skills and the institutions required to solve their problems."

In its first two decades, IDRC's programs were defined in sectoral terms and its funds were allocated to program divisions, for example to an ‘agricultural sciences program division’ in support of agricultural research projects. In 1993 a new Corporate Program Framework (1993-1997) was approved, based on the since widely accepted assumption that sustainable improvements in human well-being depended on knowledge, its production, distribution, ownership, and wise application. Research done in and by a country was seen as vitally important to the production of knowledge usable for development. This in turn requires a domestic scientific capacity, without which a country cannot even import knowledge effectively: an indigenous capacity, therefore, is a prerequisite for development.

In 1995, the Centre underwent a major restructuring, involving the abolition of the program divisions and the allocation of resources to specific ‘program initiatives’ to be implemented by multidisciplinary teams. Self-directed teams working on such program initiatives became the main units of program delivery.

The Corporate Program Framework (1997-2000) identified three strategic dimensions as key characteristics of sustainable and equitable development: (i) more human development, (ii) better economic management (including allocation systems that enable individuals and communities to control their well-being), and (iii) sustainable use of the environment. The framework also anticipated devolution of IDRC program management to ‘South’ institutions and new arrangements with Canadian partners. The proposed creation of research networks as virtual research institutions were to involve the Canadian research community to a much greater degree and at a lower cost than previously, as well as encourage higher levels and quality of scientific exchange with developing country scientists. The current Corporate Strategy and Program Framework (2000-2005) spells out IDRC’s corporate mission as follows:
“IDRC strives to optimize the creation, adaptation and ownership of the knowledge that the people of developing countries judge to be of the greatest relevance to their own prosperity, security and equity.”

Three goals are identified for the period:

(i) to strengthen and help mobilize the indigenous research capacity of developing countries, especially directed to achieving greater social and economic equity, better management of the environment and natural resources, and more equitable access to information;

(ii) to foster and support the production, dissemination, and application of research results leading to policies and technologies that enhance the lives of people in developing countries; and

(iii) to explore new opportunities and build selectively on past investments within its new program framework.

The first goal has led to the setting up of three corresponding program areas under which IDRC’s activities are currently structured. Staff teams comprising different specialists are now organized in formal Program Initiatives (PIs) which are the driving force of IDRC’s programming and act as networks that link researchers in order to address specific problems and to set research agendas. In addition to PIs, IDRC funding supports International Secretariats and Corporate Projects. The former are research consortia made up of several donors where IDRC provides the financial/administrative infrastructure needed for autonomous long-term research agenda. Corporate Projects are a quasi-residual category for those activities which fall outside PIs and Secretariats. In 2000, IDRC was supporting 11 Program Initiatives, 9 Secretariats, and 8 Corporate projects.

The content of each Program Initiative is directed by its Prospectus, prepared by the PI team and approved by the IDRC Board, usually for a period of four years. It covers the links between the development context and the proposed research, the rationale and objectives of research in this area and for IDRC involvement, the work plan in terms of project development and networking including the regional focus and the strategy to be followed in each region. It also identifies important partnerships and the means for effective communication and dissemination of results. PIs are not static endeavours and new components are always under development: those are entered into the PI’s ‘pipeline’ and each PI reviews its portfolio of projects annually. PI teams maintain contact through email and telephone, and get together physically only once a year. Teams are usually composed of members in Ottawa and in one or more IDRC regional offices; the majority of team members work on two PIs with one serving as the member’s ‘home’ PI.

Please see below for a listing of those three areas.
As mentioned above, IDRC’s programming currently focuses on three areas of enquiry or ‘program areas’: Social & Economic Equity (SEE), Environment & Natural Resource Management (ENRM), and Information & Communication Technologies for Development (IC4D). MIMAP, the object of the present report, is the acronym for ‘Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies’ and falls within the Social & Economic Equity program area. The broad goal of SEE is the strengthening of the information and analytical base through which developing countries achieve their economic and social development objectives. In Asia, SEE emphasizes research on economic and trade adjustment policies, on health systems and the provision of essential micronutrients, particularly in South Asia. In Southern Africa, peace building and reconstruction are priorities, to be complemented by research on governance in sub-Saharan Africa. Since sustainable and equitable development can only be achieved with the full participation of women and men, IDRC and SEE have been working to ensure that the research it funds incorporates these principles. MIMAP is thus one among many components of the SEE program area, which is itself part of a much larger range of IDRC activities.
Environment  (started in 1996, coordinated by the Angelo King Institute, de la Salle University)

Intended originally as a multi-country network, this has become a network of activities and specialists in the Philippines, interacting with the rest of the MIMAP Network. The network has sought to examine and quantify the environmental effects of changes in macroeconomic policies in the Philippines. It has organized two major workshops and has had cooperative endeavours with Naga City, with the Council for Sustainable Development of the Province of Palawan and with the Planning and Development Office of the same Province. It has initiated the use of a Geographic Information System for its database, which has since been adopted by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) and is used in central and regional Government briefings. The project appears basically completed.

Gender  (started in 1998, coordinated by the Institute for Social Science Research Trust)

Designed to initiate coordinated research activity in South Asia on the gender differentiated impact of macroeconomic policy reforms. National level data on various gender indicators have been collated and analysed in five countries of South Asia; household surveys were carried out in four of them in the households of women workers in ‘Export Processing Zones’ and ‘Export Oriented Units’. There were investigations of violence against women, of regional psycho-social and cultural aspects of gender-based stress and violence, and of a CGE model using gender-disaggregated data; a case study took place in Kerala on links between high measured Gender Development Index\(^a\) and the ‘status of women’; existing gender models were reviewed. Phase II was designed to concentrate on integrating conventional and non-conventional gender indicators into national poverty monitoring system; on the CGE; on household and intra-household modelling work; and on refining and applying the Gender Development Index. Household surveys have been conducted in other kinds of households which have been directly impacted, positively and negatively, by structural adjustment programs. A pilot study was conducted under MIMAP proper and combining poverty monitoring and gender monitoring, both for national poverty monitoring (Pakistan and Nepal) and for community-based monitoring (Viet Nam and Philippines), as well as further work on the analysis of ‘conventional’ indicators of gender bias (Kerala & Sri Lanka). A CGE model incorporating the domestic and leisure sectors is being developed to analyse the impact of trade liberalisation on women’s employment opportunities (Bangladesh). An intra-household analysis has cast light on the gender differentiated impact of economic policy changes in India. Phase III, with a 2-year time frame, has just started and will concentrate on: gender modeling, gender

\(^{64}\) Based on the same three variables as the Human Development Index (life expectancy, educational attainment, income) with each variable adjusted for gender discrepancies and combined using equal weights.
impact of the growth of information and communication technologies in the countries of the region, linkages between economic growth, income inequality and gender, the qualitative dimensions of differences among men and women in the experiences of, and reactions to, poverty, and the policy implications of the findings of the three phases of the Network. The Network is also reaching out to assist the newer MIMAP countries in West Africa.

Health  (started in 1998, coordinated by University of Montreal)

The purpose is to gather data to look at relationships between macroeconomic and adjustment policies, health sector reform, and accessibility, utilisation & quality of health care in the South. Four teams have held national forums (Burkina Faso, Colombia, India-Orissa, Zimbabwe65.) Considerable effort was invested in formulating a framework to conceptualise the direct and indirect influences of adjustment and sector reform on the supply of, and demand for, health care, and ultimately on the quality, utilisation and accessibility of health services. The framework has two distinguishing features in that it considers two mechanisms of impact (supply side and demand side) and three levels of impact (macro: effects on the health care sector and on the economic environment of communities; meso: effects of macro-level changes on the supply of health services and on households influencing the demand on health care; micro: effects of the above on the utilisation of health care by individuals who believe they need care). The project is a ‘multiple-case / multiple-level’ study, with each of the participating countries66 representing a case. Observations are conducted at the national, regional and local levels. All countries share a similar methodology; the design is cross-sectional and retrospective (last 15 years) combining quantitative analysis of primary and secondary sources of data with qualitative analysis at different levels. The main methodological tool is a four modules set of household questionnaires which gathers information of the household unit, individual household members (women & children in particular) and their access, and quality of health care services. The analysis has five steps: main features of the Structural Adjustment Program in the country; main structural features of the health care system; main community features; outcomes of accessibility, utilisation, quality of services in the health care system; and analysis of the relationships between macroeconomic adjustment programs, community conditions, health care system structure, and the response variables. Particular focus is placed on understanding the impact that adjustment programs and health system reforms have had on the intra-household allocations of resources, women’s work burden, and barriers women face in accessing health services. Country studies and an integrative analysis were scheduled to be completed in 2001. A book was also to be published in 2001 but did not materialize because of financial and time constraints; it is now back on track and scheduled to be co-published with IDRC Books by the end of 2004. Subsequent work focuses on (i) means to improve access of poor households and

65 Thailand and Mexico also had teams.
66 Mexico, Thailand, India, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Uganda, Burkina Faso.
individuals to health care; (ii) means to optimize sectoral health spending (public and private) in different regions on health care, preventive measures, clean water supply, and education, to achieve best health outcomes; (iii) integrating important findings into national monitoring, modelling and policy development mechanisms.

Labour  (started in 1999, coordinated by the Cambodia Development Resources Institute)

It describes the main features and macroeconomic role of labour markets in Cambodia, Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and examines the links between labour markets and growth & poverty and in channelling the impacts of the Asian crisis. Three phases have been completed as well as a book. The first phase looked into the impact of the Asian crisis on the Southeast Asia transitional economies, the second focused on labour markets in SEATE and Thailand, and the third looked at job creation in non-farm and off-farm activities. A gender component has been added in order to integrate gender into the main report of each country as well as the synthesis paper. The project was undertaken through cooperation between the seven research institutions comprising the Development Analysis Network in the four countries and builds on a previous IDRC project with the same institutions which addressed the impact of the Asian crisis on the economy as a whole. Given the importance of labour markets at both macro and local levels, it is hoped that the project will ultimately contribute to better macro management and improved community living standards. A leadership change is taking place in the institution which hosts the network (CDRI); that has slowed down considerably the process of determining future directions for the network, and proposals for further work have not yet been received.

Microfinance  (started in 2000, coordinated by Laval University, Centre de recherches en economie et finance appliquees - CREFA)

Microfinance has emerged as a key poverty reduction issue in MIMAP country projects as well as in broader development thinking and action. In the absence of ‘formal’ financial services, substitute and informal mechanisms, described as Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries [COFI], tend to be put in place by communities themselves in the three standard groups of financial products (insurance, savings, credit): Two major options are available for COFIs: (i) provide financing directly to poor persons and thus improve their income - the strategy used by many NGOs; (ii) provide financing to businesses and entrepreneurs which in turn will generate the employment that will provide income to the poor. Risks and operational rules are different for each option and those for option (i) are currently much better understood. The Microfinance Network looks at the second option and has a research program focusing on three key ideas: (i) a strategy of poverty alleviation can be based on the promotion of SMEs, specifically rural farm and non farm SMEs; (ii) a strategy to that end is the provision of financing using market based solutions that are not dependent on public or private subsidies; and (iii) in order for this to be possible, it is
necessary to create legal, regulatory, and supervisory frameworks that will support sustainable growth in such types of financial intermediaries.

Phase I, now in the process of ending and a preliminary final report has been received. That phase was comprised of five major components and nineteen research topics. It developed a Network on the Regulation and Supervision of COFIs to examine linkages between COFIs, the regulatory and supervisory environment within which they operate, and poverty outcomes. That called on case study teams in six countries67. The Network organized a workshop in Dakar in December 2001 and one was planned for Benin in March 2003. The network also played an advisory role in national and international discussions regarding COFIs in Mexico and Canada. The results of the case studies will be published in a special issue of the Canadian Journal of Development Studies scheduled for early 2004. A pre-proposal for a Phase II has been received and commented upon. A thorough external evaluation of the project’s first phase and scoping investigation is underway so that the project responds to real needs and distinguish itself from what others are already doing. The next phase will take into account the lessons of the first phase and the conclusions of the external evaluation.

**Gender Budgets** (started in mid-2000)68

This Network is mostly funded by UNIFEM (with Belgium funds) and the Commonwealth Secretariat. MIMAP and country teams participate but do not manage the Network. MIMAP emphasis is on: (i) applying MIMAP modelling and monitoring methodologies to the assessment of public spending in different key sectors notably education, health and social protection; (ii) developing methodologies to assess impacts by gender of revenue raising mechanisms (taxes, user charges, borrowings, etc.); (iii) integrating gender work with the broader work of engendering macro policy; and (iv) website development for widespread dissemination and knowledge sharing. MIMAP would like to expand its work (but not necessarily within this specific network) on improved provision of public services, particularly in areas of education and social security/protection. This will require expansion of financial and human resources through partnerships and co-funding. UNIFEM has mobilized additional funds from the European Union and several bilateral donors for country initiatives. The Gender Budget ‘partnership’ is informal, without a MOU signed between the various institutions. MIMAP partners on projects as opportunities come up and as its members have an interest or relevant expertise. For instance, MIMAP is working with UNIFEM on a project where MIMAP expertise in CBMS will be used to develop a tool to monitor gender budgets at the local level.

67 Benin, Canada, Colombia, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines.
68 Part of MIMAP II.
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Dr Cielito F. HABITO

Quebec City, Canada

Dr. John Cockburn, PEP Coordinator; Professor, Department of Economics, Université Laval
Dr. Bernard Decaluwe, Professor, Department of Economics, Université Laval
Dr. Jean-Yves Duclos, Professor of Economics, Université Laval
Dr. Louis-Marie Asselin, Director, Quebec Office, Canadian Centre for International Studies and Cooperation (CECI)

Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines

Hon. Joel Reyes, Governor, Province of Palawan
Hon. David Ponce de Leon, Vice-Governor, Province of Palawan
Hon. Edward S. Hagedorn, Mayor, City of Puerto Princesa
Ms. Rebecca V. Labit, City Councillor, City of Puerto Princesa
Ms. Noela C. Lasmarias, Economist, Conservation International Philippines (NGO Partner)
Mr. Nelson Devanadera, Provincial Planning and Development Officer, Province of Palawan
Staff of the Provincial Planning and Development Office, Province of Palawan
Ms. Fe Barcellano, Kagawad (Village Council Member), Barangay Salvacion, Puerto Princesa City (Chair of CBMS Validation Meeting)
Ms. Marissa Robles, Barangay Nutrition Scholar (Presentor of CBMS results), Barangay Salvacion, Puerto Princesa City
Mr. Angel Padon, City Planning and Development Coordinator, Puerto Princesa City
Ms. Ofelia Aguilar, Research Staff, City Planning & Development Office, Puerto Princesa City
Ms. Merly Taguba, Barangay Nutrition Scholar, Secretary of Tribal Association, Barangay Salvacion, Puerto Princesa City
Mr. Diosdado A. Dagot, 1st Kagawad
Mr. Rolly Namuco Sr, Kagawad
Mr. Renato Yala, Kagawad
Mr. Carlos Elor, Kagawad
Ms. Clarita Cortez, Kagawad
Mr. Anselmo Cajelo Sr., Kagawad
Head Nurse, Barangay Health Office, Barangay Salvacion, Puerto Princesa City
Community Representatives: teacher representatives, Barangay health workers, day care workers, and selected community residents.

New Delhi

Dr. Swapna Mukhopadhyay, President, Institute of Social Science Research Trust (ISST)
Staff of ISST
Dr. A. C. Kulshresta, Additional Director-General, Central Statistical Organisation
Prof. Atul Sarma, Professor, Planning Unit, Indian Statistical Institute
Prof. Amitabh Kundu, Professor, Centre for the Study of Regional Development, Jawaharlal Nehru University
Dr. Surjit Bhalla, President, Oxus Research
Dr. M. Govinda Rao, Director, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy
Dr. Subir Gokarn, Chief Economist, Crisil Centre for Economic Research
Dr. Rohini Nayyar, Member, Planning Commission
Dr. S. P. Gupta, Member, Planning Commission
Dr. Pronab Sen, Adviser, Planning Commission
Dr. P. K. Chaubey, Professor and Chairman, Centre for Economic Analysis and Financial Management, Indian Institute of Public Administration
Dr. Basanta Kumar Pradhan, Chief Economist and Head, MIMAP-India, National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER)
Dr. Devendra Kumar Pant, Economist, NCAER
Dr. P. K. Roy, Senior Statistician, NCAER
Prof. M. R. Saluja, Senior Consultant, NCAER
Staff Members of NCAER
Mr. Roger Finan, Regional Director, International Development Research Centre
Mr. Chandra Thiruchittampalam, Development Counsellor, Canadian High Commission

Bangkok

Mr. Ashok Khosla, President, Development Alternatives (New Delhi, India)

Manila

Ms. Ofelia M. Templo, Former Assistant Director-General, National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)
Ms. Socorro Zingapan, Director, National Policy and Planning Staff, NEDA
Ms. Erlinda Capones, Director, Social Development Staff, NEDA
Dr. Fernando Aldaba, Professor of Economics and Former Director, Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs, Ateneo de Manila University
Dr. Ponciano S. Intal Jr., Director, Angelo King Institute of Economic and Business Studies, De La Salle University
Prof. Solita Collas-Monsod, Professor of Economics, University of the Philippines School of Economics and President, Human Development Network

Dr. Dominique Njinkeu

Anselme Adégbidi, MIMAP coordination team leader and researcher
Epiphane Adjovi, MIMAP coordination deputy team leader and researcher
Cosme Vodounou, MIMAP coordination team member and researcher
Esaïe Gandonou, MIMAP coordination team member and researcher
Evelyne Gnanhoué, MIMAP secretary
Sylvain Degbe, Embassy of Denmark, formerly associated with MIMAP

Benin
Joseph Prince Agbodjan, CAPE
Mohamed Koukoui, CAPE
Michel Ahohounkpanzon, UNDP country economist, Benin
Mrs Claude LeRoy, Country economist, World Bank (CGE modeling)
Pierre Lessard, Director, CIDA Canadian Cooperation bureau
Moussiliou Djima, MIMAP researcher
Marie Odile Attanasso, MIMAP researcher
Roland Medjigbodo, MIMAP researcher
Damien Mededji, MIMAP junior researcher
Amoussouga Gero, Dean faculty of Economics (Abomey-Calavi)
Maurice Bankole, Director CAPE
Joseph Prince Agbodjan, CAPE
Mohamed Koukoui, CAPE
Jean-Yves Sinzogan, Ministry of Finance

Burkina Faso
Claude Wetta, MIMAP country team leader
Samuel Tambi Kabore, MIMAP researcher
Gnanderman Sirpe, MIMAP researcher
Kassoum Zerbo, MIMAP researcher
Souleymane Sikiron, MIMAP researcher
Lassina Konate, MIMAP researcher
Prosper Somda, MIMAP researcher

Senegal
Abdoulaye Diagne, Senegal MIMAP team leader
Gaye Daffe, MIMAP coordination team, researcher
Abdourahmane Ndiaye
Mamadou Dansokho
Fatou Cisse
Mouhamadou Sall
Momar Sylla
Racine Kane
Aliou Faye
Francois Cabral
Mbaye Diene
Mayacine Camara
Mouhadou Thiam
Director of Statistics of Senegal
Director, Unite de Politique Economique
Karim Dhaou, ENDA Tiers Mondes
Coordination des ONG du Senegal