

EVALUATION OF THE IDRC PROJECT ON CAPACITY BUILDING IN RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

Prepared for



Prepared by

Michael W. Bassey

November 30, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	4
ACRONYMS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1. INTRODUCTION.....	15
1.1 Background	15
1.2 Project Objectives and Expected Results.....	16
1.3 Objectives of the Evaluation Study	16
1.4 Scope, Organization and Audience of the Report	17
1.4.1 Scope of Report	17
1.4.2 Organization of Report.....	17
1.4.3 Intended Audience and Use of Report	17
1.5 Methodology	18
1.5.1 Sources of Information.....	18
1.5.1.1 Document Review	18
1.5.1.2 Questionnaires – Development and Administration	18
1.5.1.3 Structured Telephone and Face-to-Face Interviews.....	19
1.5.1.4 Attendance at Workshops and Meetings	19
1.5.2 Analysis of Information	19
1.5.3 Limitations and Constraints.....	20
2. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION STUDY	20
2.1 Scope of Project Activities.....	20
2.2 Main Activities of the Project	21
2.2.1 General Information.....	21
2.2.2 Workshops.....	23
2.2.3 Training of Trainers	23
2.2.4 Mini Grants.....	23
2.2.5 Advisory Services	24
2.3 Capacity Building Effect of Project.....	24
2.3.1 Overall Achievement of Objectives.....	24
2.3.2 Quality of Resource Mobilization Tools Developed	26
2.3.3 Individual Capacity Building.....	27
2.3.3.1 Partner Institution Staff	27
2.3.3.2 Consultants.....	28
2.3.3.3 IDRC Staff	29
2.3.4 Institutional Capacity Building.....	30
2.3.4.1 Resource Mobilization.....	34
2.3.4.2 Criteria for Successful Resource Mobilization	34
2.3.4.3 Organizational Management.....	35
2.3.4.4 Partnering.....	36
2.4 Effectiveness and Efficiency of CBRM Project.....	37
2.4.1 Effect of the Project Design.....	37
2.4.1.1 Presence of Program Staff in Regions.....	37
2.4.1.2 Choice of Activities for Capacity Building	37
2.4.1.3 Management of Project.....	38
2.4.2 Project Implementation	38

2.4.2.1 Effectiveness of consultants.....	38
2.4.2.2 Scoping Studies.....	39
2.4.2.3 Customization of Tools and Promotion of their Use.....	39
2.4.3 Perceptions of the Design and Implementation of the CBRM Project	40
2.5 Complementarity Between CRBM Project and Other IDRC Activities.....	42
2.6. Performance of PBDD	42
2.6.1 Coordination of the CBRM Project	43
2.6.2 Responsiveness to Partners Needs and Innovativeness	44
2.6.3 Availability of Resources and Their Use	45
2.6.3.1 Financial Resources.....	45
2.6.3.2 Human resources.....	46
2.7 Lessons Learned	46
3. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE WAY FORWARD	48
3.1 Using Lessons Learned.....	48
3.2 What Role Can PBDD Play?.....	48
3.3 Future Programming	49
3.3.1 Demand for Resource Mobilization.....	49
3.3.2 Needs of Research Partners	49
3.3.3 Documentation of Past Work	50
3.3.4 Research Component	50
3.3.5 Possible Entry Points.....	50
3.3.5.1 PBDD Staff Development	50
3.3.5.2 A CBRM Phase II	51
3.3.5.2.1 Sources of Funds	51
3.3.5.2.2 Structure of CBRM Phase II Project	51
3.3.5.2.3 Links Within IDRC	52
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	53
4.1 Conclusions	53
4.2 Recommendations.....	54
ANNEX A. EXPECTED OUTCOMES OUTPUTS AND RESULTS FOR THE CBRM PROJECT.....	57
ANNEX B. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE CBRM PROJECT	58
ANNEX C. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	61
ANNEX D. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE CBRM STUDY	63
ANNEX E. INTERVIEW GUIDES USED FOR THE EVALUATION	67
ANNEX F. LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS CONTACTED FOR THE STUDY.....	74
ANNEX G. BIOGRAPHY OF EVALUATOR – Dr. Michael W. Bassey	80

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This assignment was not accomplished by me alone. I have received the support of dozens of people, from the conceptual stages of this evaluation through the preparation of the report. I am grateful to Nicole Généreux who provided me with the necessary intellectual and moral support as well as guidance on many aspects during this work. My appreciation is also expressed for the important background to this work that was provided by Katherine Hay in Delhi and for helping with arrangements during my visit to India. I also thank Suzanne Taylor for her input during this assignment that helped to clarify various issues and improve this report.

Many people have given their time to respond to the questionnaires, and to talk to me during the course of this assignment. I would like to thank all those individuals from research institutions who provided information by email, by telephone conversations and through informal discussions during various workshops I attended.

The spontaneous and keen interest of present and past staff of PBDD, who spent so much of their time answering my many questions with enthusiasm, helped me to understand the project from its conception to its implementation. Other IDRC staffs, such as Regional Directors and Regional Comptrollers, were instrumental in making me understand the potential impact the CBRM Project can have within the Centre. I would like to thank the Director of PBDD, Danielle St. Pierre for discussions with her, which helped to sharpen various aspects of this report.

My deepest gratitude goes to many staff in WARO and in SARO who spent substantial time catering to my various requests and for facilitating the conduct of this evaluation. I finally would like to thank IDRC for having given me this opportunity to carry out this study. It has added to my knowledge regarding what research institutions need to be successful in research for development.

ACRONYMS

ABN	Association Bangr Nooma
ABSP	Association Burkinabé de Santé Publique
AERC	African Economic Research Consortium
ANSAB	Asia Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources
AUA	Association des Universités Africaines
CBRM	Capacity Building in Resource Management Program
CDS	Center for Development Studies
CERAPE	Centre d'études et de recherche sur les analyses et les politiques économiques
DEBTEC	Development of Biotechnology and Environmental Conservation Center
EEPSEA	Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia
ENWARCA	Educational Research Network of West and Central Africa
ESARO	East and Southern Africa Regional Office
GKP	Global Knowledge Partnership
IAGU	Institut Africaine pour la Gestion Urbane
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
KADO	Karakoram Area Development Organization
LIBIRD	Local Initiatives for Biodiversity Research and Development
MERO	Middle and North Africa Regional Office
NPTCI	Nouveau Programme de Troisième Cycle Interuniversitaire en économie
PBDD	Partnership and Business Development Division
SARFG	South Asian Fund Raising Group
SARO	South Asian Regional Office
WARO	West and Central Africa Regional Office

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) supports research for international development. Although it assists a wide range of research institutions to carry out meaningful work, IDRC is conscious of the need for alternate funding from other sources, for its partners. Many IDRC research partners are unable to obtain sufficient funding from various sources. There is thus a need for capacity building, within the institutions, to assist them to re-direct their efforts towards, public and private, local, regional, national and sub-regional sources of funding and through new and different strategic partnering and fundraising techniques. IDRC initiated the Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization (CBRM) Project in 2003, managed by the Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD) and implemented in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East.

Project Objectives

- Develop and promote customized resource mobilization tools,
- Strengthen skill sets of research partners
- Encourage emerging experts to contribute to building the field of resource mobilization for research for development
- Learn from and influence the resource mobilization sector to better respond to needs of research community and related networks in the South
- Capture learning from training activities and advisory services to enrich the entire program and to inform the evolving role of PBDD within Program and Partnership Branch.

Objectives of the Evaluation Study

The objectives of the evaluation study as outlined in the Terms of Reference are to:

- Assess the extent to which the CBRM project has contributed to building the capacity for resource mobilization among IDRC research partners and their ability to diversify their source of funding and improve sustainability;
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant award process, matching institutions needs with the appropriate consultants/training, particularly from view-point of key of supported institutions and management of the project;
- Contribute to the reflection about the future of the program.

Intended audience and Use of Report

This report is primarily aimed at these groups to achieve the following:

- PBDD staff – Provide them information on the overall achievements and performance of the project to allow the division to learn from its work and plan for the future.
- IDRC management – Inform them of the effects of the CBRM Project on research institutions' resource mobilization capabilities. This should help them in decision-making regarding future investments that should be made in a follow-up CBRM activity.
- IDRC staff - Inform them of the effects of the CBRM Project on research institutions and to sensitize them to possible roles they can play in providing future support for the sustainability of the institutions.
- Research partners - Provide a document from which information can be extracted to inform various partners (institutions, consultants and other donors) regarding the overall effects of the CBRM Project.

Methodology

The main activities for the evaluation study were: literature review; development and implementation of questionnaires; attending workshops and meetings; structured interviews by telephone and in person; analysis of data, and preparation of the report. Documentation was provided by the PBDD and obtained through web searches. Questionnaires were developed for three categories of key informants: institutions that received support from the CBRM Project; organizations and individuals that provided consultancy services; and individuals that benefited from the CBRM Project. Telephone and face-to-face interviews were held. Thirty nine (39) formal responses were obtained from key informants, from regions where the project was carried out, using questionnaires and interviews.

Findings of the Evaluation Study: Main Activities of the CBRM Project

The CBRM Project was conducted in all IDRC regions (ASRO-SARO, ESARO, LACRO, MERO and WARO), reaching about 240 organizations and about 400 individuals. Capacity building was carried out by consultants and IDRC staff using modalities such as; development of training tools, training workshops, training of trainers, Mini Grants and Advisory Services. Scoping studies were conducted to assess the potential for funding in various regions as well as to assess the existence of training consultants. Tracer studies were carried out in Asia to assess progress made within some institutions as a result of the CBRM Project. In general, the project was well designed with each component was guided by a strategy.

Findings of Evaluation Study: Capacity Building Effect of Project

Achievement of Objectives

The project has satisfactorily achieved its first three objectives. The fourth and fifth objectives that have to do with learning, influencing others and enriching PBDD's program have only been partially achieved. This is partly due to the fact that monitoring of the project's activities was not rigorously carried out to collect and document the information needed to demonstrate results.

Quality of Resource Mobilization Tools Developed

Tools were developed at two levels; for PBDD officers to carry out the implementation of the project and for partners to improve their competence in resource mobilization. For PBDD, the tools developed included: concept notes; regional strategies; questionnaires; terms of reference for consultants; scoping studies of trainers; philanthropic studies; guidelines for implementing Mini Grants; and, a monitoring guide. For research partners, the tools developed included the following: resource pool of trainers; fundraising tools for specific regions and institutions, definition of visions and missions; organizational strategies; and training tools specific to similar institutions with similar problems. All stakeholders found these tools to be of high quality and enhanced the capacity building activities. The training guide, which was produced by Venture for Fund Raising, a consulting organization in the Philippines, is a good tool. Training tools for resource mobilization were more developed in Asia than in the other regions partly because work started earlier in Asia.

Individual Capacity Building

Individuals from institutions attended training workshops in resource mobilization. Changes that resulted from the project are: increased skills in seeking funds, better skills at collaborating with others, increased knowledge in improving the management of the institution; ability to develop long-term strategies, etc.

Consultants on the other hand became more sophisticated in their approach to training, communicated more effectively with institutions, became more knowledgeable in resource mobilization and improved the management of their own organizations.

PBDD officers responsible for the CBRM Project were strengthened in both resource mobilization and organizational management. They initially had little or no knowledge about capacity building and resource mobilization but developed competence through learning on the job. This helped them to carry out a successful project.

Institutional Capacity Building

Research institutions acquired a range of benefits from the project such as: being sensitized to better management, new knowledge, new orientation for their planning, new skills (in proposal writing, communicating ideas, etc), increased levels of funding and diversification of donors, improved strategies, and financial self-sufficiency in some cases. A significant number of the institutions, which received capacity building support, have increased their funding level many-fold. Based on the assessment of the progress made by the institutions, some criteria for successful resource mobilization have been identified and outlined in the report.

The overall organizational management of the institutions has been positively influenced by the project. They are more aware of the need for transparency, efficient management systems and paying much more attention to participatory methods for decision-making. Financial systems are also better managed due to the influence of the CBRM Project. In some cases the composition of Boards has been modified to reflect diversity in the work of the institution.

Findings of the Evaluation Study: Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Project

Effect of Design and Implementation

The presence of PBDD officers in Regional Offices was a very effective strategy in terms of providing support for this project. This was highly appreciated by research partners, and staff also felt that this enhanced their performance. On the other hand, having officers based in Ottawa and working at the regional level in such a project demanded significant coordination.

Choice of Capacity Building Activities. Workshops, training tools, Mini Grants and Advisory Services were excellent methods of responding to general as well as specific needs of research institutions. This mix of activities, some institutions felt, allowed individuals to make their most meaningful contributions to their institutions through the CBRM Project. It helped to lift the morale of individuals because they felt in control of their work. The training of trainers' workshops, on the other hand, helped to create a critical mass of persons with expertise in resource mobilization training who subsequently provided training services to individuals and institutions.

Management of Project. Certain aspects of the project design affected its overall efficiency. Having no single person being responsible for the project and with the authority to take decisions, affected the effectiveness of the project in reporting results. The management of activities was decentralized with no officer having a clear mandate and resources to play a leadership role. Activities in the regions were well carried out but the management structure did not allow for the pulling together of the effects of the project to provide an overall coherent picture.

The fact that the administration of funds of the project was centralized in Ottawa posed some perceived difficulties regarding financial management. One scenario would have been to allocate funds to Regional Offices for implementation, given the small amounts that had to be administered.

The absence of PBDD officers in some regional offices reduced the overall project's effectiveness in those regions.

Customization of Tools. Training tools were developed for the pilot workshops conducted in Asia. These were in turn adjusted for use in subsequent training activities. Experiences in Asia influenced activities in Africa and Latin America but consultants in each region adjusted tools to their local context. Tools

needed for better management of the research institutions were in many cases lacking. These included procedure manuals, accounting software, terms of reference for developing strategic plans, clearer monitoring and evaluation procedures, etc. Although results obtained using the available tools were satisfactory, there is room for improvement. There is need for a resource mobilization training guide for research institutions, which serves as a reference for anyone interested in the subject. The training guide developed by Venture for Fund Raising is a good tool but its effectiveness will need to be assessed after it has been used by a wide set of research institutions across various regions.

Partner's Perception of Design and Implementation of Project

An analysis of the feedback from various stakeholders has been carried out to obtain useful information that will contribute to the planning of follow-up activities of the CBRM Project. This has been categorized according to actions or features of the project that were appreciated or could be improved. A comprehensive list is presented in the report.

Findings of the Evaluation Study: Complementarity Between CBRM Project and Other IDRC Activities

This project is aligned with IDRC's mandate of providing support to research institutions in developing countries. Its activities have been carried out in collaboration with other programs within IDRC. Resources have in several cases been pooled to support the work. The CBRM Project is also important for IDRC's networks and programs (e.g. Bellanet, Telecentre.org, and EEPSEA) from the point of view of sustainability.

There is room for collaboration between the CBRM Project and the Think Tank Initiative. This Initiative will only be able to collaborate with some of IDRC's research partners linked to economic and policy research, due to its mandate. There should nevertheless be opportunities for future collaboration, where institutions in the Think Tank network can participate in CBRM activities.

Findings of the Evaluation Study: Performance of PBDD

Coordination of the CBRM Project

The report discusses the performance of PBDD in the light of how the CBRM Project was conducted, pointing out its strengths and weaknesses. It is noted that working across several time zones, with several partners, using PBDD officers with other duties, presented challenges for the team implementing the project. The project did not appear to be prioritized within PBDD. The time needed by PBDD officers to supervise the activities was underestimated and no one among them had sufficient authority to take a strong coordinating role. The project was thus carried out in a decentralized manner with good collegial interaction, but with no one being responsible for compiling and disseminating projects outputs. The coordination of the project was therefore not aggressive enough to ensure that the work in the various regions was adequately monitored. Thus relevant information needed to determine the achievement of some of the objectives were not systematically collected, documented and disseminated. The success of this project was due to the perseverance and dedication of individual PBDD officers responsible for activities in various regions.

Responsiveness to Partners' Needs

Recipients were very impressed with the innovative approach of the project, the flexibility of PBDD officers, their responsiveness and overall goodwill to effect change. It is felt that the approach used by PBDD officers inspired the research institutions and consultants to perform at a high level. Some partners, who did not know how to start, received what they considered to be good guidance and encouragement from PBDD officers.

Availability of Resources and their Use

PBDD officers felt that funds were adequate to carry out the planned activities. Funds could not be allocated quickly, perhaps due to the low absorptive capacity of research institutions and also the high workload of staff, which prevented them from developing more activities. Some research partners on the other hand felt that funds were inadequate. This was true for some of the institutions that were more organized and which could absorb larger amounts, especially in Asia.

Human resources were available but inadequately prepared in resource mobilization to carry out the project. They had to train themselves on the job. There was also need for self development in organizational development. This learning experience benefited the project and will also be useful for future work.

Findings of the Evaluation Study: Lesson Learned

Lessons learned from the CBRM Project are obtained from a wide range of information sources. Some key lessons are:

- It takes persistent support and time for the effects of capacity building for resource mobilization become to become evident within research institutions
- Capacity building needs in organizational development varies between regions.
- Organizational readiness is a key condition for organizational change
- Mini-grants are effective as a mechanism to help research partners to put into practice and internalize the skills and techniques learned during workshops.
- Using participatory methods in organizational development is effective in accurately assessing needs and promoting organizational buy-in
- Collaboration between CBRM and other program staff appears to occur more easily in Regional Offices compared to what happens in Ottawa. This may have to do with smaller groupings and proximity and the closer working atmosphere in Regional Offices
- It is necessary to have a champion within PBDD to promote the CBRM Project

Findings of the Evaluation Study: Suggestions for the Way Forward

What Role Can PBDD Play?

The experience gained within the CBRM project has reinforced PBDD, making it a potential leader in future capacity building activities in resource mobilization within the Centre. It can also help to create a higher level of awareness of the potential benefits of integrating organizational development into IDRC's activities with partners in the future. PBDD will now have to show how resource mobilization support can be further developed, taking into account the close links between effective organizational management and successful resource mobilization. Thus PBDD will have the role to lead the development of possible models that can be used to implement this support. The task will include defining the types of interactions that should exist between various parts of the Centre to establish a culture of institutional capacity development.

Future Programming

Demand for Resource Mobilization and Needs of Partners. Interaction with dozens of institutions during this study clearly indicates a perceived need by all of them to improve their resource mobilization capabilities. There is a strong need for capacity building activities to improve strategy development, work planning, project development, monitoring and evaluation, and customized resource mobilization planning. Attention will also need to be paid to creating the critical mass of consultants needed in various regions to support the institutions.

Needs of Research Partners. In order for these institutions to become strengthened, certain needs have to be met, which include: training of staff; guidance on how to carry out fundraising; some financial

resources to gather, document and communicate information; being part of networks; access to periodic advice, guidance and mentoring.

Documentation of Past Work. There is a need for PBDD to highlight the results of the CBRM Project and its importance in improving the performance and sustainability of research institutions. Time and resources should be dedicated to find out what happened and what has worked well. Available information will need to be supplemented by new assessments to obtain the required information. This can then be used to develop program strategies for future work.

Research Component. Research can play the important role of catalyzing a future CBRM Project as well as strengthening the credibility of PBDD within and outside IDRC. It can help to find answers to important questions related to institutional behavior, development and use of tools, as well as well as generate knowledge in collaboration with research organizations and universities.

A CBRM Phase II Project. The report discusses some possible arrangements that can be used to further promote the work of the CBRM Project. In the first place, the case is made for a CBRM Phase II housed within PBDD as a project or as a unit. This second phase can be led by a person with the mandate to supervise the work so that it is conducted in an organized and cohesive manner, while encouraging input from various parts of the Centre. Some of the pros and cons of having the project housed elsewhere within the Centre or using extensive consultant help are discussed in the report.

The potential *role of the Regional Offices* is outlined. It may be possible to allocate funds by region, thus allowing Regional Offices to be involved in strengthening a group of institutions at a time, instead of spreading out too thinly. This, in the long run, should allow for increased collaboration between programs and PBDD and coherence in the Centre's capacity building efforts in resource mobilization

A potential input of *Regional Comptrollers* is also suggested, allowing them to be involved in assessing the needs and absorptive capacity of research institutions during project development.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Effects of CBRM Project

- C1. The CBRM Project has put in place a strong base from which future and wider intervention on capacity building in resource mobilization can be carried out.
- C2. Based on the assessment of the content, quantity and geographical coverage of the activities for the CBRM Project, objectives 1 to 3 have been satisfactorily achieved but objectives 4 and 5 have only been partially achieved.
- C3. The CBRM Project has helped research institutions to obtain increased funding from donors, diversify their donor base, and become more self-sufficient.
- C4. The CBRM Project has sensitized many research institutions to the need for developing resource mobilization strategies. They have also realized the necessity to have a well managed organization in order to mobilize resources. Many of them have therefore transformed their operations by adopting sound organizational management practices.
- C5. The CBRM Project complemented existing activities within the Centre, such as strengthening some IDRC Programs for devolution. It can also play a useful role in providing support to the capacity building of institutions within the Think Tank Initiative

Implementation Aspects

C6. The demand for capacity building in resource mobilization by IDRC research partners is high.

C7. Resource mobilization is an integral part of organizational development.

C8. The activities used for capacity building, such as training workshops, training tools and Mini Grants were well carried out and led to the strengthening of research institutions and individuals in resource mobilization.

C9. Useful training tools for resource mobilization have been developed within the CBRM Project and can be adapted for use by various IDRC research partners in various regions.

C10. Training organizations and individual consultants have provided useful services in resource mobilization to research institutions, but there is a shortage of these service providers in all regions

C11. Three constraints why some research institutions do not benefit quickly from capacity building training are: inability of the institutions to exactly define their needs; lack of funds to pay for consultancy services; and, lack of a critical mass of on-the-ground consultants.

C12. It takes time for research institutions to acquire the expertise needed to manage their programs effectively. Deliberate, persistent but phased support and guidance is required for them to become self-sufficient in resource mobilization.

Management and Coordination

C13. The CBRM Project has not been systematically monitored to collect data on the effects of the activities on research institutions and individuals.

C14. IDRC has not been adequately informed of the results of the CBRM Project.

C15. The overall management of the CBRM Project has been challenged by the inadequate provision of human resources for coordination and the project not being prioritized within PBDD.

C16. The CBRM Project was more active in Asia compared to Africa, Latin America and the Middle East, due to the presence of PBDD officers, more experienced trainers and stronger institutions.

Recommendations

Documentation and Dissemination of Results

R1. The results of the CBRM Project should be collected and documented (in collaboration with IDRC partners) and used to communicate the resource mobilization effects within and outside the Centre. [Sections 2.3.1, 3.1 and 3.3.3]

R2. IDRC should consider including information on resource mobilization achievements of research partners in documents such as Project Completion Reports to show their success in leveraging funds. This would be a good way of mainstreaming CBRM into the overall capacity building system and support process of IDRC. It would also sensitize research partners to the importance IDRC attaches to their capacity to obtain other sources of funds for sustainability. [Section 2.3.4.1]

Defining Phase II

R3. A Phase II CBRM Project should be viewed as an extension of IDRC's current partnership efforts and should be built on the wide base for reflection that has been created by work done so far. [Section 2.3.3.3]

R4. Given the good performance of the CBRM Project under PBDD, IDRC should consider a continuation of this project under the management of this division. The division has staff with appropriate competence and experience. [Section 3.3.5.2.2]

R5. Consultants who have provided CBRM support and research institutions have acquired significant experience regarding future directions for a second phase project. IDRC should consider soliciting the views of some of these partners during the planning stages of a second phase. This can be done by holding a meeting to obtain opinions regarding future activities and approaches.

R6. In the interest of reducing difficulties regarding the financial management of a Phase II CBRM Project, the PBDD should ensure that the Grants Administration Division is fully involved in the development of this phase. (Section 2.4.1.3)

R7. Given the positive effects the CBRM Project has had on various groups, and the high level of interest shown by research institutions to strengthen their institutions, IDRC may be faced with increased requests for capacity building. The Centre could therefore consider having internal discussions on what added role it can play, apart from the CBRM Project, in institutional capacity development.

Management and Coordination of Project

R8. A Phase II CBRM Project should consider having a coordinator or a project leader with the authority and flexibility to ensure adequate planning implementation, monitoring and documentation of all components of the project. [Sections 2.4.1.3 and 3.3.5.2.2]

R9. There is evidence that pooling of efforts across Asia has had good effects within the CBRM Project. Consideration should therefore be given to coordinating the activities of a next phase across regions, using a single strategy. Activities can then be implemented by regional blocks (Africa, Middle East, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean) to maximize the use of available staff and expertise. [Section 2.6.1]

R10. Research institutions that will benefit from CBRM Project support could be chosen, using well defined criteria including, need, absorptive capacity, level of organizational management and involvement with IDRC. [Section 2.6.2]

R11. IDRC should consider giving Regional Offices a greater role in the overall implementation of future CBRM activities. Funds could be allocated by regions, with Regional Directors facilitating collaboration with programs in the region. [Sections 2.4.1.3 and 2.6.1]

R12. Regional Comptrollers should be involved in the early stages of the development of projects, to assess the status of institutions and their ability to manage funds. This will help to identify institutions that may benefit from the CBRM Project. [Section 3.3.5.2.3]

Research Considerations

R13. IDRC should consider the addition of a research component within the CBRM Project, aimed at generating knowledge, developing resource mobilization materials and alliances with research organizations and universities [Section 3.3.4]

R14. Organizational readiness and absorptive capacity play an important role in the ability of a research institution to benefit from CBRM planning and implementation. A component of future CBRM research should be aimed at understanding organizational readiness and absorptive capacity of organizations and developing tools to measure them. [Sections 3.3.4 and 2.6.3.1]

Strengthening Expertise

R15. The number of competent consultants who can offer CBRM services to research institutions needs to be increased in certain regions. The CBRM Project should consider building the capacity of individual consultants and consultant organizations in less endowed regions such as Africa and Latin America. This can be achieved through training and by them gaining experience through working with research institutions. [Section 2.3.3.2]

Tools

R16. The range of tools available for CBRM should be improved, customized to make them more user-specific and their use promoted. This can be carried out by assessing existing tools, understanding their use and effectiveness, and making improvements as required. [Section 2.4.2.3]

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) supports research for international development. While it provides significant resources to a wide range of research institutions and individuals to achieve its mandate, IDRC is conscious of the need for alternate funding to be acquired by its partners from other sources. The Centre has over the years engaged in various activities to supplement its government funding by developing partnerships with other like-minded organizations. The Partnerships and Business Development Division (PBDD), which was established thirteen years ago, has played a significant role in mobilizing extra resources to support the work of IDRC, but there is still a need for recipient institutions to have their own resources.

Experience in providing support to research institutions indicates that their existence and ability to produce useful results are threatened by lack of resources. Institutions are often unable to maintain a satisfactory level of activity once IDRC support ends. This constraint is often cited as a factor that prevents some developing country institutions from contributing effectively to development. Many IDRC research partners are unable to obtain sufficient international funding, which to some extent, tends to undermine the ability of the research partners to develop and carry out their own agenda. There is thus a need for capacity building, within the institutions, to re-direct strategies to different, public and private, local, regional, national and sub-regional sources of funding and through new and different strategic partnering and fundraising techniques. In fact, IDRC's Corporate Strategy and Program Framework 2005-2010 recognizes the importance of institutions to develop the capacity to manage funds, partner, communicate and network¹.

The Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization (CBRM) Project was initiated in 2003, managed by PBDD and implemented in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. The CBRM Project envisioned "...a research for development community capable of accessing a diversity of funding sources, as well as supplementary sources to maintain financial sustainability and generate the knowledge necessary to address development challenges. CBRM strengthens the capacity of an organization involved in research for development to mobilize resources, assisting them in establishing and maintaining their own research agendas."² The project also considered resource mobilization as "... a process that strengthens organizational capacity. A well-conceived strategic plan and communication strategy, a diversified donor base and fundraising plan, and solid management practices all contribute to organizational well-being. These are the basic elements that comprise resource mobilization."

In the absence of a *definition of resource mobilization* within the CBRM Project, it is proposed that the following definition³ be used to provide a common base of understanding for this evaluation study: ***Resource mobilization is a process that involves attracting the human, technical, financial, physical and technological support required by an organization and managing relationships with partners in order to become more sustainable.***

¹ IDRC Corporate Strategy and Program Framework , para 124

² Website on Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization, http://www.idrc.ca/ev_en.php?ID=85709_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

³ This definition has been developed based on exchanges with PBDD and should not be interpreted as a final version. PBDD will have further reflections to define a final definition of resource mobilization.

1.2 Project Objectives and Expected Results

This study was commissioned by PBDD to evaluate the CBRM Project whose objectives were to:

- a) Develop and promote customized resource mobilization tools
- b) Strengthen skill sets of research partners
- c) Encourage emerging experts to contribute to building the field of resource mobilization for research for development
- d) Learn from and influence the resource mobilization sector to better respond to needs of research community and related networks in the South
- e) Capture learning from training activities and advisory services to enrich the entire program and to inform the evolving role of PBDD within Program and Partnership Branch

The results expected from the CBRM Project, as presented in the proposal⁴ for the work, for four main aspects, are shown in Annex A. An abridged version is presented below:

- **People:** IDRC research partners develop with greater awareness and better skills in fundraising. Existence of trainers and experts in resource mobilization within IDRC research partner networks, providing training within their regions.
- **Organizations:** Strengthened capacity of organizations in aligning their communication and resource allocation strategies with their resource mobilization strategies. Strengthened research networks with robust governance, stronger coordination, and greater knowledge of options that are important to address financial sustainability.
- **Relationships:** Existence of a new contact network of resource mobilization practitioners. Strengthened relationships between IDRC and other donors.
- **PBDD:** Strengthened skills of staff in managing capacity building in resource mobilization. Emerging role of PBDD within IDRC, and of IDRC within the international cooperation community of fostering resource mobilization skills development.

1.3 Objectives of the Evaluation Study

The objectives of the evaluation study as outlined in the Terms of Reference⁵ are to:

- Assess the extent to which the CBRM project has contributed to building the capacity for resource mobilization among IDRC research partners and their ability to diversify their source of funding and improve sustainability;
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant award process, matching institutions' needs with the appropriate consultants/training, particularly from the view-point of key supported institutions and management of the project;
- Contribute to the reflection about the future of the program.

⁴ See PBDD document on Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization for IDRC Research Partners, Project Proposal 2003

⁵ The Terms of Reference for the evaluation are presented in Annex B.

1.4 Scope, Organization and Audience of the Report

1.4.1 Scope of Report

This report, in keeping with the evaluation's terms of reference attempts to provide IDRC with some answers regarding:

- How the CBRM project has affected partner institutions through its activities;
- How well the project was carried out;
- What has been learned to improve future activities in capacity building in resource mobilization;
- What are the possible scenarios for future interventions of IDRC in improving the organizational capacity of partner institutions in developing countries.

The evaluation was aimed at neither the review of the activities of the CBRM project carried out by a large number of institutions in many geographical locations, nor the collection of quantitative data related to the implementation of activities, costs or individuals involved. This would have necessitated the prior collection of substantial data on a wide range of aspects and the maintenance of a database and a much longer period for this study to pull the information together.

1.4.2 Organization of Report

Section 1 presents the overall justification for the CBRM Project followed by its objectives and expected results. The objectives of the evaluation and methodology used to carry out the work, pointing out the main constraints, are briefly outlined.

Section 2 presents and discusses the finding of the study keeping in perspective the main questions defined for the evaluation. An overall assessment is presented for the main activities used to build the capacity of the research institutions, illustrating the scope of the work, both in content and geographical reach. The effect of the project on the capacity of individuals and the institutions, with reference to the various activities and tools used, and changes that occurred are then discussed. How the project design and the implementation of the project helped to build the required capacity is then analyzed, linking this to choice of activities, project management, studies carried out and tools used. The report continues with an analysis of the perceptions of various partners regarding the design and the implementation of the project. This describes what was appreciated and what could have been done differently. The complementarities between CBRM and other IDRC activities are next discussed followed by an analysis of how PBDD has performed in carrying out the project. The main lessons learned from the work are then outlined in the final part of this section.

Section 3 presents suggestions for the way forward, with emphasis on how the CBRM project can be strengthened within IDRC. Possible and future areas for intervention are presented and analyzed. Also discussed are modes under which IDRC can provide future support CBRM support to partner institutions.

Section 4 finally presents the conclusions and recommendations of the study.

1.4.3 Intended Audience and Use of Report

This report is primarily aimed at these groups to achieve the following:

- PBDD staff – Provide them with feedback on the overall achievements and performance of the project to allow the division to learn from its work and plan for the future.
- IDRC management – Inform them of the effects of the CBRM Project on research institutions' resource mobilization capacities. This should help them in decision making regarding future investments that should be made in a follow-up phase of the CBRM project.
- IDRC staff - Inform them of the effects of the CBRM Project on research institutions and to sensitize them to possible roles they can play in providing future support for the sustainability of the institutions.
- Research partners - Provide a document from which information can be extracted to inform various partners (institutions, consultants and other donors) regarding the overall effects of the CBRM project.

1.5 Methodology

The study was based on the Terms of Reference provided by the PBDD. The main activities of the study were:

1. Literature review
2. Development and implementation of questionnaires
3. Attendance at workshops and meetings
4. Structured interviews with selected persons from various institutions (by telephone and in person)
5. Analysis of information obtained from various sources
6. Analysis of questionnaire responses and information from telephone interviews
7. Preparation of report

1.5.1 Sources of Information

1.5.1.1 Document Review

Written information used in this study was provided by PBDD personnel, by interviewees, and through literature and web searches made by the consultant. Information provided by PBDD included:

- i. Specific documents on the development of the CBRM Project (proposals, monitoring strategies, etc)
- ii. Project monitoring and annual meeting reports
- iii. Report of studies on donors and other stakeholders
- iv. Documentation on training materials (methodologies and guides)
- v. Data on project activities

A list of documents consulted is presented in Annex C.

1.5.1.2 Questionnaires – Development and Administration

Documentation on CBRM's work, the TOR for this study and information from discussions with PBDD staff served as bases for preparing an evaluation framework, which is shown in Annex D. This framework was in turn used to develop the questionnaires for obtaining input from three categories of key informants: institutions that received support from the CBRM Project; organizations and individuals that provided consultancy services; individuals that benefited from the CBRM Project; and IDRC staff who may have been involved in the CBRM project. Since the geographical coverage of the project was wide, the questionnaires were prepared in English and in French. Informants in Latin America were contacted in English or French.

The questionnaires, samples of which can be found in Annex E, were in general aimed at obtaining some answers to three main issues:

- i. What has been the effect of the CBRM Project on institutions, individuals and IDRC staff?
- ii. What has the CBRM Project learned from the range of activities carried out, and what experiences have been acquired regarding the provision of capacity building support to research institutions in resource mobilization?
- iii. What should be the form, if any, of future support provided by IDRC, aimed at strengthening the resource mobilization capacity of research institutions?

A total of sixty two (62) persons were identified as key informants in consultation with PBDD staff (ASIA – 22; WARO – 12; ESARO – 6; LARO – 4; MERO – 2; IDRC – 16). Fifty nine (59) questionnaires were sent out by email, giving respondents two weeks to send their responses. Effort was made to cover all the geographic areas of the project. The complete list of persons and institutions identified as key informants, who received or responded to questionnaires, or who were interviewed are shown in Annex F.

1.5.1.3 Structured Telephone and Face-to-Face Interviews

Some of the key informants did not reply to the questionnaires. In other cases, supplementary information was needed to clarify issues after receiving the filled questionnaires. It was also preferable to obtain feedback from some respondents through conversations. Telephone or face-to-face interviews were therefore organized by the consultant to obtain input from some of these people. This helped to provide important information that would not otherwise have been made available for this study. Twenty six (26) such interviews were conducted for this study. The list of people interviewed is shown in Annex F.

1.5.1.4 Attendance at Workshops and Meetings

The wide geographical coverage of the project and the short time required to gather data required the consultant to be proactive in interacting with as many CBRM partners in as short a time as possible. Thus he attended three meetings at where he interacted with individuals from Asia, Africa and IDRC.

The South Asian Fund Raising Group, based in India, held its 20th Workshop, August 8-11, 2009 in Jaipur, India. The CBRM project supported about 18 participants to attend the workshop and some of them had been involved in capacity building activities. Another workshop on organizational development was held in Dakar, Senegal, October 28 to November 1, 2009 for research institutions in West/Central Africa. The ACACIA Research Learning Forum was held in Dakar, October 5-8, 2009 and participants from IDRC-supported research institutions attended. This involvement of the consultant in the three workshops provided him with an overall insight into the needs and experiences of institutions in resource mobilization and in organizational development in general. It also allowed the consultant to assess the impression of partners regarding the present and potential future role of IDRC in strengthening the capacity of research organizations.

1.5.2 Analysis of Information

Thirteen (13) questionnaire responses were received and twenty six (26) formal face-to-face or telephone interviews were held. Dozens of informal discussions were also held with individuals,

during the workshops mentioned above, from which useful information was obtained. All the returned questionnaires were analyzed and the responses grouped according to the information needed. Responses were initially analyzed to extract responses to each question, followed by merging all responses to obtain coherent answers to the main issues of the evaluation. Another analysis was carried out to compare responses to see if there were variations between the three groups of respondents. (No significant differences were noted on the effect of the CBRM Project on the performance of institutions or individuals due to regional differences.) Care was taken to verify information provided by cross checking information obtained from CBRM documentation, from partners and from IDRC staff. Comments, discussions and conclusions of this report are based on all of these analyses.

1.5.3 Limitations and Constraints

Certain difficulties which had to be surmounted during the implementation of this study are mentioned below:

- The evaluation study started in August 2009 and shortly after it was necessary to attend the meeting in India, before getting acquainted with the CBRM Project.
- It was not easy to find information on the involvement of specific institutions or individuals in the CBRM Project. It therefore took much more time than planned to identify roles and involvement of institutions and individuals. The existence of an updated database for the project would have significantly reduced this constraint.
- The response to the questionnaires was slow and it was therefore necessary to send several reminders. This may have been partially due to some of the key respondents being away on vacation or on travel duty. These delays created some pressure on the consultant to carry out a complicated assignment within a relatively short timeframe. One was obliged to analyze questionnaires, conduct interviews and write the report at the same time in order to meet deadlines.

It should however be mentioned that although the above-mentioned challenges existed, the consultant did receive good collaboration from many institutions who gave freely of their experiences and time. The support of PBDD staff and other IDRC personnel in readily participating in interviews and providing information helped to alleviate some of the pressures.

2. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION STUDY

2.1 Scope of Project Activities

The CBRM Project was developed by PBDD and details of its development are discussed in the project proposal⁶. The project was initiated by PBDD on the request of IDRC staff and senior management, in recognition of the need to assist IDRC research partners who find it difficult to rely on funding from accustomed sources, and through accustomed modalities. With the dependence on traditional sources becoming more unreliable, financial sustainability was undermined and threatening the existence of many institutions. The hope was that capacity building would enable IDRC research partners to develop strategies towards different public, private, local, national, regional and sub-regional sources of funding through the development of strategic partnerships and fundraising techniques.

⁶ Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization for IDRC Research Partners, Project Proposal 2003

PBDD thus developed the CBRM Project with emphasis on strengthening the fundraising capacity of IDRC research partners, but conscious that the institutions would need the following to be successful:

- a clear vision, mission and “niched” areas of programmatic focus with a strategic long-term plan and program framework, and that these are easily understood by people unfamiliar with research for development;
- executive leadership and independent governance structures committed to program and financial sustainability;
- sound management, administrative and financial reporting systems;
- a communication strategy where an organization has identified the various audiences to whom it will direct specific messages and the modalities to be used for conveyance.

The project would be implemented in ASRO, ESARO, LACRO, MERO, SARO, and WARO and through training workshops, training of trainers, mini-grants and advisory services. PBDD officers and program officers from other Program Initiatives would work closely to ensure coherence in the delivery of the Centre’s programs. It was anticipated that this project would also strengthen the skill sets of IDRC staff with an interest in improving their knowledge in resource mobilization.

The project’s intention was to liaise with Centre staff from Program and Partnership Branch (PPB), Resources Branch, and the President’s Office on issues including capacity building assessment, capacity building modalities and promoting a community of practice.

2.2 Main Activities of the Project

2.2.1 General Information

CBRM programming activities took the form of workshops, advisory services, research and the development of appropriate tools. About 240 organizations attended the capacity building workshops in all regions, and about 400 individuals participated.

A total of \$CAD 2,573,326 was allocated to fund the project’s activities. A summary of some administrative and funding aspects of the project are shown in Table 1, showing its duration and supplementary funds from Forward Planning and the Evaluation Unit.

Table 1. Summary information pertaining to the funding and duration of the CBRM Project

Pilot Phase: 2002-2004	
<i>Official Starting Date:</i> May 28, 2004	
<i>Initial Project Duration:</i> 30 months	<i>Initial Project Amount:</i> \$CAD 1,150,000
Project Supplement and Extension	
<i>Extension Date:</i> February 2006	<i>First Supplement Amount:</i> \$CAD 622,550
<i>Funds from Forward Planning:</i> \$CAD 500,000	<i>Funds from Evaluation Unit:</i> \$CAD 122,550
<i>New Project Amount:</i> \$CAD 1,772,550	
Second Supplement: June 07	
<i>Supplement Amount:</i> \$CAD 800,776	<i>New Project Amount:</i> \$CAD 2,573,326
New Completion Date: April 23, 2009	
<i>Total Project Duration:</i> 5 years	

CBRM support was mainly provided to institutions and networks in the form of workshops and Advisory Services. Table 2 shows the number of Advisory Service and Workshop interventions that were provided to both institutions and networks.

Table 2. Number of Workshops and Advisory Services supported for institutions and networks in all regions 2003-2008

	Workshops	Advisory Services
Institutions	13	16
Networks	7	12

Project activities were carried out for institutions in all regions where IDRC has research partners. A comparison of the number of interventions supported for each project activity is shown in Table 3. Also shown is the total percentage of funds spent in all regions for the three program activities.

Table 3. Number of activities supported and percentage of funds spent by region 2005-2008

	Number of activities supported			Percentage of funds spent per activity*		
	Research Tools	Workshop	Advisory Services	Research Tools	Workshop	Advisory Services
ASIA	4	8	5	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
ESARO	3	2	5	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
LACRO	2	2	8	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
MERO	0	2	1	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
WARO	3	6	9	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
All Regions	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	11	48	41

*: 1% of funds were spent on activities that were considered to be global in nature. \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\: Information not available

The CBRM Project was conceived and implemented using resources shown in Table 1. The previous experiences of PBDD were used to develop the project and to link it to IDRC's other programs. A pilot training workshop was initially held in Bangkok, Thailand in January 2003 followed by other workshops in various regions. Each workshop grouped institutions with similar interests to stimulate networking and to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the use of available tools.

Scoping studies were conducted to assess funding available for development research and to assess trainers and/or organizations, which were engaged in the field of providing resource mobilization training and consultancy services. The studies entailed collating information about resource mobilization trainers or organizations that were already known to IDRC, as well as researching on those with whom IDRC did not yet have prior contact. Tracer studies were initiated in Asia to assess progress, successes and challenges of some workshop participants.

CBRM strategies⁷ for ESARO, LACRO, WARO, and SARO-ASRO were prepared and used to guide the work carried out in the respective regions. A monitoring guide⁸ was developed by a consultant to facilitate the monitoring of the project. This guide provided a process by which CBRM could track the effectiveness of its various strategies to build IDRC's research partners' organizational capacity for mobilizing resources. It included tools for monitoring such as; monitoring reports, monitoring forums; indicator review based on a logical framework and an

⁷ See references in Annex C.

⁸ A Monitoring Guide was prepared for the CBRM Project by Molly den Heyer and is cited in Annex C

external evaluation. In general the planned monitoring would provide information which included:

- Individual Learning: increased knowledge, skills and/or awareness
- Individual Behavioral Change: individuals apply their new knowledge, skills, and/or awareness
- Organizational Change: the organization adapts to reflect new learning. In the CBRM Project this change consists of an increase in organizational capacity.

The CBRM Project was developed to respond to the needs of various types of organizations in different countries and regions. The aim of the various activities was to strengthen the skills of partners in resource mobilization and partnering. PBDD officers in WARO, ESARO, SARO and ASRO have been active in implementing the activities. Due to the absence of staff in other regional offices (LACRO, MERO) activities in these two regions tended to lag behind other regions. In the case of LACRO, the efforts of PBDD officers in Ottawa have allowed capacity building support to be provided to several institutions.

The following sections provide an overview of the various activities that were supported by the CBRM project. Details of the activities have been covered in various Annual Reports⁹, and other documents. How these activities have contributed to meeting the objectives of the CBRM Project will be discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

2.2.2 Workshops

Workshops served as a means to introduce new knowledge and skills to IDRC research partners. The CBRM Project has supported over 20 capacity development workshops world-wide for partners working on issues, which include economics, environment, natural resource management, health, information technology and capacity building of women. Some of the partners were government research institutions, NGOs, educational institutions, research networks and community-based organizations. Consultants were hired to facilitate the workshops. In Asia and Latin America, organizations with experience in resource mobilization provided the required services, whereas in Africa and the Middle East individuals were identified to provide the required capacity building. The stronger pool of institutions with expertise in capacity building in resource mobilization in Asia is partly responsible for the higher numbers of activities in this region compared to the others.

2.2.3 Training of Trainers

The relative lack of individuals with training experience in resource mobilization led to the carrying out of scoping studies in Asia, Middle East, East Africa, West Africa and Southern Africa to identify potential trainers and future collaborators. Two workshops for the training of trainers were held in 2007 in Cairo (MERO) and Dakar (WARO). Some of those trained were subsequently used to train others in future workshops in these two regions. In Asia, the CBRM Project developed a partnership with Venture for Fundraising (www.venture-asia.org). This institution became a strong leader in fundraising capacity building in Asia and was used to provide support to many research partners in resource mobilization.

2.2.4 Mini Grants

The CBRM Project administered Mini Grants, in some cases, as a method of helping organizations and networks to facilitate the uptake of new knowledge and skills gained from

⁹ See list of Annual Reports for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 in Annex C

workshops. The grants were awarded for specific follow-up activities (after CBRM workshops) on training, facilitation and strategy development, and ranged from \$CAD 5000 to \$CAD 10,000. There were some instances where the grant was substantially higher, as was the case for support to Chaitanya in Pune, India. This grant mechanism was found by the CBRM Project to be quite effective in helping partners to put into practice the knowledge and skills acquired from workshops.

Mini-grants have for example been used to cover: the participation of individuals to SAFRG Workshops in India; provision of advisory services to Asian partners by Venture for Fundraising based in the Philippines; support for partners of the Telecenter.org project; development of organizational models for social enterprises by the NGO Sula Batsu in Costa Rica; training in resource mobilization for the Association Burkina de Santé Publique (ABSP) in Burkina Faso; and advisory services to institutions in North Africa and the Middle East by the Center for Development Studies in Egypt.

2.2.5 Advisory Services

IDRC research partners, once introduced to basic concepts of resource mobilization, were in general interested in obtaining more information, skills and guidance in developing competence at both individual and institutional levels. The CBRM Project therefore used consultants that had participated in the training of trainers' workshops, and other consulting organizations, to work with some of the research institutions that requested support. This basically involved the consultants interacting directly with the research organizations in the preparation of tools that would be used to effectively communicate with potential donors. In general, the advisory services were used to prepare organizational strategies, communication strategies and tools, work plans, proposals, etc. This activity has taken place in all regions and a sample of some typical beneficiaries is:

- Asia – ANSAB, Nepal; Chaitanya, India; D. NET, Bangladesh; eHomemakers, Malaysia; KADO, Pakistan; LI-BIRD, Nepal; MITRA, India
- East Africa – Computer for Schools Kenya
- Latin America – Omar Dengo Foundation; Sula Batsu, Costa Rica
- Middle East and Northern Africa – Alexandra University and Centre for Development Studies (CDS), Egypt
- West Africa – CORAF/WECARD, Senegal; ERNWACA, Burkina Faso; Faculty of Economic Sciences and Management (FASEG), University of Cheikh Anta Diop, Senegal

2.3 Capacity Building Effect of Project

2.3.1 Overall Achievement of Objectives

The monitoring guide for this project, mentioned earlier, identified indicators that should have been used to measure various effects caused by the various activities. This study has not been able to find a clear indication of the use of this monitoring guide during the implementation of the project. There are no systematically collected data, which could be used to assess the level of achievement of the indicators outlined in the logframe. This observation is confirmed by discussions with PBDD officers who either only knew of the existence of the logframe and did not use it, or who were unaware of its existence. The CBRM Project did not exploit its monitoring strategy to the desired extent.

This absence of a pool of information that should have been systematically gathered and documented has challenged this study. The scope of the project was very wide and it was necessary to have information and results systematically collected and collated. It was difficult to retrieve information from the non user-friendly storage system.

There is a general view that the project has not, over time, provided enough information to IDRC colleagues on the main effects of the activities and is considered a weakness of the project. Reasons for this state of monitoring and data collection and storage is nearly unanimously perceived to be related to: an inadequate monitoring plan; a very busy work schedule of staff, which prevented them from allocating time to this task of monitoring; and, insufficient time being allocated to discuss issues related to project monitoring.

It should be clearly stated that the above observations, only allude to project monitoring and data collection. It is not a critic of the quality of the implementation of the project, which is considered to be good and carried out by a dedicated group within PBDD.

The activities were geared to achieving the project's five objectives. An indication of the relation of activities to objectives is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Activities carried out and their relationships to the achievement of objectives

CBRM Activity	CBRM Objectives Fulfilled by Activity
Training Workshops	1. Development of resource mobilization tools 2. Strengthening skill sets of research partners 3. Encourage contribution of emerging experts to RM for R4D
Training of Trainers	1. Development of resource mobilization tools 2. Strengthening skill sets of research partners 3. Encourage contribution of emerging experts to RM for R4D
Advisory Services	1. Development of resource mobilization tools 2. Strengthening skill sets of research partners 3. Encourage contribution of emerging experts to RM for R4D
CBRM Training Toolkit	1. Development of resource mobilization tools
Case Studies	4. Influence the RM sector to better respond to needs of Southern Partners 5. Use learning from project to enrich CBRM and inform role of PBDD
Donor Scoping Study and Tracer Studies	1. Development of resource mobilization tools
Mini Grants	1. Development of resource mobilization tools 2. Strengthening skill sets of research partners 3. Encourage contribution of emerging experts to RM for R4D
Present Evaluation	5. Use learning from project to enrich CBRM and inform role of PBDD

Regarding the documentation of results, which is related to objectives 4 and 5, the CBRM Project has made attempts to collect information and develop some simple databases. Various activities that have been supported are tabulated in Excel spreadsheets and lists of participants and institutions are available but the information is not easy to access. A very informative document¹⁰ describing the *raison d'être*, design, implementation, partners, results and lessons learned has been prepared by PBDD for the CBRM Project. A comprehensive Website¹¹ of the CBRM Project contains information on its main activities, pedagogical resources and important scoping studies and references. Case Studies have been developed in collaboration with some institutions, to record changes in capacity, behavior and other parameters but these are few and

¹⁰ CBRM by Design: Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization at IDRC, PBDD, January 2009

¹¹ Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization, http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-85709-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

would need to be enriched. Considering the number of institutions that have been reached by this project a larger number of Case Studies would be needed to provide the depth of information needed to help achieve objective 4 and 5.

Objectives 4 and 5 were achieved to a less extent than the others because the systematic collection, documentation and dissemination of information from the project were not done. However two important activities, the support provided to SAFRG for two yearly international training workshops, were important contributions to objective 4. These CBRM interventions enriched the workshops and sensitized the SAFRG regarding different approaches to training. It can however be argued that PBDD as well as other IDRC staff could have obtained useful information from the project's Website. While this is true, it is noted that more appropriately packaged and more easily digested information of the activities and their effects would have been more useful. In general it can be concluded that given the content, quantity and geographical coverage of the activities, objectives 1 to 3 have been satisfactorily achieved whereas objectives 4 and 5 were partially achieved.

Assuming that IDRC will continue with capacity development to promote better resource mobilization among its research partners, proper monitoring of the CBRM Project (in the future) would set a benchmark for those institutions that are involved in activities. Ortiz and Taylor¹² have stressed that monitoring and evaluation should "aid in showing whether capacity development processes are developing or strengthening capacities that result in more system and organizational readiness and ability..." Lusthaus et al¹³ have pointed the link between organizational monitoring and evaluation and program monitoring and evaluation. In essence, sound monitoring of the CBRM Project will help to clarify objectives, link activities and inputs to those objectives, set performance targets, collect routine data, and feed results directly to those responsible. Thus, institutions involved in the CBRM Project would also be influenced, through the example of how the project is managed, to improve their organizational management.

2.3.2 Quality of Resource Mobilization Tools Developed

The development of resource mobilization tools was key to carrying out the capacity development activities of the CBRM Project. Tools were developed at two levels; for PBDD officers to carry out the implementation of the project, and for partners to improve their competence in resource mobilization. For PBDD, the tools developed included: concept notes; regional strategies; questionnaires; terms of reference for consultants; scoping studies of trainers; philanthropic studies; guidelines for implementing Mini Grants; and, a monitoring guide. For research partners, the tools developed included the following: resource pool of trainers; fundraising tools for specific regions and institutions, definition of visions and missions; organizational strategies; training tools specific to similar institutions with similar problems.

IDRC staff generally found the tools developed by colleagues or consultants were of high quality. A reading of various documents used to guide the development of the project (concept notes, strategies, etc) indicated that they were concise, relevant and clear. One observation which may be useful in the future is to clearly identify the version of each document produced to avoid confusion. In some cases a document had more than one version and it was necessary to scan through each in order to determine which one was the latest version.

¹² Emerging Patterns in the Capacity Development Puzzle: Why, what and when to measure?, Alfredo Ortiz and Peter Taylor, Institute of Development Studies, 25 July 2008

¹³ Organizational Assessment: A Framework for Improving Performance, Charles Lusthaus, Marie-Hélène Adrien, Gary Anderson, Fred Carden and George Plinio Montalván, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C., International Development, Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada, 2002

The training guide developed by Venture for Fundraising in the Philippines¹⁴ is an important tool and a major output of the CBRM Project. This was done through the development of a close working relationship with Venture for Fund Raising, which helped them to improve their competence and effectiveness as a capacity-building organization. They gained experience from assisting several research institutions within the CBRM Project. Finally they used their various experiences to produce a document that responds to the needs of a wide group of organizations in resource mobilization. Perhaps with minor modifications it can be widely used as a basic tool by research institutions in developing countries for resource mobilization.

While the level of tool development in Asia by research institutions for resource mobilization was very good, that in other regions lagged behind. The consultants used acceptable tools and techniques for the activities in, for example, Africa but a constraint was the lack of organizations that provided capacity building in resource mobilization. More work will have to be done in the area of identifying solid organizations in this area of fundraising that can provide support to the African institutions. The project activities in Latin America were supported by fundraising organizations such as In2Action in Argentina. Tools used by these consultants and organizations were adapted for use within specific training activities.

It should be noted that the resource mobilization tools promoted in the CBRM learning clinics were quite diverse. These sessions were well attended and the participants learned a great deal from them. Some of the institutions received advisory services from Venture for Fund Raising to develop customized tools, due to the differences in types of institutions. One of them was for example a small donor grants program while other was an IDRC-funded research network. This type of flexibility in the development of tools has allowed the CBRM Project to provide effective training, using consultancy support for strategic planning and the development of resource mobilization plans.

2.3.3 Individual Capacity Building

2.3.3.1 Partner Institution Staff

Almost all of the participants who attended capacity building training were staff of IDRC research partner institutions. Thus these people were the first to experience the intention of the CBRM Project before their institutions. Some of them only attended one training activity whereas others attended two or more. Information collected from individuals indicates a very high level of satisfaction regarding the quality of training received. Some of the changes they have noticed in their capacities are:

- Increased understanding of issues to be considered in resource mobilization
- Ability to share knowledge gained within institutions after training
- Increased skills gained in report/proposal writing for use at the institutional level
- Better appreciation of the effort involved in resource mobilization within an institution
- The use of partnership development as an entry point to resource mobilization
- Ability to develop strategies for several years
- Increase in skills to identify potential stakeholders, private sector collaborators, government partners, international donors and even a more appropriate board

¹⁴ Resourced Mobilization: A Practical Guide for Research and Community-Based Organizations, Venture for Fund Raising in association with the International Development Research Centre, 2009

2.3.3.2 Consultants

A deliberate strategy of the CBRM Project was to use the training of trainers' workshop to develop the capacities of potential consultants. Fundraising organizations as well as individuals were identified and encouraged to develop their skills. Capacity was thus built for service-providing organizations interested in research rather than those who were only interested in community-based organizations. Some of the changes in behavior and skills noted by consultants were:

- Consultants (and consulting organizations) have become quite sophisticated and sustainable
- They are now able to communicate more effectively with research institutions
- Individual consultants have gained knowledge and skills that have allowed them to now perform as competent trainers
- Individual consultants are being contracted to carry out work on action plans for resource mobilization, for other international organizations apart from IDRC
- Consulting organizations are now able to review their structure and to develop themselves using top level organizational models

Individual consultants have operated mainly in West and Eastern Africa. A few of them have been transformed through capacity building workshops into competent trainers in resource mobilization and organizational development. This transformation has taken place with the support of the CBRM Project, which also provided the opportunity for them to repeatedly provide services to research partners. It should be stressed that the number of these consultants with the required expertise is far from being adequate. In fact, experience during this study indicates that the demand for consultant input is very high. Three visible constraints to some research institutions benefiting from consultant input are: inability of the institutions to exactly define their needs; lack of funds to pay for consultancy service; lack of a critical mass of on-the-ground consultants. A concerted effort will have to be made in the future to reinforce this group of service providers and to facilitate their involvement in developing the capacities of research institutions in resource mobilization.

In Asia the situation was relatively better due to the presence of some organizations that had good expertise in developing capacity in resource mobilization. Experiences gained by two of them within the CBRM Project are outlined below in Tables 5 and 6 to illustrate the sort of effect the CBRM program has had on these types of organizations. Changes were noted at two levels; improvement in resource mobilization capacity and management skills.

Table 5. Effect of the CBRM Program on Venture for Fund Raising

Changes Experienced by Venture for Fund Raising
<p><i>Capacity Building Skills</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Became an important and major trainer in resource mobilization in Asia for the CBRM Project ▪ Provided years of service to research organization through collaboration with IDRC to conduct resource mobilization trainings, administering small grants and providing resource mobilization technical mentoring to IDRC partners in Asia ▪ Developed skills in mentoring research organizations in resource mobilization through face-to-face interaction or electronically ▪ Learned to customize its training tools to the needs of the partners ▪ Prepared a resource mobilization guide that is available in print and the IDRC website <p><i>Management Skills</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learned to plan their work, listen and learn from the partners and then intervene

- Understood the needs and mission of research for development
- Gained experience in providing services through contracts or grant agreements
- Management and implementation of resource mobilization trainings and Mini Grants
- Learned to develop and manage the documentation of case studies of the CBRM Project

Table 6. Effect of the CBRM Program on the South Asian Fund Raising Group

Changes Experienced by South Asian Fund Raising Group
<p><i>Capacity Building Skills</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has been transformed into a major trainer in resource mobilization in Asia ▪ Its reach has been extended by IDRC support (in terms of opportunities and resources) to train organizations in resource mobilization ▪ Training workshop activities strengthened by IDRC support for panel members, core support, etc <p><i>Management Skills</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gained confidence by encouragement from IDRC (moral, technical and financial) ▪ Considering doing research in resource mobilization to find out what works and what does not ▪ Developed expertise to plan and implement very large workshops in resource mobilization for a wide range of clients, including research institutions

SAFRG, which has been in operation for over 20 years and trains between 150 and 300 individuals a year, has credited the CBRM Project with enlarging its network of partners. Research organizations are participating in their SAFRG's workshops and their content has changed to include spokespersons with practical resource mobilization experience. IDRC is noted by SARFG and other partners to be the only donor that supports fundraising. This is a boost for training institutions, and they feel that IDRC has made a strong statement for resource mobilization through the CBRM Project.

2.3.3.3 IDRC Staff

The capacity of PBDD staff has been strengthened as a result of their involvement in conceptualizing, strategizing, implementing and supervising the CBRM Project. No formal training activities were planned for PBDD personnel. They have had to develop competence by doing and learning on the job. Some of the changes in staff's attitudes and skills include:

- The ability to plan complex activities involving a wide range of institutions with various interests
- Improved capacity in organizing the training of adults
- Ability to generate awareness regarding IDRC's support for resource mobilization
- Improved capacity to work more effectively with partners to develop their capacity in resource mobilization and organizational development
- Awareness generated of the need for research institutions to attain self-sufficiency
- Improved ability to work within a team to further the goals of the CBRM Project and help other institutions
- Improved capacity in carrying out contents analysis of organizational change
- Improvement in thinking regarding IDRC's approach to capacity building
- Greater awareness of the role of organizational management in resource mobilization
- Personal knowledge, of resource mobilization training methods and the field, has increased many-fold

Most PBDD officers had little or no knowledge of resource mobilization or organizational development before the start of this project. Many had no experience in training before their involvement in the CBRM Project. They now have been sensitized, are informed and knowledgeable about capacity building needs of institutions. This change has to a large extent been due to the personal perseverance of those involved PDBB officers.

The CBRM Project has widened the base for reflection within PBDD. Before the project, all discussions were basically centered on partnerships (fundraising). Discussions are now on wider issues such as the sustainability of IDRC being linked to that of its partners. Substantial formal and informal knowledge creation has occurred within the Centre on institutional development issues. To some extent the CBRM Project has given better visibility and stature to PBDD and has helped to evolve the thinking of IDRC positively in the area of capacity development. What has so far been achieved and learned can be used in developing future CBRM programming, which can be seen as part of and an extension of IDRC's partnering efforts.

2.3.4 Institutional Capacity Building

Various factors affect the extent to which capacities of institutions were developed by the CBRM Project. A major factor was related to readiness of the institution to acquire knowledge and to change, even though it meant making substantial sacrifices. Many of the institutions interviewed for this study stressed their perceived need to change their existing situation and the effort it took to get the job done. What they gained from the activities of the project included: new knowledge, new orientation for their planning, new skills (in proposal writing, communicating ideas, etc). Significant changes have been observed in these areas within partner institutions. It has been noted that the level of capacity strengthening of an institution depends on the degree to which individual capacities have been strengthened. In general research institutions are now thinking about organizational behavior rather than just about how well they function.

The level of capacity building of research institutions by the CBRM project has varied. Some institutions have only been supported for a single participant to attend a training workshop. Other institutions have had several of their personnel attend workshops and have in turn received various forms of support such as Mini Grants and Advisory Services. As mentioned earlier, the various outcomes have not been systematically documented to show in detail how each of the recipients of CBRM support has been affected. But available and documented information confirm that strong capacity building has occurred within the institutions as demonstrated by 9 case studies carried out by the CBRM Project. Tables 7 to 15 identify some key evidence of capacity building that have occurred for selected institutions in Asia and Africa, which can be used to generalize the extent to which capacity building has occurred.

Table 7. Changes within ANSAB, Nepal that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: ANSAB (1992), Nepal
Area of intervention: Conserving biodiversity and poverty alleviation Nepal
CBRM support: Trainings in 2003; mini grant support for capacity building in resource mobilization
<p>Effect of Capacity Building:</p> <p><i>Resource Mobilization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed resource mobilization strategy • Redesigned its organizational framework • Developed resource mobilization strategy in 2006 with IDRC support • Developed skills and confidence to approach seven different donors for funding • Received donor support by 2005-2006 for programs <p><i>Management</i></p>

- Improved capacity to discuss and plan for the future leading to development of the strategy for their Resource Centre
 - Built strong human resource capacity for resource mobilization
 - Acquired systemic understanding of resource mobilization issues
 - Developed business plan for the Resource Centre management team
 - Started operating their Resource Centre in April 2007
 - Managed the Resource Centre efficiently
- Self-sufficiency**
- Generated income for services provided to cover the running cost of the Resource Centre
 - Allocated 20% of Resource Centre income for organizational operations of ANSAB

Table 8. Changes within Chaitanya, India that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: CHAITANYA (1993), India
Area of Intervention: Empowering women by organizing them into self-reliant institutions
CBRM Support: Participated in resources mobilization workshops; received substantial CBRM funds for capacity building and development of organizational management plans
<p>Effect of Capacity Building</p> <p><i>Resource Mobilization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-oriented efforts to obtain support from other donors due to exposure to innovative fund raising methods • Diversified funding base to attract individuals as donors • Developed innovative fund raising activities • Submitted proposals to four donors and got two funding support • Generated about \$US30,000 within 6 months <p><i>Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed a strong business plan • Built and equipped a new Women's Training Resource Centre • Developed training and capacity building services • Developed strategies at the organizational level to increase visibility, improve operational effectiveness and efficiency • Championed capacity building in resource mobilization leading to the possible establishment of diploma courses in Fund Raising and Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation by the Tata Institute of Social Sciences

Table 9. Changes within CORAF/WECARD in Dakar that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: West and Central African Council for Agricultural Research and Development (CORAF/WECARD) 1983
Area of Intervention: Coordination of agricultural research for West and Central Africa
CBRM Support: Participation in workshops, Mini Grant to rethink their institutional strategy and develop research mobilization strategies
<p>Effect of Capacity Building:</p> <p><i>Resource Mobilization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized the importance to diversify funding sources • Developed resource mobilization strategy to set up an endowment fund • Carried out scoping study of donor support for agriculture in West and Central Africa • Sensitized partner countries regarding the need for a unified resource mobilization strategy • Convened various donor meetings to solicit long-range funding • Wrote several proposals for funding support • Succeeded in obtaining support from various donors to about US\$110 million <p><i>Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed 10-yr strategy and operational plans to agricultural research in West and Central Africa • Developed new organizational structure with new personnel • Developed a transparent financial management system • Built a new office to house its expanded programs

Table 10. Changes within D.Net in Bangladesh that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: Development Research Network (D.Net) (2001), Bangladesh
Area of Intervention: Using Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for poverty alleviation and economic development in Bangladesh
CBRM Support: Participation in capacity development workshop in resource mobilization
<p>Effect of Capacity Building:</p> <p><i>Resource Mobilization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created a resource mobilization and partnership development program • Strengthened knowledge and skills of staff and board members in resource mobilization • Comprehensive mapping of donors and matching programs to donor interests • Increase in outreach to potential donors through various fund raising meetings • Overall funds available have doubled during its affiliation with the CBRM Project • Prepared and submitted 40 proposals to donors and have received 20 positive responses • Succeeded in getting funds from wide cross-section of donors from the private sector • Overall change in income sources due to the CBRM Project <p><i>Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed organizational strategy • Prepared D.Net plans and visibility materials and disseminated them to potential donors • Became member of Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP) <p><i>Self-sufficiency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succeeded in generating the majority of income from its own income-generating activities by providing consulting services and individual donations

Table 11. Changes within eHomemakers in Malaysia that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: eHomemakers, (1998) Malaysia
Area of Intervention: Help mothers to work at home to balance home and work life
CBRM Support: Resource mobilization training workshop; case study workshop; support for preparation of training modules
<p>Effect of Capacity Building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed and documented resource mobilization history • Stimulated to produce a better business strategy • Searching for way forward in improving its organizational management capacity

Table 12. Changes within ERNWACA in Bamako that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: Educational and Research Network of West and Central Africa (ERNWACA) (1989)
Area of Intervention: Increase research capacity, and enhance collaboration among researchers and practitioners to strengthen educational practices and policies on the continent.
CBRM Support: CBRM support through contact with PBDD Program Officer
<p>Effect of Capacity Building:</p> <p><i>Resource Mobilization</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed a fund raising strategy • Presented strategic resource mobilization plan to its board and its acceptance • Set up a resource mobilization committee • Held several donors meeting <p><i>Management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepared a strategic plan • Regional and national dialogue strengthened through e-dialogue • Success of national teams in Niger, Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal in mobilizing resources through grants and consultancies • Development of entrepreneurial spirit among many national teams

Table 13. Changes within KADO in Pakistan that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: Korkoram Area Development Organization (KADO), Pakistan
Area of Intervention: Improve the socio-economic base and living conditions of the rural population in the region
CBRM Support: Mini Grant Challenge Fund
Effect of Capacity Building: <i>Resource Mobilization</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed a better understanding about resource mobilization within KADO (staff and board members) <i>Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened capacity of the organization Created in-house capacities in project management (proposal writing, monitoring and evaluation) and resource mobilization <i>Self-sufficiency</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed high level of self sufficiency covering 90% of core costs by its own endowment

Table 14. Changes within LI-BIRD in Nepal that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: Local Initiatives for Biodiversity Research and Development (LI-BIRD), Nepal (1996)
Area of Intervention: Capitalizing on local initiatives for sustainable management of renewable natural resources and improving the livelihood of people
CBRM Support: Two participants at resource mobilization workshop in Sri Lanka
Effect of Capacity Building: <i>Resource Mobilization</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened efforts to develop resource mobilization strategies in LI-BIRD Emphasis put on resource mobilization strategy and active plans are being implemented Recognized process of resource mobilization is long <i>Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changed organizational strategy and implementation Strategic directions set till 2012

Table 15. Changes within MITRA in India that are attributed to the support of the CBRM Project

Institution: MITRA, India (2000)
Area of Intervention: An organization focusing on using information and communication technologies (ICTs) to bring about change in the social sector
CBRM Support: Two participants attended training workshop by Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP)
Effect of Capacity Building: <i>Resource Mobilization</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stimulated to assess its resource mobilization strategy Decided to diversify funds from one source to generating its own income through services <i>Management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted two internal workshops on organizational strategy and resource mobilization to sensitize and Train staff Strong team spirit and recognition of problems were generated <i>Self-sufficiency</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue generated from services covered over 25% of organization's costs

The above changes within partner institutions demonstrate that the CBRM Project was able to develop the capacities of institutions to the extent that they changed several aspects of their operations. It however takes time for an institution to be self-sufficient and partner institutions would therefore like to see a continuation of the capacity building activities of the CBRM Project.

2.3.4.1 Resource Mobilization

Having the capacity to mobilize resources is not synonymous with being successful in resource mobilization. The above section indicates that there is an inextricable link between resource mobilization and organizational development. Significant capacity development has occurred within the CBRM Project and this has led to the acquisition of financial resources by many research institutions. This section will focus on progress made by partners to mobilize funds as a result of the CBRM Project's activities. This discussion would have been more strengthened with quantitative data from tracer studies to show the evolution of changes in, for example, funding received by an institution over a period.

There is a unanimous view that the activities of the CBRM Project have had a positive impact on the resource mobilized by partner institutions. Some of these institutions have:

- increased the level of funding from traditional donors
- received funds from local and international businesses
- generated funds from services they provide to various clients
- received funding from individuals, local, regional and international donors
- became self-sufficient to the extent of having little need for donor funds

Some institutions have experienced significant changes in their financial situation. For example CORAF/WECARD has over the life of the CBRM Project improve its situation from working in the red to now working with a budget of about \$US100 million over the next five years. D.Net started with US\$ 3000 in 2007 and now has a resource pool of over US\$ 1.5 million. Chaitanya has since 2005 diversified its source of funding from four to seven. National, government, corporate and income generated funds contribute about 70% of the institution's financial resources, compared to 30% from international donors. Some institutions like ANSAB have been able to reduce their dependence on donor funding because they now generate substantial revenue from providing services to various clients. Many others are still struggling with the development of the overall framework they need for effective resource mobilization. Overall, the majority of the institutions, which have had contact with the CBRM Project, are moving in the right direction but successes experienced in fundraising vary.

The ability of an institution to obtain funding is in many respects a measure of the success of its resource mobilization activities. Documenting the progress made by the research institutions would be useful and could be done in various ways to strengthen the CBRM Project. IDRC would have an indication of what institutions are accomplishing in resource mobilization by seeking and providing such information in Project Completion Reports, on how successful they have been in leveraging funds. This action may be a good way of mainstreaming CBRM into the overall capacity building system and support process of IDRC. It would also sensitize research partners to the importance IDRC attaches to their ability to obtain other sources of funds for sustainability.

2.3.4.2 Criteria for Successful Resource Mobilization

Analysis of the available information for the CBRM Project indicates that some generalizations can be made regarding why some partner institutions succeed in mobilizing resources whereas others may take a much longer time. Success is dependent on factors other than training.

The institutions involved in the CBRM Project have obtained positive results to various degrees, as indicated by Tables 7 to 15 above. Some, like Chaitanya, have made significant progress to the point of convincing a university to giving courses in resource mobilization. ERNWACA

attracted seven new funding partners and funding increased five-fold. IAGU in West Africa has diversified its funding source by generating income from services provided in waste management. Others such as eHomemakers are having difficulties making rapid progress in obtaining funds. The reasons for the varied levels of success depend on factors such as leadership, the area in which the institution is working, the political and economic climate etc. Some conditions under which institutions have worked and which are common to the more successful institutions, and appear to be necessary for them to succeed in mobilizing resources include:

- The inclusion of participatory approaches, from the design to the implementation stage of the resource mobilization strategy. (Involvement of staff, board members, donors, and partners in discussions)
- Improvement in the knowledge base and skills of staff of the institution
- Existence of a complete organizational strategy and operational plan
- Development of sound income generating strategies apart from donor funds
- Diversification of funding sources
- Existence and implementation of an effective public awareness strategy
- The development of a brand that is viable and marketable
- Presence of a champion that will lead the resource mobilization activity
- Flexibility in the management system, which allows for constant innovation as required
- Good governance and transparency in the management of activities and financial resources
- A supportive and progressive board
- Good intelligence on donors who are interested on the institution's activities
- Complete documentation of results of the institution
- Involvement in networks allowing for interaction with like-minded institutions and donors
- The existence of an organization or consultant that will provide good support to the research institution

While the above is not intended to present all the conditions necessary for success, it nevertheless provides some guide regarding some of the criteria that institutions should try to meet to improve their chances of succeeding in mobilizing resources. It should therefore be useful to institutions that are seeking to improve their funding situations.

2.3.4.3 Organizational Management

This project was aimed at strengthening capacities of research partner institutions of IDRC in resource mobilization. However, as repeatedly noted from interaction with partners and mentioned in this report, good organizational management is a prerequisite for effective resource mobilization. The changes within research institutions that resulted from the CBRM Project and outlined in Section 2.3.4 and Tables 7 to 15, were mainly related to the management of the institutions. An institution should be well managed for it to develop and operate a successful resource mobilization strategy. It may obtain a single substantial funding in the short-term but no donor will continue its support if the institution's management system is weak. This section therefore seeks to draw out some of the observations obtained from institutions regarding how their organizational management has been affected by the CBRM Project.

Basically all institutions mention their keen interest in the development of strategic plans or revising these plans. They were aware, in the first instance, that the absence of a plan (outlining their vision and mission, what they wanted to do and how it would be done) would not make them competitive in seeking funds. Thus this CBRM Project catalyzed partner institutions to

develop their strategic plans. It is noted that the majority of institutions have obtained significant information from the various workshops their staff have attended. Their second set of interest was to develop public awareness strategies, to promote their strategies, package and disseminate information on their activities, for added visibility. Some of the institutions have been restructured to create specific responsibilities for managing activities, but what is noteworthy is the involvement of the staff in the organizational development process. This approach has created a more transparent and efficient management system, in which more people contribute to management-related and technical aspects of the institution's work. It is felt that this general buy-in to the process of change will make the institutions more effective in the long-term.

Organizational management in the area of development and submission of proposals has been improved, according to all key informants. It appears that once the CBRM activities succeeded in getting institutions to develop their overall program directions, they became confident in what they wanted to achieve and were motivated to write proposals even without having a prospective donor ready to fund the activity. This process was often carried out using a participatory approach, making the personnel feel ownership of the proposals. From a management perspective this also strengthens the institution in preparation for the implementation phase of the proposed project. Information suggests that management of the activities has become more effective due to this wider involvement in project development.

Some institutions have strengthened their organizational management by changing the composition of their Board to have a broader vision regarding work that should be done. In some cases where members cannot be replaced the Board has been enlarged to bring in people with different backgrounds. Some Boards have been changed to ensure the maximum diversity of expertise of its members. In this way the technical, financial, communication other aspects of the institution have been reinforced.

Finances of partner institutions have been better managed compared to years preceding the CBRM activities. Knowing the implications of having sound and transparent financial practices that respond to the requirements of donors, institutions have re-organized their finances, procured better financial software, hired competent financial managers and in some cases even hired internal auditors. As one of the institutions said, "A donor will not give you money if you cannot tell him how you will manage it." This comment underlines why most institutions have been hasty to put in place financial management systems that are up to acceptable standards.

2.3.4.4 Partnering

Given the role of partnering in resource mobilization, this section assesses to what extent the institutions have learned about partnering and developed these skills.

It takes time to develop partnerships, especially when institutions are separated by large distances and people are busy with their day-to-day duties. The CBRM Project has facilitated this aspect by bringing various research partners together to attend workshops. These opportunities have allowed some interactions during workshops and at times shortly afterwards, to share information. But in general, the partners have not created continued dialogue and exchange, due to time constraints and workload. There have been cases where some contacts were maintained but this has been few and depended on partners having very specific mutual interests that bind them together. Partners belong to networks that have professional interests and may not consider resource mobilization as a basis for maintaining contact. The CBRM Project has not therefore been a strong factor in catalyzing the building of networks nor has it led to coalitions to mobilize resources.

Organizations and individuals who provide services in capacity building are more likely to be involved in professional networks for resource mobilization. Some of these people are board members of charity organizations, members of fundraisers associations, members of fundraising networks and participants in congresses worldwide. This group has also benefited from being involved in training in the CBRM Project. It has allowed them to develop relationships with research institutions for future work. Organizations such as Venture for Fund Raising and SAFRG and Centre for Development Studies have benefited from training partners, which have sharpened the quality of their trainings.

Research institutions have developed new partnerships with a wide range of funding organizations. These alliances, according to the institutions, have been mainly due to the CBRM project, which has “pushed them to venture” into the wider donor arena. These partnerships are however mainly one-on-one, between an institution and a donor. But having the support of one donor at times facilitates getting support from others with similar interests.

2.4 Effectiveness and Efficiency of CBRM Project

2.4.1 Effect of the Project Design

2.4.1.1 Presence of Program Staff in Regions

PBDD is a strategic and technical entity of IDRC for partnering. It understands the trends of institutions, donors, negotiates details of collaboration, monitors and ensures that good relationships are maintained. The logic for lodging the CBRM Project within PBDD therefore appears to be sound and is in line with the mandate of the division. The project was designed to use its funds and others from within the Centre and to collaborate with other IDRC Programs. Thus this appeared to be a good arrangement as it solicited the support of programs in identifying partners as well as using the mechanism of co-funding.

Given that each PBDD officer is a focal point for Program Initiatives, this was supposed to contribute to the effectiveness of the CBRM Project. This did not take place to a great extent and perhaps for the following reason. If a program officer in PBDD is responsible for liaising with a Program Initiative that has activities spread out over various Regional Offices, it would be difficult for this person to master the local contexts in the various regions where the PI is being implemented. A better approach might have been to locate a PBDD officer in a regional office and let her work with the program officers responsible for the Initiatives in that region to promote the CBRM Project. This appears to be operationally less complicated. It would appear that a mix of these two approaches have been used. LACRO and MERO have implemented the project without a PBDD person in situ. The other regions have had some local presence of PBDD officers. The results indicate that the regions with strong PBDD presence have implemented more activities for the CBRM Project due to proximity, better identification of needs and constant dialogue, making it easier for the PBDD officer to perform. While the above comments concern the personnel aspect of the project design, it is understood that financial or other constraints may have been responsible for the situation.

2.4.1.2 Choice of Activities for Capacity Building

The overall design of the project’s activities has been appreciated by the consultants who were involved with training. Workshops, training tools, mini grants and advisory services were excellent methods for responding to general as well as specific needs of research institutions. Each of these activities, and others implemented, targeted objectives of the project, as noted in

Section 2.3.1. This mix of activities, some institutions felt, allowed individuals to make their most meaningful contributions to their institutions through the CBRM Project. It provided them with a range of knowledge and information as well as it uplifted morale on an individual basis because of the feeling of having control over their activities. The training of trainers' workshops, on the other hand, helped to create a critical mass of persons with expertise in resource mobilization training. These persons can later provide training services to individuals and institutions, thus multiplying the training in their respective countries or regions.

2.4.1.3 Management of Project

One concern regarding project management is the fact that no single person was neither responsible for the project nor had the authority to take decisions. This affected the effectiveness of the project in reporting results. The project was managed in a decentralized mode with no one having the clear mandate and resources (such as assistant support) to take a real leadership role. Activities in the various regions were well carried out but with insufficient pulling together of the different work to provide an overall coherent picture of the project and its achievements. It would appear that this situation is related to the apparent lower priority given to the project compared to other duties within PBDD. Some of the comments made later in this report (Section 2.6.1) regarding inadequate monitoring and documentation of results are related in part to this management challenge.

The fact that the administration of funds of the project was centralized in Ottawa posed some perceived difficulties regarding financial management. The project had many components and approval had to be obtained, then funds were moved and then moved again at the end of the activity. One scenario would have been to allocate funds to Regional Offices for implementation, given the small amounts that had to be administered. It however appears that difficulties in implementation might have been related to a lack of synergy between IDRC's internal granting system, project management procedures and the design of the CBRM project. This experience can be minimized in the future by involving the Grants Administration Division in the development of the next phase of the CBRM project.

2.4.2 Project Implementation

2.4.2.1 Effectiveness of consultants

The program spent more resources in Asia compared to other geographical areas. This was due to two main factors: the presence of PBDD personnel and the availability of experienced consultants to provide the appropriate services to partner institutions. Training and advisory service support provided by Venture for Fund Raising was considered to be of high quality by both IDRC staff and partner institutions. Their past experience in fundraising coupled with the requirements of working with research partners allowed them to develop training tools that were relevant to specific groups. The SAFRG which specializes in giving courses in fundraising also was rated as being effective in stimulating participants during workshops. The atmosphere during these workshops developed enthusiasm and interest amongst many of the research partners.

In Africa and the Middle East, consultants had to be trained to provide the support needed by the project. The Centre for Development Studies based in Cairo has provided consultancy support in capacity building to institutions in the Middle East and North Africa. Consultants were in general not used to working with research institutions and therefore had to adjust to the realities. Training methods also had to be adjusted. It was a learning experience and they gained the

needed expertise in the process. The overall assessment of these consultants by both IDRC staff and partners was favorable. They have worked with the CBRM Project to facilitate useful workshops and provide individual support to some institutions. The consultants are not many and there is need for the numbers to increase, which should ultimately lead to the existence of consulting organizations with the required expertise and resources to reach a larger number of clients.

Given the experience gained by the consultants, they can be useful in providing information that can guide the planning of a follow-up project. Their attendance at a future meeting hosted by IDRC, to review the past activities and make suggestions for a second phase CBRM Project would be useful.

2.4.2.2 Scoping Studies

Information on needs, the status of resource mobilization and the absorptive capacity of institutions were not readily available to PBDD for decision-making. These, the availability of consultancy expertise and potential availability of funds in various regions were gathered through several scoping studies carried out or commissioned by PBDD¹⁵. The CBRM Project was implemented using the findings of these studies. It is difficult to assess if the information gathered made the project more effective but one would suspect that this is a reasonable assumption. It is however clear that the efficiency of the project was improved by these studies as they saved time and increased knowledge for decision-making.

2.4.2.3 Customization of Tools and Promotion of their Use

The range of tools used in this project and their quality were discussed earlier in Section 2.3.2. The training tools developed and used during this project are the subject of this discussion. They were used to carry out the capacity building workshops and in providing services to the research institutions. The pilot workshops carried out in Asia allowed training tools to be developed. These were in turn adjusted for use in subsequent training activities. Experiences in Asia influenced activities in Africa and Latin America but consultants in each region adjusted tools to their local context. A consulting organization in Middle East and North Africa used materials it had previously developed. Tools that were needed for better management of the research institutions were in many cases lacking. These included procedure manuals, accounting software, terms of reference for developing strategic plans, clearer monitoring and evaluation procedures, etc.

Although results obtained using the available tools were considered by institutions to be satisfactory, there is room for improvement. There is need for a resource mobilization training guide for research institutions, which serves as a reference for anyone interested in the subject. The guide by Venture for Fund Raising is a good addition but its effectiveness will need to be assessed after it has been used by a wide set of research institutions across various regions. The tools for the resource mobilization workshops need to be made more user-specific. This work will have to be developed by consultants as they plan to provide services to a given institution or group of institutions.

In conclusion, what has been achieved with the available tools has made the capacity building process effective but substantial work is needed to improve their appropriateness under different contexts.

¹⁵ Studies on Emerging Donors were carried out for Brazil, China, India and South Africa. Other studies were conducted for Africa, Middle East and North Africa to identify possible consulting capacity. The reports are referenced in Annex C.

2.4.3 Perceptions of the Design and Implementation of the CBRM Project

Individuals who have been involved in various aspects of the CBRM Project provided their views regarding what they appreciated and what they felt could be improved. The following is a collection of these and each of them actually reflects the opinions of more than one person. Information was collected, as described in the methodology, as well as from informal discussions with a wider group during various workshops. It therefore represents how the project was perceived. It is presented here to provide PBDD with a tool for future planning in the event the project is continued in one form or another. Tables 16 and 17 show the views of various people involved in the project regarding the design and implementation respectively of the project.

Table 16. What respondents appreciated and would like improved in the project design

Project Design
<p>Appreciated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following activities were very important and useful: training of trainers; map of contributors; training on techniques for developing strategies for resource mobilization; exchanges and testimonies by participants; the Mini Grant funds • The project was a global initiative, targeting all the regions with consistent messages and methods • The CBRM Project allowed PBDD Officers to be as creative as possible in working with partners to design the assistance according to their needs, and to try out new intervention methods with the consultants • The contents of the training modules were very good • The community of practice in resource mobilization was useful • The collaboration between the CBRM Project and the other programs, including financial contributions was a good thing for the Centre • CBRM made partners to understand that they cannot depend on just one donor
<p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a wish for the contents of the capacity building to be standardized, so as to make them much more applicable to a wider range of institutions • There should be tools for better monitoring and evaluation of; a resource mobilization program; a strategic plan; communication plan • Consultants at times did not fully understand the programs of institutions before developing their tools for intervention • Available resource mobilization materials have been developed for fundraising from sources such as private charities/individuals. These are not appropriate for the research granting institutions and development agencies, which fund research institutions. The CBRM Project needs to use consultants with expertise in fund-raising from these traditional sources of research funds • Some regions lagged behind in CBRM activities. Resource persons were few in these regions and IDRC personnel had to spend substantial time helping them to understand the context in which partners work. • Not enough opportunities existed to share information and experiences across regions • Some resource persons only understood fundraising and would therefore need to acquire expertise in organizational development, to effectively support clients • The coordination of the project was difficult. The coordinator had to keep abreast of all activities in all regions. This work was part-time, making it a challenge to keep up with the details. Much time was lost communicating. This caused lapses in effective monitoring and follow-up • The results of the evaluation on the operation of the network of the community of practice in resource mobilization have not yet been communicated to partners • There was a lack of continuity for some activities. This left partners hoping for a follow-up. • Not enough information is available to disseminate • There was a lot of competition for funds. From the partners' perspective the funding process was long

Table 17. What respondents appreciated and would like improved in project implementation

Project Implementation
<p>Appreciated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBDD staff understood the challenges being faced by research institutes and had many relevant ideas. • The good consultation and collaboration with the PBDD officers; very receptive to ideas proposed.

- Conception and defense, by Program Officers, of activities that were of interest to partners
- CBRM Project built the capacity of organizations in developing countries that will serve them well in the long-term
- Potential for sustainability has been created for research partners by introducing them to resource mobilization techniques
- Project has “pushed” partners to pay attention to organizational development
- All program officers were involved in real teamwork, using available funds to work together
- It was a good feeling to provide funds to organizations that normally could not have such funds and to see them improve themselves.
- Program officers learned more about IDRC research partners and this was very stimulating
- The motivation provided by IDRC was priceless
- Workshops gave self-confidence to institutions, using different techniques and strategies that allowed them to search for funding with serenity and effectiveness, and to find solutions to the needs of institutions in resource mobilization
- Advice obtained from IDRC on reorienting institutional action plans.
- Training of trainers workshops allowed knowledge to be shared on the mobilization of resources throughout a region
- Training tools served to inform institutions regarding the availability and use of training methods used in resources mobilization
- The community of practice in resource mobilization and the sharing of resources on-line were appreciated.
- The involvement of local trainers to work with the CBRM Project in their own country was beneficial.
- The administration of funds was user-friendly for some research institutions
- Good communication existed between the IDRC Evaluation Unit and PBDD

Areas for Improvement

- Training was not provided to staff before they started managing the project. The training-through-practice took place in parallel with the execution of the project, which is not considered a good strategy. Training should have taken place before the project started
- The grant system was not nimble enough to quickly provide funds needed for the work. There was a need to find an effective way of getting funds out to partners in a timely manner. Partners were thus constrained to carry out the work in a much shorter time
- It appeared as if value was not given to the CBRM Project by IDRC
- The CBRM project was perceived as a side activity and not really central to the work of PBDD. As such time dedicated to it is not given high consideration. This perception can be eliminated by giving the CBRM Project more recognition and a higher priority
- Transaction costs were high
- The lack of a research element in the CBRM Project is something that is missing in the project and something that would have given it more credibility
- It is perceived that there is not enough time and freedom for PBDD officers to document the effects of the CBRM project such as case studies.
- Too much time was spent to get the job done after work hours. No benefits were obtained for that.
- There has been a lack of rigor in the implementation of the CBRM Project. There was a need to make firm and clear conclusions based on evidence
- There has not been any meaningful database. No systematic collection and arrangement of the information pertaining to project (e.g., profile of partners, who has done what, when where, what effects noticed, etc). There is therefore no way of easily accessing information easily to, for example, group people or institutions by activities in which they have been involved.
- The CBRM Project did not have a full time coordinator. This has challenged the implementation of the project.
- The designated coordinator had no powers. Should have been a person that supervises others to carry out the activities of the project.
- The work within CBRM was considered to be dispersed. The implementation was not well structured to think of the workload of PBDD officers. They were over challenged.
- There was an overwhelming feeling that there has been a lack of follow-up in this project. For example, little is known about how the institutions did after the support provided ended.
- No planned or visible exit strategy by the PBDD regarding how each recipient will be left on its own, regarding how the project will move on after funding stopped. This was a general feeling expressed by many key informants.
- Some partners felt that IDRC was only interested in getting them to write the case studies after providing a small sum for funding.

- Substantial funds were given to various institutions for the development of strategic plans. These activities were however implemented without sufficient guidance on how to prepare strategic plans using consultants. This in many ways did reduce the effect of the project on the institutions. Institutions did not know what to do and waited for direction from IDRC. The strategic plans of the institutions therefore did not have the key elements needed, in some cases.
- Time for training of some partners was considered short.
- Working with consultants on one hand and with partners on the other hand, was considered to be very labor-intensive. A lot of time was spent on communications. PBDD officers had to do this to get the activities moving and on track.
- Some partners have been destabilized by frequent changes of PBDD officers with whom they had to work.

2.5 Complementarity Between CRBM Project and Other IDRC Activities

This project is aligned with IDRC's mandate of providing support to research institutions in developing countries. Its activities have been carried out in collaboration with other programs within IDRC. Resources have in several cases been pooled to support the work. Program officers in other Program Initiatives have worked with PBDD officers to develop capacity building workshops involving several research institutions with similar interests. The response from IDRC program staff regarding this collaboration has been very positive and they wish that it can continue. Institutions that have benefited from the CRBM Project and which are also receiving research support from IDRC have become more sensitized to the benefits of good management. Their efforts for better governance have in turn helped them to plan better and to carry out their research.

The CRBM Project is also important for IDRC's networks from the point of view of sustainability. Two studies commissioned by IDRC on developing a devolution strategy for the Climate Change Adaptation in Africa Program¹⁶ and on evaluating the Centre's experience with the devolution of secretariats¹⁷ have shown the importance of funding in ensuring the sustainable operation of devolved secretariats. In effect, those institutions with sound organizational management and constant sources of revenue have the greatest chances of survival. It therefore is logical to assume that building the capacity of existing IDRC-supported networks, through the CRBM Project, as was for example the case for EEPSEA and Telecentre.org, was both complementary and useful.

The Think Tank Initiative, which is being implemented by IDRC, has the mandate to strengthen independent economic and policy research institutions. This Initiative will be able to collaborate with some of IDRC's research institutions linked to economic and policy research due to its mandate. There should therefore be opportunities for future collaboration, where institutions in the Think Tank network can participate in CRBM capacity building activities.

2.6. Performance of PBDD

Various aspects related to the success of the project have been discussed above and comments regarding the performance have inevitably surfaced in one form or another. This section brings together some key elements that help to assess the performance of PBDD in carrying out the CRBM Project. It points out various strengths and weakness which should be useful in planning future work.

¹⁶ Devolution of The Climate Change Adaptation in Africa Programme: Experience to Date and Strategic Options, Final Report, Michael W. Bassey and Stephen Yeo, August 2009

¹⁷ Evaluation of the International Development Research Centre's Experience with the Devolution of International Secretariats, Jim Armstrong and Alexa Khan, The Governance Network™, June 22nd, 2009

2.6.1 Coordination of the CBRM Project

Some PBDD officers participated in the CBRM Project. They carried out this task in addition to their usual responsibilities related to partnership and partnering within the division. Coordination of the activities of this project was supposed to be a full time position but this did not happen. PBDD officers had to deliver results within a context where it appeared that the CBRM Project was accorded a lower priority compared to other PBDD tasks.

The designated part-time coordinator of the project, a PBDD officer, had the task of reviewing proposals and approving funding that was in the annual work plan. As mentioned earlier this person had no authority to supervise other colleagues. Supervision of the project was decentralized, with the PBDD officer in each region taking responsibility for activities. Substantial work was thus done within the project in many areas, in several locations, within several institutions, involving many people. Each part of the system worked well but it lacked a systematic pulling together of various aspects of the project to make it more cohesive. A clear plan for the coordination of the project appeared to be missing. Thus, no single PBDD officer had the mandate to play a full coordinating role with the responsibility that would allow for decision-making, adequate monitoring and reporting. The success of the project was based partially on the interest, perseverance, dedication and the collegiality that existed between PBDD officers, and coordination at the regional-level.

The time needed by PBDD officers to supervise the activities was underestimated. Challenges occurred due to difficulties of communication and working across different time zones. The work was time-intensive because they had to assist both consultants and institutions implementing various activities. Each staff therefore had to manage the work within her region.

Notwithstanding the above comments about coordination, an assessment of the quantity of activities carried out and the quality of their execution is very positive. Good quality training has been provided for many individuals and institutions have been positively influenced in resource mobilization as well as in organizational management. Overall, partner institutions, their staff, and consultants providing services to the project, have a positive view regarding the performance of PBDD in coordinating various aspects of the project.

The approach adopted in Asia contributed to the good results obtained. A special arrangement there allowed for the development and use of only one strategy for Asia covering SARO and ASRO. The two PBDD officers there worked effectively as a team from the start and learned from each other. Looking at Africa and the relatively meager human capacity available for training etc, one may wonder if a similar informal but coordinated approach cannot be considered for a future CBRM Project. It may have merits in improving efficiency and the performance of PBDD staff.

Given the regional specificity of such a project, in terms of institutions, manpower, socio-economic realities, cultures and traditions, it is felt that the coordination of the project would have benefited from a more active involvement of the Regional Offices. Discussions with Regional Directors indicate strong interest in the CBRM activity. They see this as a means of fostering IDRC's mandate by helping institutions to become more sustainable. This leads to the question of whether there is any added role Regional Offices could have played in the coordination of the project, and indeed if there is room for such input in the future. Regional Offices may be able to accelerate the strengthening of institutions by considering this scenario, for example:

- PBDD officers will be located in regional offices to carry out work, based on defined strategies
- Funds will be allocated by regions and the PBDD officers will collaborate with other program officers at the regional level to identify the appropriate institutions and individuals
- All activities for the region will be managed at the regional office level including monitoring of activities
- Regional Directors will be encouraged to stimulate interaction between PBDD officers and other program officers
- Monitoring of the project will be uniform for all regions using similar methodologies, information gathering systems and databases, which can be easily combined into a single and coherent database
- A CBRM coordinator will have the task of ensuring coherence in the development of common tools, monitoring, documentation, exchange and dissemination of information between the various regions, etc

This example is only used to illustrate a possible method of involving Regional Offices in the project, realizing that there are others and that there may be constraints to its implementation.

2.6.2 Responsiveness to Partners Needs and Innovativeness

The effectiveness of PBDD officers depended on the institutions and individuals with whom they collaborated. The choice of these institutions appears to have been based on previous interactions between them and IDRC. What were the criteria and process used to ensure that the choices were good and to support one institution compared to another? It may not be possible to answer this question now but if the project takes a larger dimension in the future, it would be useful to define such criteria and process. This is important because with an anticipated large number of institutions that will be interested in capacity building it may be necessary to demonstrate a rational basis for making choices.

The ease of responding to the needs of partners depended on their experience in defining their problems. Some partners knew what they wanted whereas others were not sure where to start. Institutions in general required assistance in defining their course of action. This created more work for PBDD officers who obviously did not have the time and perhaps the expertise to provide this support. Some partners indicated that they expected more guidance than that provided, which is not surprising, taking note of the wide range of their needs. This sentiment may be alleviated in the future by defining the extent of IDRC's support during the early stages of discussion with research institutions.

It appears that the CBRM Project assumed that all institutions needed to mobilize resources. Although this might have been true for the majority of institutions, some institutions might not have had a problem with the availability of funds. Their needs were more oriented towards strengthening their overall management system. Another aspect related to responsiveness to needs was the important issue regarding who within an institution was the most appropriate to receive training in CBRM. Obviously, certain persons would have been best suited for such capacity building investments.

Another issue that emerged from this study is whether the CBRM Project responded adequately to specific concerns of research institutions allowing them to be competitive. Given the emergence of various subject areas for research within climate change, energy, global economics, education, health, etc, the CBRM project could have considered preparing groups of

institutions, by developing their capacities to mobilize resources in these areas. Such interventions would be useful and would allow the project to work with specific groups of institutions, strengthening them to compete effectively for resources. This approach could be considered in the next phase if the CBRM Project.

PBDD personnel have in general been ranked highly by partners regarding their responsiveness and flexibility. These attributes allowed the project activities to be oriented towards the needs of the individuals and institutions, while giving these partners substantial confidence in themselves. This responsiveness and interest has been manifested by the attendance of several IDRC staff from other programs in workshops. For example the presence of the Vice-President of Resources and the Director of Administration and Finance at the Organizational Development Workshop in Dakar in September/October 2009 was a good example of this recognition and support for the needs of research institutions. It also indicated that IDRC is serious about what the CBRM Project intended to achieve.

The CBRM Project was innovative. There is no information available to this consultant regarding any similar project being supported by any donor. Donors do not normally develop the capacities of their partners in resource mobilization. This makes the project unique and therefore puts IDRC in the forefront of capacity building for the sustainable operation of research institutions. The approach adopted by the project in using activities that were complementary (toolkit development, workshops, mini grants, advisory services, etc) provided partners with options to allow them to develop at their own pace.

There is however a danger that expectations may rise significantly, causing demand to be greater than available resources. This is in fact expected and is not perceived to be a bad thing. It would indicate the success of the CBRM Project and the need for IDRC to perhaps look at how it may modify and incorporate this support into its overall programming. It could also be an opportunity for IDRC to build partnerships with other donor institutions for a more concerted provision of support to research institutions in strengthening institutional capacity.

2.6.3 Availability of Resources and Their Use

2.6.3.1 Financial Resources

The perception among PBDD officers is that the project had adequate funds to carry out the planned activities. It was not possible to exhaust all available funds possibly due to human resource constraints or due to the low absorptive capacity of the research partner institutions. Finances therefore did not appear to hinder the project from performing or from being effective. As pointed out earlier, more funds were used in Asia compared to the other regions due to the presence of: PBDD officers in regional offices; good CBRM consultants; and stronger institutions.

Some partners felt that funds were sufficient whereas others felt they needed more. Some of those who needed more funds would not have been able to manage them. This raises questions regarding who should receive support. Should support be provided for weaker or stronger institutions? What should be the value of financial support provided for activities? In general, the absorptive capacity of the institutions was something that was not determined before the project funds were made available. This discussion reinforces the point made earlier in Section 2.6.2, regarding the need to develop criteria for choosing institutions that were supported.

Institutions that needed more funds wanted these resources to carry out public awareness activities; carry out internal training; document work done; monitor and evaluate their progress.

2.6.3.2 Human resources

PBDD officers provided the management support needed for the CBRM Project. The officers fulfilled this role adequately despite challenges already mentioned in Sections 2.3.3.3, 2.4.1.3, and 2.6.1. This project has created an experienced team that have the competence to manage an expanded CBRM Project in the future, taking into account organizational management issues that will need to be addressed in developing the capacity of institutions. They have also developed the expertise needed to supervise the consultants needed to assist in implementing the various CBRM-related activities.

What needs to be corrected, to enhance the performance of PBDD officers, are the following:

- The CBRM Project should be prioritized within PBDD
- Recognition should be given to the time and effort devoted to the project by PBDD officers
- Leadership of the project should be determined to ensure effective coordination
- Gaps in knowledge needed to improve the performance of PBDD officers should be identified and corrective action taken

2.7 Lessons Learned

The CBRM Project collected information using the following means and documented them in following form:

- Tracer studies were carried out by PBDD
- A document “CBRM by Design” was compiled by PBDD
- A web site exists and contains a wide range of information on the activities and results of the CBRM Project
- An evaluation was carried out at the end of each activity. This was for in-house consumption but not rigorous enough to inform others of the effect of the activity on partners.
- Consultants prepared reports after each assignment
- Reports were prepared after each activity as well as travel reports by PBDD officers
- Annual team meetings provided opportunities for sharing experiences and information
- Annual project reports outlined work carried out and plans for the next year

Lessons learned from various sources, including the above, have been compiled in this study and are presented in Table 18. They concern a wide range of aspects related to this project such as: factors that caused change to occur within institutions in resources mobilization; some needs for capacity building; effects of tools and methods used; importance of effective communication; and, what affected the performance of IDRC in general. This list is not exhaustive but gives a good indication of important issues that arose from the conduct of the CBRM Project.

Table 18. Key lessons learned from the CBRM Project

Lessons Learned
<p><i>Change within Institutions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term support is required for the effects of resource mobilization capacity building to become evident. • A collection of different interventions is necessary to bring about the change needed for institutional sustainability. Institutions change by learning through doing various activities. • Organizational readiness is a key condition for organizational change to occur. PBDD in collaboration with other programs needs to better identify readiness and work with those organizations where capacity building is more likely to have an impact. • Change within an organization is caused by who is trained in resource mobilization and by having the support of top management. • Resource mobilization within an institution is effective when organizational management is enhanced and communication systems are strengthened. • Resource mobilization is not the only factor influencing organizational change within research institutions <p><i>Needs for Capacity Building</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for capacity building in organizational development and resource mobilization varies between regions. PBDD has succeeded in adopting flexible regional strategies to implement the CBRM Project. • PBDD needs to encourage the building of local expertise in CBRM training and advisory services to help create a critical mass of consultants in the regions • Training provided to research institutions in resource mobilization needs to be accompanied by additional support to maximize capacity building effects • Many institutions expect their hands to be held by IDRC in the resource mobilization process. This is why there should be clarity regarding what IDRC can offer. An exit strategy is needed for contact with each institution. <p><i>Tools and Methodologies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training often needs to be customized and adapted to specific regions and types of research partners. For example, different pedagogical tools might have to be used for networks compared to NGOs. • Mini-grants are effective as a mechanism to help research partners to put into practice and internalize the skills and techniques learned during workshops. • Using participatory methods in organizational development is effective in accurately assessing needs and promoting organizational buy-in. <p><i>Communication with Partners</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to engage with leaders since they are better positioned to facilitate widespread change within their institutions. • Partners must be informed of the expectations and limits of the project. • It is important to match the consultants to the needs of the partners. Otherwise there may be a mismatch between the absorptive capacity of the organization and the expertise of consultants providing the service. • Flexibility with partners is important as this allows them to be creative and to have confidence in what they are doing. • Community-based organizations appear to benefit the most from the CBRM Project. It seems as if it is easier to work with them. <p><i>IDRC Performance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration between CBRM and other program staff appears to occur more easily in Regional Offices compare to what happens in Ottawa. This may have to do with smaller groupings and proximity and the closer working atmosphere in Regional Offices. • Success of the CBRM Project in a region partially depends on the enthusiasm of PBDD officers and the Regional Director. • PBDD needs to improve on how to demonstrate the effectiveness of CBRM in the broader field of organizational development. There is need to properly document the effects of the project on partners. • It is necessary to have a champion within PBDD to promote the CBRM Project.

3. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE WAY FORWARD

The preceding sections presented and discussed what the project has achieved in strengthening the capacity of research institutions in resource mobilization as well as what it has learned that can help the PBDD to improve such CBRM support in the future. This section attempts to pull all the findings together to make suggestions that will help to define some possible next steps in planning a follow-up phase of the CBRM Project.

3.1 Using Lessons Learned

The CBRM Project has made substantial progress and has achieved a significant part of its objectives. PBDD and other IDRC staff now have some appreciation regarding the needs of institutions in various regions, their receptiveness to capacity building, what approaches work, possible modalities for collaboration between programs, and weaknesses to be addressed. Also shown by this study are the synergies that exist between the CBRM Project and other initiatives within the Centre. Program officers have come to realize the value that the CBRM project brings to their programs. In general, it appears that the justification for capacity building in resource mobilization has been made and understood, through his project.

The CBRM Project can influence decisions within the Centre by providing information on its accomplishments in very clear terms. This is a challenge, given that it has not been done systematically over the years. A concerted effort will therefore have to be made to bring together all the information of this project to demonstrate how the institutions in particular have been affected. This will imply a significant documentation of results with the close collaboration of the partner institutions. In order to get out such information as soon as possible, a plan can be developed to disseminate specific information (success stories and experiences) in small amounts to senior management and internal audiences within IDRC. The information can then be re-packaged as needed for various audiences such as donors and research partners to influence them. In addition, PBDD officers and research partners can make presentations at national, regional and international events on the project's accomplishments.

3.2 What Role Can PBDD Play?

PBDD is experienced in promoting partnering. This experience in interacting with other donors and that gained within the CBRM project has reinforced the PBDD, making it a potential leader in future institutional capacity building activities within the Centre. It can help to create a higher level of awareness of the demand by research institutions to integrate organizational development into capacity building for resource mobilization. Even though this project may be known by some colleagues within the Centre, PBDD still has to show how CBRM (and potentially organizational development) can fit within the support IDRC will provide to research institutions in the future.

The PBDD will have the role of leading the development of possible models that can be used to implement future support. The task will include facilitating the definition of the type of interaction that should exist between various parts of the Centre to incorporate the capacity building of institutions within its programs. This can be done if the PBDD establishes itself as the division that understands the issues related to making institutions effective and more sustainable. In order to achieve this, it will be necessary for staff to develop expertise in research related to strengthening research institutions and establish some links with organizations (such as universities) with the relevant research experience in capacity building.

3.3 Future Programming

It is assumed here that there is general agreement that the CBRM Project has produced interesting and useful results and there is interest to use what has been learned to further provide capacity building to research organizations. It is also assumed that the CBRM Project will continue its activities in another phase. This section then discusses some ideas regarding actions that may be taken in planning possible future interventions; basically this concerns the next steps in the short- and medium-term; over a period less than five years.

3.3.1 Demand for Resource Mobilization

All research institutions need financial resources, hence the need to mobilize resources. They can only achieve this through making themselves visible and marketable. This is done by improving how their institutions operate. In general, institutions do not have a well thought out long-term strategy, which is needed to guide their actions towards their mission. There is therefore a demand for capacity building to improve how institutions function so that they can better define their needs, map out the work they want to do and then search for appropriate resources to meet the needs. Demand for the range of activities involving organizational management and resource mobilization is high. It will be necessary to ensure that activities include: strategy development, work planning, project development, monitoring and evaluation, and customized resource mobilization planning. Attention will also need to be paid to creating the critical mass of consultants needed in various regions to support the institutions.

3.3.2 Needs of Research Partners

Future work by PBDD will obviously be determined by the needs of the research partners. This study obtained the input of various institutions and individuals regarding their perceived future needs in CBRM. The list is presented below in Table 19.

Table 19. Future needs of research institutions for the future

Future Needs Expressed by Partners	
Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions need expertise on: how to gather information to help them develop their strategy • More members of institutions need to be trained in the basics of resource mobilization • Develop a good process of gathering/packaging important information and communicating them effectively to collaborators and donors.
Advice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More guidance is needed regarding how institutions can do their own fundraising • Institutions need guidance on how to search for potential donors • There is need for periodic advice, guidance, mentoring on general issues
Financial Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial resources to document case studies and share results on a larger scale. • Most organizations want to be in the mainstream of resource mobilization. They want to be part of networks to enable them to link with like-minded people and potential donors

The support needed by research institutions can be grouped into three areas: training (which includes sensitizing and informing them regarding what they can do to improve their overall performance); providing advice to assist them to make the appropriate decisions and best choices; financial support to help them to have access to training and advice. In future interaction it is important for IDRC to outline the extent of its support at the start as well as define an exit strategy for each intervention. This is important because, institutions always have needs and will keep making requests if limits are not set.

3.3.3 Documentation of Past Work

There is a need for PBDD to highlight the results of the CBRM Project and its importance in improving the performance and sustainability of research institutions. It is important for PBDD to do this to maintain its leadership role. Time and resources should be dedicated to find out what happened and what has worked well. Some available information that can be used include: documents already mentioned earlier, including Project Completion Reports (PCR), results of this evaluation; and the study on the work of Telecenter.org in Asia. It would be useful to put all of this information together to inform IDRC and donors of the concrete results obtained by this project.

3.3.4 Research Component

The remark regarding incorporating research into a future phase of the CBRM Project has been made earlier in Section 3.2. This point is very important and will therefore be expanded on here. The preceding Section 3.3.3 on documenting results indicates the need to obtain convincing information, based on hard evidence and analysis of past work and potential wider impacts of the interventions. Research can therefore play a catalyzing role in a future CBRM Project. This will serve to strengthen the credibility of the role of PBDD within and outside the Centre.

Alliances can be developed with research organizations and universities, which have the relevant experience in capacity building in resource mobilization, and related components of organizational development. Such interaction will help PBDD to generate and disseminate knowledge, and develop materials on various aspects for each region. Some areas for research may include:

- What makes an institution succeed in mobilizing funds?
- What are the conditions that determine the organizational readiness of an organization?
- How can the absorptive capacity of an institution be determined for CBRM support?
- How specific should tools be for them to be useful to an institution?
- What critical changes should an institution make in its overall management for it to have a viable resource mobilization strategy?

3.3.5 Possible Entry Points

3.3.5.1 PBDD Staff Development

PBDD officers have acquired substantial expertise and experience in resource mobilization, through the CBRM Project. Most of the knowledge has been acquired on the job but there are obviously some gaps, which can be identified and rectified. This should be considered so as to fully strengthen the resource mobilization skills of the officers involved in the next phase of the project through professional development training.

While it is a useful approach to build on the CBRM experience and to provide improved support in this area, there is a need for some support in organizational development even though the dominant entry point is resource mobilization. Opportunities should therefore be found to enrich the knowledge of PBDD officers in organizational management whenever this is possible.

3.3.5.2 A CBRM Phase II

3.3.5.2.1 Sources of Funds

The present mode of funding for the CBRM Project has worked well. Future funds for the project can be allocated directly to PBDD, from program funds used to support research projects, or programs jointly funded by other donors. The extent of this type of pooling of funds will depend on the felt need for institutional capacity building within the Centre and on the creativity of IDRC staff. Such collaboration will strengthen the overall reach of the project and at the same time increase the profile of IDRC in this specific area of CBRM.

Grant sizes have been a source of discussion with several partners. Since this is to some extent subjective, it is felt that future activities should have grant sizes, which experience has shown can be absorbed by institutions. These seem to range between CAD\$10,000 and CAD\$50,000. Grants for individuals to participate at workshops will be substantially lower.

3.3.5.2.2 Structure of CBRM Phase II Project

The view is unanimous among research institutions and IDRC that the CBRM project should evolve to another phase. The issue discussed in this section concerns the possible structure of the program.

In order to strengthen the coordination of the CBRM Project, consideration should be given to setting it up as a unit somewhere within the Centre, as an IDRC capacity building activity. This unit can be housed anywhere within the Centre but given the partnering mandate of PBDD and its experience with the CBRM Project, this division may have a comparative advantage over others. It has competent staff with the relevant experience and interest, which should allow it to build on the previous phase without difficulties.

The case for housing a phase II project within Programs should also be made to provide another option. Capacity building is aimed at institutions that carry out projects supported by various Initiatives within the Centre. The question may be asked; why not house a wider phase II CBRM Project within Programs? This arrangement has a potential advantage because part of the funds earmarked for a given project can be used for strengthening the institution. This would be similar to the way monitoring and evaluation is incorporated into most projects that are financed by IDRC. The proximity of the project to the various Initiatives may make collaboration easier. The downside, however, is that a “new” activity will have to be created within an entity of IDRC that has little expertise and prior experience in the area of CBRM.

A coordinator or project leader will have to be identified to play a strong coordinating role in a second phase. The person should have the mandate to supervise the work so that it is conducted in an organized and cohesive manner, while encouraging input from throughout the Centre. Possible skills needed would include; CBRM, strong leadership, ability to interact with others on organizational development issues, and interest in research.

Another mode for CBRM support could be directly through individual research projects. In this case no CBRM Project unit exists but financial support for capacity development for the recipient is provided by project funds, similar to monitoring and evaluation within projects. Recipients are then strictly responsible for the implementation of the capacity building activity using locally hired human resources. While this process may work well for a few institutions it is doubtful that it will attain the high level of success desired, due to the difficulties research

institutions have in managing the organizational development process. In such a case, the consultants facilitating the process will have to be very capable in playing a highly catalytic role. There is also room for significant confusion because several IDRC projects may provide CBRM support to the same institution.

In view of the above it would appear strategic for PBDD to continue to manage the next phase of the CBRM Project but with added mechanisms that will allow it to become an effective service for strengthening research institutions being supported by IDRC.

3.3.5.2.3 Links Within IDRC

Think Tank. It is felt that strong collaboration could exist between a future CBRM Project and the Think Tank Initiative. While both activities are separate, the Think Tank has a component to support the organizational development of independent social and economic institutions that will be complementary to the CBRM Project. It will be necessary for these two activities to find areas for collaboration, which in turn will be beneficial for developing country institutions.

Regional Comptroller Input. In order to embed CBRM within the Centre, some thought should be given to how modifications to procedures would help the process. One possibility would be to involve Regional Comptrollers in the early stages of the development of projects, to assess the status of institutions and their ability to manage funds. (Regional Comptrollers are presently involved in project development after discussions have reached an advanced stage.) This would allow for fuller Centre involvement in the capacity building process. In effect this will develop a stronger culture of collaboration within IDRC.

Regional Office Input. Strong support for the CBRM Project has been noted at the Regional Office level. The possibility of having funds allocated by regions was mentioned earlier in this report. What is important however is to have strong involvement of the Regional Offices because this seems directly linked to a successful capacity building activity. A possible approach is to choose a manageable number of research institutions to work with in each region and develop an implementation plan for them in resource mobilization. The development of such a plan for a region would benefit from the input of the regional office and staff. The role of various training organizations and consultants will be developed during the development of the regional plans. In this way the CBRM Project will work with an initial number of research institutions and then move on to others in a progressive manner, allowing many of them to benefit from the capacity building activities. This process can also be helpful in strengthening groups of partners such as; universities, networks, Program Initiatives (such as Acacia), etc, before devolution.

A CBRM Phase II Project will benefit from the legacy of the original project in various regions. A number of training courses in resource mobilization and organizational development can now be dispensed by local consultants. This should substantially reduce the number of training courses organized by IDRC staff and it will be cost effective to support institutions to attend them. The approach of holding individualized strategic planning workshops, where the resource persons assist the participants to do an organizational review, use models and tools to identify their potential donors and collaborators, and then develop an action plan, has been used. This has been shown to be effective and can be adapted to a larger context in a future project, freeing staff to concentrate on other capacity development issues.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section outlines key conclusions and recommendations drawn from the preceding sections. The conclusion section is divided into three sections: main effects of the project; observations regarding the overall implementation; management and coordination aspects. Recommendations are grouped under documentation and dissemination of results, suggestions for defining Phase II, management and coordination, research issues, strengthening staff expertise, and the development and use of tools.

4.1 Conclusions

Effects of CBRM Project

- C1. The CBRM Project has put in place a strong base from which future and wider intervention on capacity building in resource mobilization can be carried out.
- C2. Based on the assessment of the content, quantity and geographical coverage of the activities for the CBRM Project, the first three objectives have been satisfactorily achieved, whereas the other two have only being partially achieved.
- C3. The CBRM Project has helped research institutions to obtain increased funding from donors, diversify their donor base, and become more self-sufficient.
- C4. The CBRM Project has sensitized many research institutions to the need for developing resource mobilization strategies. They have also realized the necessity to have a well managed organization in order to mobilize resources. Many of them have therefore transformed their operations by adopting sound organizational management practices.
- C5. The CBRM Project complemented existing activities within the Centre, such as strengthening some IDRC Programs for devolution. It can also play a useful role in providing support to the capacity building of institutions within the Think Tank Initiative

Implementation Aspects

- C6. The demand for capacity building in resource mobilization by IDRC research partners is high.
- C7. Organizational development is an integral part of capacity development in resource mobilization.
- C8. The activities used for capacity building, such as training workshops, training tools and Mini Grants were well carried out and led to the strengthening of research institutions and individuals in resource mobilization.
- C9. Useful training tools for resource mobilization have been developed within the CBRM Project and can be adapted for use by various IDRC research partners in various regions.
- C10. Training organizations and individual consultants have provided useful service to research institutions in resource mobilization, but there is a shortage of these service providers in all regions

C11. Three constraints why some research institutions do not benefit quickly from capacity building training are: inability of the institutions to exactly define their needs; lack of funds to pay for consultancy services; and, lack of a critical mass of on-the-ground consultants.

C12. It takes time for research institutions to acquire the expertise needed to manage their programs effectively. Deliberate, persistent but phased support and guidance is required for them to become self-sufficient in resource mobilization.

Management and Coordination

C13. The CBRM Project has not been systematically monitored to collect data on the effects of the activities on research institutions and individuals.

C14. IDRC has not been adequately informed of the results of the CBRM Project.

C15. The overall management of the CBRM Project has been challenged by the inadequate provision of resources for coordination and the project not being prioritized within PBDD.

C16. The CBRM Project was more active in Asia compared to Africa, Latin America and the Middle East due to the presence of PBDD officers, more experienced trainers and stronger institutions.

4.2 Recommendations

Documentation and Dissemination of Results

R1. The results of the CBRM Project should be collected and documented (in collaboration with IDRC partners) and used to communicate the resource mobilization effects within and outside the Centre. [Sections 2.3.1, 3.1 and 3.3.3]

R2. IDRC should consider including information on resource mobilization of research partners in documents such as Project Completion Reports to show their success in leveraging funds. This would be a good way of mainstreaming CBRM into the overall capacity building system and support process of IDRC. It would also sensitize research partners to the importance IDRC attaches to their capacity to obtain other sources of funds for sustainability. [Section 2.3.4.1]

Defining Phase II

R3. A Phase II CBRM Project should be viewed as an extension of IDRC's current partnership efforts and should be built on the wide base for reflection that has been created by work done so far. [Section 2.3.3.3]

R4. Given the good performance of the CBRM Project under PBDD, IDRC should consider a continuation of this project under the management of this division. The division has staff with relevant competence and experience. [Section 3.3.5.2.2]

R5. Consultants who have provided CBRM support and research institutions have developed significant experience regarding future directions for a second phase project. IDRC should consider soliciting the views of some of these partners during the planning stages of a second

phase. This can be done by holding a meeting to obtain opinions regarding future activities and approaches. [Section 2.4.2.1]

R6. In the interest of reducing difficulties regarding the financial management of a Phase II CBRM Project, the PBDD should ensure that the Grants Administration Division is fully involved in the development of project (Section 2.4.1.3)

R7. Given the positive effects the CBRM Project has had on various groups, and the high level of interest shown by research institutions to strengthen their institutions, IDRC may be faced with increased requests for capacity building. The Centre could therefore consider having internal discussions on what added role it can play, apart from the CBRM Project, in institutional capacity development. [Sections 3.1 and 3.2]

Management and Coordination of Project

R8. A Phase II CBRM Project should consider having a coordinator or a project leader with the authority and flexibility to ensure adequate planning implementation, monitoring and documentation of all components of the project. [Sections 2.4.1.3 and 3.3.5.2.2]

R9. There is evidence that pooling of efforts across Asia has had good effects within the CBRM Project. Consideration should therefore be given to coordinating the activities of a next phase across regions using a single strategy. Activities can then be implemented by regional blocks (Africa, Middle East, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean) to maximize the use of staff and available expertise for support. [Section 2.6.1]

R10. Research institutions that will benefit from CBRM Project support could be chosen, using well defined criteria including, need, absorptive capacity, level of organizational management and involvement with IDRC. [Section 2.6.2]

R11. IDRC should consider giving Regional Offices a greater role in the overall implementation of future CBRM activities. Funds could be allocated by regions, with Regional Directors facilitating collaboration with programs in the region. [Sections 2.4.1.3 and 2.6.1]

R12. Regional Comptrollers should be involved in the early stages of the development of projects, to assess the status of institutions and their ability to manage funds. This will help to identify institutions that may benefit from the CBRM Project. [Section 3.3.5.2.3]

Research Considerations

R13. IDRC should consider the addition of a research component within the CBRM Project, aimed at generating knowledge, developing resource mobilization materials and alliances with research organizations and universities [Section 3.3.4]

R14. Organizational readiness and absorptive capacity play an important role in the ability of a research institution to benefit from CBRM planning and implementation. A component of future CBRM research should be aimed at understanding organizational readiness and absorptive capacity of organizations and developing tools to measure them. [Sections 3.3.4 and 2.6.3.1]

Strengthening Expertise

R15. The number of competent consultants who can offer CBRM services to research institutions needs to be increased in certain regions. The CBRM Project should consider building the capacity of individual consultants and consultant organizations in less endowed regions such as Africa and Latin America. This can be achieved through training and by them gaining experience through working with research institutions. [Section 2.3.3.2]

Tools

R16. The range of tools available for CBRM should be improved, customized to make them more user-specific and their use promoted. This can be carried out by assessing existing tools, understanding their use and effectiveness, and making improvements as required. [Section 2.4.2.3]

ANNEX A. EXPECTED OUTCOMES OUTPUTS AND RESULTS FOR THE CBRM PROJECT

The following is excerpted from the CBRM proposal and regroup the expected Outcomes, Outputs and Results. It provides a view of areas and people that were targeted and what was in general expected from the CBRM Project.

People

- increased number of individuals from IDRC research partners in various regions with greater awareness of, and better skills in fundraising techniques
- training of trainers and experts in resource mobilization from within IDRC research partner networks, and/or other groupings, who provide training within their regions

Organizations

- strengthened capacity of organizations which have undergone training and/or received customized advice for strategic planning and management skills in aligning their communication and resource allocation strategies with their resource mobilization strategies
- strengthened research networks with robust governance, stronger coordination, and greater knowledge of options important to address financial sustainability;

Relationships

- a new contact network of resource mobilization practitioners;
- strengthened relationships between IDRC and other donors by sharing lessons learned and occasionally engaging in joint activities

PBDD

- PBDD officers with enhanced skills in providing advisory services and managing capacity building in resource mobilization
- an emerging new role of PBDD within IDRC, and of IDRC within the international cooperation community of fostering resource mobilization skills development and as a consequence, new capacity:
 - o Research partner and/or IDRC authored articles published in resource mobilization and related periodicals
 - o via PBDD website and intranet: availability of systematized information on what works, and what doesn't with delivering fundraising training to research organizations; variety of tools tailored to the research organization; case studies; anecdotes that can be used by trainers in resource mobilization, partners; and more.

ANNEX B. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE CBRM PROJECT

Background

1. Resource mobilization is a process that contributes to strengthening organizational capacity. A well-conceived strategic plan and communication strategy, a diversified donor base and fundraising plan, and solid management practices all contribute to organizational well-being. These are the basic elements that comprise resource mobilization.
2. The Capacity Building for Resource Mobilization (CBRM) project was designed by the Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD) in 2003. It started in May 2004 and will end in April 2010. Resource mobilization is the substantive focus of the project, with the underlying hypothesis that robust organizations can better attract and manage funding and contribute to extending project reach.
3. The program's objectives as stated in the proposal were:
 - To develop and promote customized resource mobilization tools,
 - To strengthen skill sets of research partners
 - To encourage emerging experts to contribute to building the field of resource mobilization for research for development
 - To learn from and influence the resource mobilization sector to better respond to needs of research community and related networks in South.
 - To capture learning from training activities and advisory services to enrich the entire program and to inform the evolving role of PBDD within Program and Partnership Branch.
4. The program has embraced a learning-by-doing approach and aimed to build capacity at both the individual and organizational levels. This is done primarily through workshops and more targeted advisory services. During the lifespan of the project, training workshops were the main entry point for the program. Over 230 institutions and 350 persons have attended one of the 20 workshops. The workshops have been delivered to 13 clusters of research partners, in collaboration with IDRC program initiatives, whereas the other 7 were organized specifically for network managers.
5. Almost half of components of this project has been oriented towards specific organizations and networks. On average, the budget represents \$30k per intervention over a period of 6 to 12 months. One exception however, the Chaitanya project (\$202K) which included also monitoring and evaluation capacity building and was designed as a 3 year project, and co-funded with the Evaluation Unit. Regional strategies were also defined and training of trainers was one major axis of those.
6. As per the PBDD meeting in September 2008, it was decided, to request a one-year extension to wrap up the work and documentation, conduct an evaluation and discuss future plans. This brought the project life to 6 years with its total budget of 2.572 550 dollars.
7. Since this project was PBDD's first major programming experience on capacity building, , this evaluation is an opportunity for learning,

Purposes

The main purposes of this evaluation are:

8. To have evidence of achievement of objectives of the CBRM program to date. It intends to lay out what has been achieved in terms of capacity building for the partners

involved in the training and mentoring activities, as well as the influence it had within the Centre.

9. To indicate if the process/mechanism (training workshops, post workshop follow-up; mini-grants, consultancy services) have been effective compare with other capacity building programs and approaches. .
10. To inform PBDD how to capitalize on the experience since 2004 and suggest ways that IDRC could continue to build capacity to help its research partners become more financially sustainable (some of the options that could be looked at include: extending the program; changing it; terminating it; integrating RM considerations into PI project planning; supporting research in this field; outsourcing; merging with other work on OD within IDRC, etc.). In short, this evaluation will help IDRC decide if support for resource mobilization should continue.

Users

11. Primary target users of the evaluation are:
 - PBDD team members (for learning and reflecting on next steps)
 - PBB management for information and planning IDRC
 - Senior Management for information and decision making
 - IDRC program teams
12. Secondary target audience:
 - Evaluation unit, to add to the pool of knowledge on the capacity building at IDRC
 - Trainers and organizations interested in RM capacity building

Evaluation Objectives

13. The evaluation seeks to:
 - Assess the extent to which the CBRM project has contributed to building the capacity for resource mobilization among IDRC research partners and their ability to diversify their source of funding and improve sustainability;
 - Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant award process, matching institutions needs with the appropriate consultants/training, particularly from view-point of key of supported institutions and management of the project;
 - Contribute to the reflection about the future of the program.

Questions:

14. This evaluation is guided by 3 sets of questions:
 1. Have the objectives of the project been met?
 2. How efficient have we been from the point of view of participants/ institutions and colleagues at IDRC?
 3. What have we learned that can feed into future programming at PBDD and other groups at IDRC?

Some other specific questions to be addressed in the evaluation include:

- How would key stakeholders (participants, trainers, others?) assess the project along a range of parameters (Responsive? Innovative? User-oriented?) and what would they suggest are the key positive and negative factors relating to the project design and implementation?
- Are the publications, pedagogical material and other tools of good quality?
- Did/ How did the capacity building activities of CBRM compliment the capacity building efforts of other teams within IDRC

- How this project has contributed to increase PBDD officers knowledge on fundraising, RM and philanthropy?
- What other suggestions could be made in terms of the thematic focus of future work or delivery mechanisms (resource mobilization versus organizational development), grant modalities (size of grants, training versus advisory services,) or quality and dissemination of outputs of this project?

Methodology

15. The methodology should include both document analysis and key informant interviews.

- The documents to be reviewed include: documentation concerning the project initiation, reports of the workshops and advisory services, training material, research papers, project completion report and website.
- Interviews will be used to collect information from a range of informants, IDRC staff (i.e. PBDD, Program officers, program leaders, Regional directors, as well as IDRC research partners, and trainers/consultants.
- Possible evaluators will be invited to submit a proposal, which should include a concise methodology and a budget to accomplish the work. Proposals will be reviewed by the Nicole Généreux and Katherine Hay (PBDD)
- Travel might be necessary for meeting IDRC staff and key informants.

Calendar

16. The results of the evaluation would feed into PBDD new programming (Ideally Q3)

Criteria of selection of consultant

17. Experienced in program evaluation; knowledge of fundraising and organizational development, familiar with IDRC work and approach, ideally speaking Spanish, French and English.

Roles and responsibilities

18. The consultant shall:

- Develop a detailed evaluation framework with proposed timeline and outputs
- Ensure the evaluation is implemented in a professional and timely manner,
- Maintain IDRC informed of the progress of the work
- Summit an interim report October 15, 2009
- Consolidate feedback comments from PBDD
- Summit to the Centre a final report by November 15, 2009
- Possibly present in person the results of the evaluation

IDRC shall:

- Provide access to all relevant documentation to the evaluator
- Provide any support to facilitate contact with key informants
- Provide timely feedback to the evaluator

19. Proposed Timeline

- Award contract after review of proposal (summer 2009)
- A interim report be submitted to IDRC by October 15th, 2009 for comments
- A final report submitted by November 15, 2009

ANNEX C. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- IDRC, PBDD: Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization for IDRC Research Partners.
- Proposal from PBDD to Forward Planning Fund
- Alcides Costa Vaz, Cristina Yumie Aoki Inoue, University of Brazilia, Brazil: Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The Brazil Case, December 2007
- Gregory T. Chin, B. Michael Frolic, York University, Canada: Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The China Case, December 2007
- Subhash Agrawal: Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The India Case, December 2007
- Wolfe Braude, Pearl Thandrayan, Elizabeth Sidiropoulos, South African Institute of International Affairs: Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The South Africa Case, January 2008
- Dane Rowlands, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs. Carleton University: Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: A Synthesis Report, January 2008
- Dane Rowlands, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, International Development Assistance: Executive Summary Reports, THE CASES OF BRAZIL, CHINA, INDIA AND SOUTH AFRICA
- Molly den Heyer: Monitoring Guide for the Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization Project, Prepared for Partnership and Business Development Division, International Research Development Centre, April 2005
- Charles Lusthaus, Marie-Hélène Adrien, Gary Anderson, Fred Carden and George Plinio Montalván, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C., International Development, Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada: Organizational Assessment: A Framework for Improving Performance, 2002
- Venture for Fund Raising in association with the International Development Research Centre: Resource Mobilization: A Practical Guide for Research and Community-Based Organizations, 2009
- IDRC PBDD: CBRM by Design: Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization at IDRC, January 2009
- Alfredo Ortiz and Peter Taylor, Institute of Development Studies: Emerging Patterns in the Capacity Development Puzzle: Why, what and when to measure?, 25 July 2008
- Michael W. Bassey and Stephen Yeo: Devolution of The Climate Change Adaptation in Africa Programme: Experience to Date and Strategic Options, Final Report, August 2009
- Jim Armstrong and Alexa Khan The Governance Network™: Evaluation of the International Development Research Centre's Experience with the Devolution of International Secretariats, June 22nd, 2009
- PBDD IDRC, Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization 2007-2008 Activity Report
- PBDD IDRC, Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization (CBRM) 2008-2009 Annual Report
- IDRC, Working Together to Strengthen Skills in Organizations, IDRC's Strategic Evaluation of Capacity Development, Phase 3. Evaluation Highlights, 15. May 2007
- Vivien Chiam and Kevin Kelpin, IDRC:CB-RM Asia Strategy, 3 January 2007
- Vivianne Ngugi and Lisa Burley, PBDD IDRC: ESARO CBRM Regional Strategy, Final Version. November, 2006,
- L. Burley, PBDD IDRC: LACRO CBRM Regional Strategy
- Sylvain Roy, PBDD IDRC : Stratégie du projet de Renforcement des Capacités en Mobilisation des Ressources (RCMR) pour la région du bureau du BRACO Année 2006/07 et 2007/08

- B. N. Généreux, IDRC PBDD: Reflections on Strengthening Organizational Capabilities, PBDD A. L. Burley for D. St. Pierre, Project Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization (CBRM), Nov. 2006, Update for ALF Sep 2008
- IDRC, Corporate Strategy and Program Framework 2005–2010
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, ANSAB Resource Centre: A Sustainable Way for Resource Generation, January 2008
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, The resource mobilization experience of Chaitanya, January 2008
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, Creating an Information and Knowledge System: The D.Net Way ...the experience in resource mobilization, January 2008
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, There is always a Road behind the Mountain – a Story of eHomemakers' Resource Mobilization Journey, January 2008
- Lisa Burley, PBDD IDRC Case Study, Strengthening Organizational Capacity Through the Lens of Resource Mobilization PBDD's Global Project and the Educational Research Network of West And Central Africa
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, Organizational Growth and Resource Mobilization ...the experience of Karakoram Area Development Organization (KADO), January 2008
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, Does resource mobilization matter? ...*the experience of* Local Initiatives for Biodiversity Research and Development, (LIBIRD), Nepal, January 2008
- PBDD IDRC Case Study, Embedding Resource Mobilization within Core Organizational Strategy The MITRA experience, January 2008
- Rick James and Rebecca Wrigley, INTRAC: Investigating the Mystery of Capacity Building, *Learning from the Praxis Programme*, Praxis Paper, 18, March 2007
- Catherine Toure IDRC: Questions donors typically asked about organizational capacity before making final decisions about initial requests for funding and/or renewal of funding, 11 November 2008
- Institute of Cultural Affairs: Middle East and North Africa, Trainers Scoping Study: Identifying Trainers to Assist with the Delivery of the "Capacity Building in Resource Mobilization for IDRC Research Partners (CBRM)", Final Report, March 25, 2007
- L. Burley: CBRM Training of Trainers (TOT), Development of Workshop Modules, Concept Note for PBDD Discussion, November 23, 2006

ANNEX D. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE CBRM STUDY

Objectives of the CBRM Project

- To develop and promote customized resource mobilization tools,
- To strengthen skill sets of research partners
- To encourage emerging experts to contribute to building the field of resource mobilization for research for development
- To learn from and influence the resource mobilization sector to better respond to needs of research community and related networks in South.
- To capture learning from training activities and advisory services to enrich the entire program and to inform the evolving role of PBDD within Program and Partnership Branch.

Objectives of the CBRM Evaluation Study

- Assess the extent to which the CBRM project has contributed to building the capacity for resource mobilization among IDRC research partners and their ability to diversify their source of funding and improve sustainability
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant award process, matching institutions needs with the appropriate consultants/training, particularly from view-point of key of supported institutions and management of the project
- Contribute to the reflection about the future of the program

Questions that Guide the Evaluation

- Have the objectives of the project been met?
- How efficient have we been from the point of view of participants/ institutions and colleagues at IDRC?
- What have we learned that can feed into future programming at PBDD and other groups at IDRC?

Evaluation Objectives	Evaluation Issues	Some Important Questions	Possible Sources of Data	Methodology for Data Collection
<p><i>Assess the extent to which the CBRM project has contributed to building the capacity for resource mobilization among IDRC research partners and their ability to diversify their source of funding and improve sustainability</i></p>	<p>Have the objectives of the program been met?</p>	<p>To what extent have the indicators been achieved? If not why?</p> <p>How has RM capacity changed at the individual and institutional level? Is there a plan for RM? How is it different from the past?</p> <p>To what extent have the sources of funding changed and/or funding been improved? (Diversification?)</p> <p>Has there been a change in the level of the revenue of the institution as a result of this CBRM Program? In what way?</p> <p>To what extent has the program affected the overall functioning of institutions (Public awareness strategy, strategy development, organizational capacity, programs developed)?</p> <p>How has program affected the RM skills of individuals in the institution? (Skills now compared to the past)</p> <p>To what extent has financial sustainability been affected?</p> <p>To what extent has partnering been affected as a result of the program? Has this resulted in more funds or more skills? In what way?</p>	<p>Project documents, project proposal, monitoring reports, evaluation reports, IDRC CBRM program staff Managers and staff of partner institutions Institutions finance personnel</p> <p>Managers and staff of partner institutions</p> <p>Same as above</p>	<p>Document reviews Use of questionnaires Interviews (face-to – face and telephone)</p> <p>Same as above</p>
<p><i>Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant award process, matching institutions needs with the appropriate</i></p>	<p>How efficient have we been from the point of view of participants/</p>	<p>How do IDRC partners assess the program’s (responsiveness, innovativeness, user-orientedness)? To what extent has the program responded to an</p>	<p>Managers and staff of partner institutions Reports of training workshops</p>	<p>Document reviews Use of questionnaires Interviews (face-to – face and telephone)</p>

<p><i>consultants/training, particularly from view-point of key personnel of supported institutions and management of the project</i></p>	<p>institutions and colleagues at IDRC?</p>	<p>institutional need? How new were the ideas and activities introduced by the program? To what extent did the program’s activities seek to respond to the needs of individuals as well as institutions?</p>	<p>Consultants’ reports Individuals who received training</p>	
		<p>What do IDRC partners suggest are the key positive and negative factors related to program design and implementation? What aspect of the program design you were involved in did you like or dislike? What aspect of the program implementation did you like or dislike? How could they have been improved?</p>	<p>Managers and staff of partner institutions Reports of training workshops Individuals who received training Consultants’ reports</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
		<p>How would IDRC partners assess the quality of consultants, pedagogical materials and other tools used? To what extent did the consultants meet up to your expectations? How effective were the pedagogical materials and training tools used?</p>	<p>Managers and staff of partner institutions Reports of training workshops Individuals who received training Consultants’ reports</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
		<p>What have been the relative merits of the various mechanisms used? (Appropriateness of: workshops, mini-grants, advisory services, training of trainers)</p>	<p>Managers and staff of partner institutions Reports of training workshops Individuals who received training Consultants’ reports IDRC program staff</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
		<p>Were the workshops a useful way of providing capacity building to individuals and institutions? Please explain.</p>		<p>Same as above</p>
		<p>To what extent were the mini-grants useful in strengthening the resource mobilization capacity of institutions?</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
		<p>Was the training of trainers an effective mechanism to develop capacity in reaching a wider number of individuals and institutions? Why? How was this training put into practice?</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
		<p>How useful were the tools, which were used in the workshops and training of trainers? Were there enough resources to carry out planned tasks?</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Same as above</p>
<p><i>Contribute to the reflection about the future of</i></p>	<p>What have we learned</p>	<p>What are the main lessons learned from carrying out this</p>	<p>Monitoring reports</p>	<p>Use of questionnaires</p>

<p><i>the program</i></p>	<p>that can feed into future programming at PBDD and other groups at IDRC?</p>	<p>program?</p> <p>How has this program contributed to increase PBDD program officers knowledge on fundraising, RM and philanthropy?</p> <p>What suggestions can be made regarding the thematic focus of future work?</p> <p>What delivery mechanisms can the PBDD use in future work (resource mobilization versus organizational development)?</p> <p>Suggestions regarding grant modalities (size of grants, training versus advisory services) What suggestions would you have regarding grant modalities (size and duration of grants, types of activities supported, choice of institutions)?</p> <p>How did the capacity building activities of CBRM compliment the capacity building efforts of other teams within IDRC?</p> <p>To what extent did the activities of this program affect the funding of institutions by other IDRC teams?</p> <p>How often did you receive information regarding the program? How has it been used?</p> <p>How should outputs of this program be disseminated? In what form and to whom</p>	<p>Feedback from partner institutions and their staff Consultants feedback and reports Annual Reports for program Feedback from PBDD program staff IDRC staff in other divisions</p> <p>Feedback from partner institutions and their staff Consultants feedback and reports PBDD staff</p> <p>Feedback from partner institutions and their staff Consultants feedback and reports PBDD staff</p> <p>PBDD staff Other IDRC staff</p> <p>PBDD, other IDRC and Institution personnel</p> <p>IDRC staff</p> <p>PBDD, IDRC, Institutions, Individuals</p>	<p>Interviews (face-to – face and telephone)</p> <p>Same as above</p>
---------------------------	--	--	---	--

ANNEX E. INTERVIEW GUIDES USED FOR THE EVALUATION

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR IDRC STAFF

Background

The Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD) of the International Development Research Centre designed the Capacity Building for Resource Mobilization (CBRM) Project in 2003. Activities for the program started in May 2004 and will end in April 2010. The project is aimed at strengthening the resource mobilization capacity of organizations so that they can better attract and manage funding and contribute to extending project reach.

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada has provided support to many institutions and individuals in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. IDRC has implemented the CBRM Project, depending on the needs of its research partners, using a variety of modalities such as; workshops, mini-grants, advisory services and a training of trainers activity aimed at extending the reach of the project.

IDRC is interested in evaluating the CBRM Project and has therefore commissioned Michael Bassey to carry out the study. Michael is an International Consultant with extensive experience in evaluation, organizational and strategic development, based in Dakar, Senegal. He will be assessing: the extent to which the CBRM project has improved the capacity for resource mobilization among its partners; and the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the process of implementing the project; and, how the experience gained can help IDRC to improve its program delivery.

In the coming weeks Michael will consult a wide range of institutions and individuals who have received support and/or interacted with IDRC within the framework of the CBRM project, through questionnaires, structured telephone interviews.

I kindly ask you to respond to the questions outlined below. Your responses will help me to first of all assess what impact the activities of the CBRM Project have had on various institutions and on individuals and what suggestions you may have for improving resource mobilization capacity building in the future.

Depending on responses provided, I may wish to obtain supplementary by telephone.

I wish to thank you very much for your participation and assure you of **full confidentiality** of your responses

Suggestions for filling the questionnaire

The answers provided in this questionnaire are intended to reflect your personal experiences within the project. I thought that it would be more efficient for you to reflect on these questions and provide written responses in the first instance, after which we could, if necessary, have a brief phone discussion to fill in gaps. I am however open to any other suggestions you may have. Thank you very much.

Kindly type your responses below and immediately after each question

1. You (the interviewee)

Name:

Position:

Institution:

2. Your relationship with IDRC CBRM Project

Since when have you been involved with the CBRM Project?

3. Your involvement in CBRM initiatives

3.1 Which of the following main activities of the CBRM Project have you been involved in? Please explain your overall role in the activities.

- a. Workshops
- b. Training of trainers
- c. Mini-grants
- d. Advisory services
- e. Case studies
- f. Any other activity not mentioned

4. Effectiveness of the CBRM Project – Achievement of Objectives

4.1 To what extent have the indicators for the CBRM Project been achieved? If not, why?

4.2 To what extent were resource mobilization tools customized and promoted by the project?

5. Efficiency of the CBRM Project Delivery Process

5.1 What were, in your view, the key positive and negative aspects of the project design and implementation?

5.2 What aspect of the CBRM Project design did you like or dislike?

5.3 What aspect of the program implementation did you like or dislike? How could they have been improved?

5.4 How do you assess the quality of the consultants, pedagogical materials and other tools used for training? (To what extent did the consultants meet up to your expectations? How useful were the pedagogical materials and training tools used?)

5.5 How appropriate has the Workshop mechanism been in meeting your institutions need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

5.6 Was the training of trainers an effective mechanism to reach a larger number of individuals and institutions? Why?

5.7 Were there enough resources to carry out planned tasks? Please Explain.

6. Lessons Learned and Future Programming at IDRC

6.1 What process has the PBDD used to learn from the various activities (Workshops, Training, Mini-grants, and Advisory Services) of the CBRM Project?

6.2 To what extent has the CBRM Project's experience being used, so far, to strengthen the role of PBDD within the Program and Partnership Branch?

- 6.3 To what extent were results of the CBRM Project systematically made available to staff of PBDD and other groups at IDRC? How often did you receive information regarding the program? How has it been used?
- 6.4 How has the CBRM program contributed to increase PBDD program officers' knowledge on fundraising, resource mobilization and philanthropy?
- 6.5 What were the key lessons learned from carrying out the CBRM Project?
- 6.6 What suggestions can be drawn from the CBRM Project regarding the thematic focus of future work supported by PBDD?
- 6.7 What delivery mechanisms can the PBDD use in future work (e.g., resource mobilization versus organizational development)?
- 6.8 Based on experiences gained from the CBRM Project, what comments/suggestions would you have regarding future grant modalities?
- a) Size and duration of grants
 - b) Training
 - c) Types of activities supported
 - d) Choice of institutions [IDRC]
- 6.9 How did the capacity building activities of the CBRM Project compliment the capacity building efforts of other teams within IDRC?
- 6.10 To what extent did the activities of the CBRM Project affect the funding provided by IDRC to CBRM recipient institutions by other IDRC teams?
- 6.11 How should outputs of the CBRM Project be disseminated? In what form, and to whom?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INSTITUTIONS

Background

The Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD) of the International Development Research Centre designed the Capacity Building for Resource Mobilization (CBRM) Project in 2003. Activities for the program started in May 2004 and will end in April 2010. The project is aimed at strengthening the resource mobilization capacity of organizations so that they can better attract and manage funding and contribute to extending project reach.

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada has provided support to many institutions and individuals in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. IDRC has implemented the CBRM Project, depending on the needs of its research partners, using a variety of modalities such as; workshops, mini-grants, advisory services and a training of trainers activity aimed at extending the reach of the project.

IDRC is interested in evaluating the CBRM Project and has therefore commissioned Michael Basseby to carry out the study. Michael is an International Consultant with extensive experience in evaluation, organizational and strategic development, based in Dakar, Senegal. He will be assessing: the extent to which the CBRM project has improved the capacity for resource mobilization among its partners; and the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the process of implementing the project; and, how the experience gained can help IDRC to improve its program delivery.

In the coming weeks Michael will consult a wide range of institutions and individuals who have received support and/or interacted with IDRC within the framework of the CBRM project, through questionnaires, structured telephone interviews.

I kindly ask your institution to respond to the questions outlined below. Your responses will help me to first of all assess what impact the activities of the CBRM Project have had on your institution and on individuals and what suggestions you may have for improving resource mobilization capacity building in the future.

Depending on responses provided, I may wish to obtain further information from some institutions or individuals by telephone.

I wish to thank you very much for your participation and assure you of **full confidentiality** of your responses

Suggestions for filling the questionnaire

The answers provided in this questionnaire are intended to reflect the views of your institution. In order to obtain a full response I kindly suggest that answers be based on the contributions of various persons including those who have been actively involved in activities related to the IDRC CBRM Project. Thank you very much.

Kindly type your responses below and immediately after each question

1. You (the interviewee)

Name:

Position:

Institution:

2. Your relationship with IDRC CBRM Project

2.1 Since when has your institution been involved with the CBRM Project?

2.2 Has your involvement in the CBRM Project been on a personal or institutional level?

2.3 What has been the role of your institution in the CBRM Project?

2.4 Who within your institution has been involved in the CBRM Project and how?

2.5 How has your institution interacted with other individuals and institutions within the CBRM Project?

3. Your involvement in CBRM initiatives

3.1 Which of the following main activities of the CBRM Project have your institution been involved in? Please explain your overall role in the activities.

a. Workshops

b. Training of trainers

c. Mini-grants

d. Advisory services

e. Case studies

f. Any other activity not mentioned

4. Effectiveness of the CBRM Project – Achievement of Objectives

4.1 How has the resource mobilization capacity of your institution changed as a result of your involvement in the CBRM PROJECT?

4.2 Does your institution have a plan for resource mobilization? If there is a plan for resource mobilization, how has the CBRM Project influenced the development of this plan?

4.3 To what extent have your institutions sources of funding changed since the start of your institution's involvement in the CBRM Project? (This is to find out if you have diversified your sources of funding).

4.4 Has there been a change in the level of resources mobilized as a result of the CBRM Project? Please explain.

4.5 To what extent has the CBRM Project affected the following activities within your institution?

- a) Institutional strategy development
- b) Public awareness strategy
- c) Organizational capacity
- d) Programs/projects developed

4.6 To what extent has your institution's involvement in the CBRM Project affected the financial sustainability of your institution?

4.7 To what extent has your institution's involvement in the CBRM Project affected its partnering and networking capacity?

4.8 Has this partnering/networking resulted in more funds and/or more skills? Please explain.

5. Efficiency of the CBRM Project Delivery Process

5.1 What aspect of the program implementation did you like or dislike? How could they have been improved?

5.2 How do you assess the quality of the consultants, pedagogical materials and other tools used for training? (To what extent did the consultants meet up to your expectations? How useful were the pedagogical materials and training tools used?)

5.3 How appropriate has the Workshop mechanism been in meeting your institution's need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

5.4 How appropriate has the Mini-grant mechanism been in meeting your institution's need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

5.5 How appropriate has the Advisory Service mechanism been in meeting your institution's need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

5.6 How appropriate has the Training of Trainers' mechanism been in meeting your institution's need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

5.7 Was the training of trainers an effective mechanism to reach a larger number of individuals and institutions? Why?

5.8 Were there enough resources to carry out planned tasks? Please Explain.

5.9 What further capacity strengthening would you need to improve your resource mobilization skills

5.10 How in general could the CBRM Project have responded better to your need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INDIVIDUALS

Background

The Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD) of the International Development Research Centre designed the Capacity Building for Resource Mobilization (CBRM) Project in 2003. Activities for the program started in May 2004 and will end in April 2010. The project is aimed at strengthening the resource mobilization capacity of organizations so that they can better attract and manage funding and contribute to extending project reach.

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada has provided support to many institutions and individuals in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. IDRC has implemented the CBRM Project, depending on the needs of its research partners, using a variety

of modalities such as; workshops, mini-grants, advisory services and a training of trainers activity aimed at extending the reach of the project.

IDRC is interested in evaluating the CBRM Project and has therefore commissioned Michael Basseby to carry out the study. Michael is an International Consultant with extensive experience in evaluation, organizational and strategic development, based in Dakar, Senegal. He will be assessing: the extent to which the CBRM project has improved the capacity for resource mobilization among its partners; and the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the process of implementing the project; and, how the experience gained can help IDRC to improve its program delivery.

In the coming weeks Michael will consult a wide range of institutions and individuals who have received support and/or interacted with IDRC within the framework of the CBRM project, through questionnaires, structured telephone interviews.

I kindly ask you to respond to the questions outlined below. Your responses will help me to first of all assess what impact the activities of the CBRM Project have had on you and your institution and what suggestions you may have for improving resource mobilization capacity building in the future.

Depending on responses provided, I may wish to obtain further information from you by telephone.

I wish to thank you very much for your participation and assure you of **full confidentiality** of your responses

Suggestions for filling the questionnaire

The answers provided in this questionnaire are intended to reflect your views of the CBRM Project, based on your personal experiences. Kindly direct your responses at the questions as best as possible. Thank you very much.

Kindly type your responses below and immediately after each question

1. You (the interviewee)

Name:

Position:

Institution:

Overview of your activities (About 5 lines about what you do):

2. Your relationship with IDRC CBRM Project

Since when have you been involved with the CBRM Project?

3. Your involvement in CBRM initiatives

3.1 Which of the following main activities of the CBRM Project have you been involved in?

Please explain your overall role in the activities.

- a. Workshops
- b. Training of trainers
- c. Mini-grants

- d. Advisory services

- e. Case studies
- f. Any other activity not mentioned

4. Effectiveness of the CBRM Project – Achievement of Objectives

4.1 How has your resource mobilization capacity/skills changed as a result of your involvement in the CBRM Project?

4.2 To what extent has the CBRM Project affected your involvement in the following activities within your institution?

- a) Institutional strategy development
- b) Public awareness strategy
- c) Organizational capacity
- d) Programs developed

4.3 What role has the project played in your involvement in resource mobilization networks?

5. Efficiency of the CBRM Project Delivery Process

5.1 What aspect of the CBRM Project design did you like or dislike?

5.2 What aspect of the program implementation did you like or dislike? How could they have been improved?

5.3 How appropriate has the Workshop mechanism been in meeting your need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

5.4 Was the training of trainers an effective mechanism to reach a larger number of individuals and institutions? Why?

5.5 How useful were the tools, which were used in the Training of Trainers workshops?

5.6 What further capacity strengthening would you need to improve your resource mobilization skills?

5.7 How in general could the CBRM Project have responded better to your need for capacity building in resource mobilization?

ANNEX F. LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS CONTACTED FOR THE STUDY

This list corresponds to all persons contacted for this study to seek information. They have various roles within the project. Not all persons contacted were able to respond and provide feedback. Feedback from respondents was obtained through questionnaire responses or by interviews.

Key Activity Areas: Workshops; Mini-Grants; Advisory Services; Training of Trainers

No.	Name	Position/Institution/Country	Involvement in Project	Project Activity Area	Category of Involvement	Form Sent	Form Received	Interview
1	Mr. Bishma Subedi,	Executive Director/ Asian Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources (ANSAB)/ NEPAL	Recipient	Workshops Mini Grant	Institution	Aug 28 2009	No	Yes
2	Reejuta Sharma,	Communications Officer/ Asian Network for Sustainable Agriculture and Bioresources (ANSAB)/ NEPAL	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 28 2009	No	Yes
3	Ms. Chong Sheau Ching,	Executive Director/ eHomemakers / MALASIA	Recipient	Workshop GKP Mini Grant, Case Studies	Institution	Aug 28 2009	No	Yes
4	Mr. Mahmud Hasann	Chief Operating Officer/ Bangladesh Telecentre Network / BANGLADESH	Recipient	Workshop GKP Mini Grant	Institution	Aug 28 2009	No	Yes
5	Dr. Shalab	iVolunteer / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop GKP Mini Grant	Individual	Aug 28 2009	No	No
6	Ms. Rajju Malla-Dhakal	LIBIRD / NEPAL	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 28 2009	No	No
7	Dr. Sudha Kothari	Director and Managing Trustee/ Chaitanya / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop, Case Studies,	Individual	Aug 28 2009	No	Yes

No	Name	Institution / Country	Involvement in Project	Activity Area	Category	Form Sent	Form Received	Interview
8	Dr. S. Senthil Kumar	Director, Information Program/ M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Aug 28 2009	No	No
9	Ms. Gauri Mehendele	Chaitanya / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 28 2009		Yes
10	Mr. Sachin Upadhye,	PME Coordinator/ Chaitanya / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 28 2009	No	
11	Mr. Sanjay Joshi,	Coordinator Social Program/ Chaitanya / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 28 2009	No	Yes
12	Ms. Shraddha Rawat	Chaitanya / INDIA	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
13	Gen. Surat Sandhu,	International Development Consultant/ Ex-Chair SAFRG/ INDIA	Trainer	Workshops	Individual	No	No	Yes
14	Pallavi Kumar, Chief	Executive Officer/ South East Asian Fund Raising Group (SAFRG) / INDIA	Trainer	Workshop	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	Yes	Yes
15	Dr. Kalpana Pant	Program Coordinator/ Chaitanya/ INDIA	Recipient	Workshop, Mini Grants	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
16	Marianne Mayan G. Quebral,	Executive Director/ Venture for Fundraising / PHILIPPINES	Service Provider	Workshops Mini Grants	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	Yes	No
17	Norma Galafassi, Director	In2action, Fundraising and Communications, Buenos Aires, Argentina	Trainer	Workshop	Individual Consultant	Sep 15, 2009	Yes	No
18	Terry Amuzu	Responsable adjoint de programme/ Association des Universités Africaines (AUA)	Observer	Workshop	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
19	Paco Sereme	Director General/ CORAF/WECARD / SENEGAL	Recipient	Workshop Mini-grants	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
No.	Name	Institution/Country	Involvement in Project	Activity Area	Category	Form Sent	Form Received	Interview

20	Oumar Cisse	Charge de Programme/ Institut Africain de gestion urbaine (IAGU)/ SENEGAL	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Sep 04, 2009	Yes	No
21	Pape Cire Dime	Director/ Nouveau Programme de Troisième Cycle Interuniversitaire en économie (NPTCI), Burkina Faso	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Sep 04, 2009	Yes	No
22	Kathryn Toure	Regional Director/ IDRC-WARO, SENEGAL	Collaborator	Workshop	Individual	Sept 11, 2009	N/A	Yes
23	Javed Iqbal	CEO/ Karakoram Area Welfare Organization, (KADO) / PAKISTAN	Recipient	Workshop Mini-grants	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
24	William Lyakurwa	Executive Director/ African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), KENYA	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Aug 31 2009	No	No
25	Salimata Ki Ouedraogo,	Researcher/ Association Burkinabe de Sante Publique (ASBP)/ BURKINA FASO	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Sep 04, 2009	No	No
26	Abdel-Karim Koumare,	Researcher/ Institut Recherche en Santé/Hôpital du Point G / Burkina Faso	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Sep 07, 2009	No	No
No.	Name	Institution/Country	Involvement in Project	Activity Area	Category	Form Sent	Form Received	Interview
27	Ferdosi Bergum	Executive Director/ Development of Biotechnology and Environmental Conservation Center (DEBTEC)/ BANGLADESH	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
28	Rogasian L.A. Mahuni	Institute of Traditional Medicine/ TANZANIA	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
29	Jean Christophe Bazika,	Coordonnateur/ Centre d'études et de recherche sur les analyses et les politiques économiques (CERAPE)/ CONGO	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Sep 04, 2009	Yes	No
30	Jean Rostand Kanga,	Director Finance and Administration, CORAF/WECARD/ SENEGAL	Recipient	Workshop	Individual	Aug 31, 2009	No	Yes

31	Etienne Ehile Ehouan	President/ President, Université d'Abobo Adjame/ COTE D'IVOIRE	Recipient	Workshop	Individual Institution	Sep 04,2009	No	No
32	Prof. Benjamin Fayomi, Directeur	Director/ ISBA-COPES, Université d'Abomey Calavi/ BENIN	Recipient	Workshop	Individual Institution	Sep 04, 2009	No	Yes
33	Tecle-Mireille Massouka,	Program Manager/ Education Research Network for West and Central Africa (ERNWACA)	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	Yes	No
34	Argun Kumar Puja	Acting Admin and Finance Officer/ Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development (LIBIRD)/ NEPAL	Recipient Trainer	Workshop Case Studies Trainer	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
35	Francois Ouangrawa,	Formateur, Chargé de la Mobilisation des Ressources / Association Bangr Nooma (ABN)/ BURKINA FASO	Recipient	Workshop Case Studies Trainer	Individual	Sep 04, 2009	Yes	No
36	Amosse Sawadogo,	Coordonnateur/ Association Bangr Nooma (ABN)/ BURKINA FASO	Recipient Trainer	Workshop Case Studies Trainer	Individual	Sep 04, 2009	Yes	No
37	Francisco Herminia, Directeur, 074	Director/ Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA)/ SINGAPORE	Recipient	Workshop Trainer, Mini-grants	Institution	Sep 01, 2009	Yes	No
No.	Name	Institution/Country	Involvement in Project	Activity Area	Category	Form Sent	Form Received	Interview
38	Executive Director	Executive Director/ Omar Dengo Foundation / COSTA RICA	Recipient	MiniGrants	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
39	María R. Sáenz	Executive Director/ Fondation Acceso / COSTA RICA	Recipient	MiniGrants	Institution	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
40	Kemly Camacho Jiménez	Presidente Dirección de Proyectos/ Cooperativa Sulá Vatus/ COSTA RICA	Recipient	Mini Grants	Institution	Oct 05, 2009	No	Yes
41	Stephen	Regional Director/ IDRC/ SARO	Collaborator	All	IDRC	N/A	N/A	Yes

	McGurk,							
42	Basheerhamad Shadrach	Program Office/ IDRC/ SARO	Collaborator	Workshops	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	No	Yes
43	Danielle St-Pierre	Director PBDD/ IDRC/ OTTAWA	Overseeing role for CBRM	All	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	N/A	Yes
44	Nicole Généreux	Senior Officer PBDD/ IDRC/ WARO	CBRM staff; Coordinator	All	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	N/A	Yes
45	Katherine Hay	Program Officer PBDD/ IDRC/ SARO	CBRM staff	All	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	N/A	Yes
46	Vivien Chiam	Partnership and Communications Manager/ IDRC/ ASRO	CBRM staff	All	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	Yes	No
47	Vivian Ngugi	Partnership Officer PBDD/ IDRC/ ESARO	CBRM staff	All	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	NO	Yes
No.	Name	Institution/Country	Involvement in Project	Activity Area	Category	Form Sent	Form Received	Interview
48	Suzanne Taylor,	Partnership Officer PBDD/ IDRC/ OTTAWA	CBRM staff	All	IDRC	Sep 15, 2009	N/A	Yes
49	Roonie Vernoooy	IDRC/ OTTAWA	Collaborator	Workshop	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	N/A	N/A
50	Kathleen Flynn-Dapaah,	Senior Program Office/ IDRC/ OTTAWA	Collaborator	Workshops	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	Yes	N/A
51	David Glover	IDRC/ OTTAWA	Collaborator	Workshop	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	N/A	N/A
52	Sarah Earl,	Senior Program Specialist, Evaluation Unit/ IDRC/ OTTAWA	Collaborator	Mini Grant	IDRC	Aug 31, 2009	Yes	Yes
53	Lisa Burley	IDRC/ OTTAWA	Former CBRM coordinator	All	IDRC	Sep 15, 2009	N/A	Yes
54	Liz Fajber, Consultant	Former IDRC staff	Trainer	Workshops	IDRC	Aug 31, 2009	No	No
55	Roger Couture,	Regional Comptroller/ IDRC/ WARO	Collaborator, Trainer	All	IDRC	N/A	N/A	Yes
56	Rana Auditto, Director	Director Grants Administration Division/ IDRC / OTTAWA (Former SARO Regional Comptroller)	Collaborator	All	IDRC	Sep 09, 2009	N/A	Yes
57	Madhav Karki	Deputy Director General/ ICIMOD/	Recipient	Workshop	Institution	Sep 01, 2009	No	No

		NEPAL (Formerly in charge of MAPPA)						
58	Tom Museli	Computer for Schools Kenya (CFSK)/ KENYA	Fund Recipient	Mini Grant	Institution	Sep 01, 2009	No	No
59	Prof. Abdalla Bujra	Executive Director/ Development Policy Management Forum (DPMF)/ Ethiopia	Service provider	Workshop	Institution	Sep 01, 2009	No	No
60	Sylvia Oyugi	Resource Mobilization Consultant/ KENYA	Service provider	Workshop and advice	Individual	Sep 01, 2009	No	No
61	Ali Mokhtar	Chief Executive Officer/Centre for Development Services, EGYPT	Service provider	Workshop, Scoping study, Advice	Institution	Nov 04, 2009	N/A	Yes
62	Lamia EL-Fattal	Program Officer/ IDRC/ MERO	Collaborator	Workshops	IDRC	Nov 04 , 2009	N/A	Yes

ANNEX G. BIOGRAPHY OF EVALUATOR – Dr. Michael W. Bassey

Dr. Michael W. Bassey is a free-lance International Consultant and is based in Dakar, Senegal. He has extensive and solid consultancy experience in organizational development, transforming institutions and programs/networks to a higher level of performance (e.g. The International Institution of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), The Rodale Institute, USA). He has a good understanding of the development of strategy and human resources in improving institutional performance. He has been responsible during most of his career in senior positions, for resource mobilization, donor relations, partnering and public awareness of large institutions. This has served him well in consultancy assignments working for organizations such as CORAF/WECARD, CILSS, etc in helping them to improve their performance and mobilize financial resources through the development of strategies and work plans. He has also worked recently in the development of the devolution strategy for the IDRC/DFID CCAA Program. Dr Bassey is a seasoned evaluator and has a large portfolio of consultancies in monitoring and evaluation in a wide range of subject areas for organizations including: IDRC, PriceWaterhouseCoopers, European Commission, CORAF/WECARD, UNDP, GEF, USAID, University of Montreal and KADD Consultants.

Dr. Bassey has nearly 35 years of experience in research and development on issues related to agriculture, engineering, energy, environment, and land management systems. He has strong analytical experience and expertise as a researcher and university teacher. He is a seasoned manager in research and development, having held director-level positions in international organizations and led the development and execution of many projects and networks in many countries at the research- and community-levels. He has worked extensively in Africa and has wide experience in South America and Asia. He has for over 25 years held positions of responsibility, in research and development, as: Regional Representative for West Africa at the International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi; Director of International Programs and Regional Director for West Africa at The Rodale Institute (USA); Director of International Programs at the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan; Senior Program Specialist at the International Development Research Centre (Canada). He is fully bilingual in English and French.