

Annual Corporate Evaluation Report, 2010–2011

This report focuses on progress during the first nine months of implementing IDRC's new, Board-approved evaluation strategy, and synthesizes findings from the external reviews conducted in the 2005-2010 period. It illustrates that evaluation is widely used across the Centre and forms an important part of IDRC's overall accountability and performance management.

Responsibility for conducting and using evaluation is shared within IDRC. Centre programs conduct and use evaluation as a program and project management tool. The Evaluation Unit provides technical support, ensures the coherence of evaluation, and strengthens evaluative thinking across the Centre. The Unit also manages a modest program budget to develop useful tools and methods, and to improve evaluation capacity and use in developing countries. An external review in 2010 found a robust and effective evaluation function at IDRC that balances a strong program support role with contributions to the field of evaluation that enhanced IDRC's reputation.

In June 2010, the Board of Governors approved a new evaluation strategy for the Centre. The first nine months of implementing this strategy involved the design of new initiatives, as well as consolidation—as reflected in the completion of the external reviews of all IDRC programs, and consultation with the Board of Governors on modifications to the external review process of Board-approved programs.

This year, IDRC turned its attention to program outcomes and progress. The Evaluation Unit continued to track evaluations as they occurred and assess their quality. Over the next 18 months, IDRC will prioritize support to high-quality program-led evaluation, while also focusing on two strategic evaluations. “*Communicating research for influence*” looks at how programs could better support their partners in communicating effectively. “*Research excellence*” examines effective ways to assess the quality of IDRC-supported research.

IDRC also helps build the field of evaluation in support of development research. This priority is in line with the intent of the Centre's Strategic Framework 2010-2015 and has brought some early successes as outlined below. The field-building work has been especially successful in South Asia with a major regional evaluation event and ongoing work with several universities in the development of curricula. Over the coming year, the Evaluation Unit will continue this work, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa, as well as Eastern and Southern Africa.

Progress Towards Evaluation Outcomes, 2010–2011

A Year of Stocktaking and Preparing the Ground

In the nine months since the Evaluation Strategy was approved by Governors, IDRC and project partners have been working to further incorporate evaluation as a core dimension of the Centre’s work and to live up to IDRC’s guiding principles. The primary factors—internal and external—that affected performance are discussed above. What follows is an overview of the progress in each outcome area of the strategy.

Evaluation within IDRC

Outcome 1: High-quality program-led evaluation

IDRC places a priority on high-quality evaluation across the organization. In terms of program-led evaluation, this involves support for research on evaluation; engagement in evaluation capacity building of program staff; demonstration of the formal integration of evaluative thinking processes in the programs’ work; and, evaluation reports that live up to IDRC’s utility, feasibility, accuracy and ethical standards. Seventeen program-led evaluations were completed this year. Of these, two evaluation reports were deemed of unacceptable quality. The Evaluation Unit is currently reviewing approaches for building evaluation capacity among program staff and is in the process of generating ideas about how to be more systematic, and target the most urgent knowledge, skill, and attitude gaps.

2010-2011 Program Area’s Evaluation Work

| | Health | A&E | Science | ICT4D | SEP |
|---|--------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| Overall rating | S | M | M | S | M |
| Supported research on evaluation | S | S | S | S | S |
| Engaged in evaluation capacity building | S | S | W | S | S |
| Evaluative thinking | S | S | S | S | S |
| Unacceptable quality evaluations | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 |
| Number of commissioned evaluations | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 |

S Strong M Medium W Weak/non-existent

Outcome 2: Influential strategic evaluations and external reviews

Strategic evaluations focus on the key results and modalities of Centre programming. The Evaluation Unit identified topics of the next strategic evaluations—*research communications for influence* and *research excellence*. Five external reviews were also conducted last year. A synthesis of the findings of these and other reviews is found in the next section. To optimize the new model of external reviews, the Evaluation Unit is seeking feedback from the evaluators, those being evaluated, and the evaluation users.

One unintended and two intended uses of the program external reviews were noted:

- **Accountability for the implementation of the program prospectus (intended):** External reviews of all prospectus programming from the 2005–2010 Corporate Strategy and Program

Framework were completed and presented to Governors.

- **Learning and improvement within programs (intended):** The prospectuses of Social and Economic Policy programs were more strategic than they had been in the past, as they incorporated baselines and graduated program-level outcomes.
- **Influencing approaches used by others (unintended):** Various organizations adopted elements of IDRC’s new model of external reviews. For example, it was the model for the evaluation of a \$10 million grant to Latin American Center for Rural Development (RIMISP). It was also presented at the European Evaluation Society conference.

Programming on evaluation

Outcome 3: Innovations in evaluation approaches and methods

Guided by needs and opportunities in development research, the Evaluation Unit works both independently and collaboratively with IDRC programs and partners to develop new evaluation approaches. The 2010-2015 evaluation strategy outlines four focal areas. Innovations in three areas are now underway; while the work on the fourth area has been largely devolved to the Outcome Mapping Learning Community (see examples just below).

Creating practical evaluation methods embedded with complexity thinking

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|
| Nascent: Ideas & Research | Minimum: Developed | Medium: Shared | High: Used |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|

- Published articles on impact evaluation and evaluating strategy
- Created Community of Practice on developmental evaluation

Challenging persistent inequities, particularly among marginalized groups

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|
| Nascent: Ideas & Research | Minimum: Developed | Medium: Shared | High: Used |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|

- Gender Evaluation Methodology* published
- Report published on "downward" accountability in research organizations

Addressing methodological challenges in difficult environments

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|
| Nascent: Ideas & Research | Minimum: Developed | Medium: Shared | High: Used |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|

- Article published on evaluation in conflict-affected settings
- PCD partner International Crisis Group exploring new strategy options for using evaluation to enhance knowledge generation and organizational learning.

Continuing the successful devolution of outcome mapping (OM)

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|
| Nascent: Ideas & Research | Minimum: Developed | Medium: Shared | High: Used |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|

- Growth in OM Learning Community membership to almost 3000 members
- Outcome mapping included in various evaluation books, manuals, and reports not affiliated with IDRC

Outcome 4: Building the field of evaluation in the South

IDRC continues to increase the ability of evaluators in developing countries to address knowledge gaps and development challenges in their specific contexts through evaluation capacity building, knowledge generation, and the creation of collaborative space. The map shows specific accomplishments in each target area.

Global Knowledge Spaces

- Nine Southern researchers first-time presenters at the European Evaluation Conference evaluation events
- Participation of Southern evaluators in global impact evaluation workshop
- First ever South Asia regional evaluation Conclave with over 300 evaluators from 10 countries

Middle East & North Africa

- Outcome mapping book published in Arabic
- Evaluation network established and membership growing

East & Southern Africa

- International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) mobilizing learning events and documenting case studies of OM practice in East Africa.

South Asia

- State of evaluation in South Asia documented and shared at regional and local events
- First graduate-level evaluation curriculum in South Asia drafted by six institutions
- Community of researchers on engendering policies and programs through evaluation
- Vibrant regional association of South Asian evaluators established



Synthesis of External Reviews of IDRC Programs

Responding to a request from the Board of Governors, staff analyzed the 16 external program reviews implemented between 2005 and 2010. While each of these reviews was already discussed by the Board of Governors, this analysis highlights cross-cutting issues for consideration. The analysis was based on a framework and a set of codes derived from the three main components of IDRC's "Grants-Plus" model —opportunity, engagement, and access. Details are available upon request. Coding quality was reviewed and no significant problems were noted.

Opportunity: IDRC responds to locally-defined research priorities and needs as it helps to create new research opportunities that would not otherwise exist.

The findings on opportunity relate to the quality, utility, relevance, and innovativeness of the research supported by IDRC.

Fifteen of the sixteen reviews found IDRC-supported research to be relevant and appropriate given the intended audiences, users, and contexts; 12 described IDRC-funded research as ground-breaking or cutting-edge and lauded programs for exploring new approaches. The reviews also described IDRC as an international leader in supporting innovative research in some of the most challenging settings. About half of the programs showed evidence of supporting new young talent, an outcome highlighted in the Strategic Framework 2010-2015 as a key element of opportunity.

Reviews noted a high level of policy influence, particularly at the local or national levels. However, reviews also identified challenges programs faced when influencing policies. Program characteristics that negatively affected policy influence include the lack of a clear niche, a low profile, a focus on academic rather than policy-oriented research, operating in a context where political features hindered the ability to influence policies, and not having enough time or presence to influence policy.

The quality of research outputs produced by the programs was described as high in five reviews, mixed or variable in nine, and acceptable in two. About one-third of the reviews identified the lack of a theoretical underpinning or an analytical framework as a main research weakness. Half of the reviews raised the challenge of measuring quality, noting the absence of an explicit definition of research quality. Among these, four pointed to the inadequacy of using traditional academic criteria alone to gauge the quality of policy-oriented research.

"Few, if any, Northern donors have a mandate to fund rigorous economic research on the South, in the South and primarily for the South."

"IDRC creates valuable opportunities to conduct research and is described by grantees as qualitatively different from other funding sources due to the freedom it gives them to pursue their own ideas and the advice it provides as they conduct their research."

All programs showed evidence of contributing new technologies and methods to their fields of research; in some cases, reviews noted the results from the use of those technologies. For example, African technologies developed under ACACIA are providing better access to educational resources; increasing transparency, efficiency, and accountability in the delivery of social services; and offering Africans the opportunity to compete in national, regional, and international markets.

The reviews indicated that capacity building is strong in all programs. In addition to the traditional effort focused on developing individual capacities, seven reviews noted a focus on strengthening organizational capacity.

Programs have contributed to building new fields of knowledge. The reviews indicated that programs have brought together communities of researchers and practitioners and have helped them develop new methodologies, tools, and technologies. They have also engaged universities, designed curriculums, encouraged publication in journals and books, and created spaces for sharing and discussion through their networks and conferences. Even though many of the reviews noted systematic work and action on fields of knowledge, only four programs explicitly framed their work around field building.

Engagement: *The Centre works with grantees throughout the research process as a mentor, and increasingly on a peer-to-peer basis.*

The findings on engagement relate to IDRC engaging throughout the research process as a partner, mentor, and research broker.

All of the reviews highlighted the positive quality of IDRC's engagement with grantees. In particular, IDRC's professionalism, collegiality, and respectful approach to programming were noted. Programs are providing focused mentorship, training, and technical support, which have helped to usefully shape research designs without defining or driving the process. Grantees repeatedly articulated IDRC's high degree of flexibility as vital. Twelve reviews explicitly commented on the programs' ability to remain flexible and responsive to project requests and constantly evolving priorities.

“Their capacities have increased, and whichever direction the technology goes, their confidence to try innovation has been increased. . . . If people have gained a confidence that just says, ‘I could try and see if it works,’ then that alone is of incredible value.”

“IDRC is the best funder we’ve ever had. Not because they have vast amounts of money, but the leadership is a pleasure to work with and the framework so flexible it allows you to find your own way.”

“Some partners reported that changes in staffing resulted in what they perceived as shifts in the quality of their projects.”

quality of the research and outputs. Although one

evaluation highlighted that at times the interactions with program officers were intensive and exhausting for researchers, it also affirmed that the

quality of the research would suffer if IDRC cut back on its advisory support. Seven of the reviews noted interruptions in programming resulting from changes or departures of program staff.

Sixteen of the reviews highlighted communication weaknesses. These weaknesses were related to

| Communication weaknesses included: |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- weak/out-of date websites- poor/vague dissemination strategies- inadequate dissemination formats- lack of clear or targeted policy messages- limited presence in international area- delays in publications- failure to synthesize evidence |

gaps in disseminating research (13 reviews) and/or program information (3 reviews). Two reviews linked communication weaknesses to the use of a linear model where communication occurred only after the research was finished. The reviews suggested that effective communication should be an on-going element of any research and that the stakeholder should be involved strategically.

Nine reviews expressed concern about monitoring at IDRC. Seven of these reported a lack of evidence to support program outcomes.

Some of these reviews suggested that the absence of effective monitoring inhibited their ability to highlight the significance of the program's work. Three reviews also noted that inadequate monitoring meant that the programs were missing the opportunity to learn from previous experience. A new project monitoring system has recently been implemented to address gaps.

“What is missing is the treasure trove of stories drawn from the projects which could have provided a qualitative measure of the value of the work which interview respondents stressed continually.”

Access: IDRC helps researchers gain access to other individuals or organizations linked by a common theme or purpose and to relevant literature, datasets, and other research materials.

The findings on access relate to how IDRC facilitates linkages between individuals, organizations, and relevant research materials.

All of the reviews highlighted how the programs linked researchers to networks. While the majority of these comments were positive, commenting on the value and success of programs to contribute to new and existing networks, two reviews raised concerns about instances of ad hoc and inappropriate pairings of partners. One noted that time-bound, multi-country projects had created ad hoc researcher linkages that were left to the discretion of the project leaders in country teams. Management responded by suggesting that the cost-effectiveness of this approach is also important, and should be taken into account.

“Typically, these [multi-country projects] have not led to dynamic and enduring collaborations between different country teams, have compromised the quality of the research undertaken in the projects, and led to limited capacity building.”

Other Findings

In addition to the coding categories based on the “Grants-Plus” model, two other categories were included in this analysis—leveraging Canadian resources and gender. The category of leveraging Canadian resources was included because of its importance in the 2005-2010 Corporate Strategy; gender was coded because of its repeated appearance in numerous reviews and its role as a cross-cutting objective of the Strategic Framework 2010-2015.

Three of the reviews highlighted examples of successful Canadian partnerships that have expanded IDRC’s capacity building efforts and networks in the South. These programs complimented the on-going work of the Canadian Partnerships Program, which, together with the Challenge Fund, is the cornerstone of IDRC’s relationship building in Canada. Several other reviews noted limited or missed opportunities for partnerships with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and other organizations.

Gender was identified as a specific focus in 12 of the programs and was raised in all of the reviews. Three reviews highlighted extraordinary contributions IDRC has made to gender programming. Beyond the Women’s Rights and Citizenship, two other programs were also showcased for pioneering new frontiers and making efforts to ensure gender was on the agenda in key policy circles. Yet seven reviews indicated weaknesses in incorporating gender, while an additional three recommended further attention. The reviews recognized overall improvements in gender programming.

Using the lens of the “Grants-Plus” business model, this analysis has looked across the 16 program reviews and identified crosscutting issues for consideration. It reveals weaknesses and strengths, and identifies some of the overarching tensions encountered by programs. Many of these – including quality, communications, and monitoring – are currently being addressed through new strategic reviews and adjustments in programming approaches.

The Centre could revisit its approach to other recurring issues including: mainstreaming gender and information and communication technologies for development; the tension between building capacity of new researchers and producing influential high-quality research; and the tension between focusing on academic outputs or on policy influence.

This analysis reaffirms that building networks and relationships is still at the core of what IDRC does. Consequently, IDRC is more successful when strong relationships are established between staff and researchers. Engagement of IDRC staff remains critically important to the production of high-quality outputs. These findings stress the importance of the “Grants-Plus” model to the Centre’s success and support the need for increasing flexibility to enable programs to respond to emergent strategies and trends. As IDRC moves forward, this analysis is intended to foster Centre-wide discussions on the broader lessons that emanated from the external program reviews.

Annex 1: Evaluation Plan 2011–2012

Agriculture and Environment

| Program Initiative | New Evaluations | On-Going Evaluations |
|---|---|--|
| Agriculture and Food Security | External evaluation of Rimisp Core Support for Rural Development project (\$40,000) | KariaNet mid-term evaluation (\$20,000 – included in project) |
| Climate Change Adaptation in Africa | <p>Evaluation of three components of project 104779 - An experimental approach to capacity building and toolkit development for monitoring and evaluation within climate change adaptation initiatives (\$19,000)</p> <p>Project level evaluation of 104683 - Rural-urban cooperation on water management in the context of climate change in Burkina Faso</p> <p>Project level evaluation of 104682 - Adapting fishing policy to climate change with the aid of scientific and endogenous knowledge</p> <p>Final program evaluation (\$150,000)</p> <p>Terminal evaluation - Altering the climate of poverty under climate change in Sub-Saharan Africa: setting priorities & strategies for adaptation with the forests for climate (\$115,000)</p> | None at this time |
| Climate Change and Water | None at this time | <p>External evaluation of 104395 - Focus Cities : Urban Waste Management in the City of Cochabamba (Bolivia)</p> <p>External Evaluation 104397 - Focus Cities : Reducing the Vulnerability, Poverty and Environmental Load in Centretown Lima (Peru)</p> |
| ECOHEALTH - Ecosystem Approaches to Human Health | <p>Climate change, water and health portfolio evaluation (\$25,000)</p> <p>Evaluating program efforts to improve capacities of recipients for Monitoring and evaluation and design improvements in projects (\$50,000)</p> | None at this time |
| Environmental Economics | External evaluation of Center for Environmental Economics and Policy in Africa (CEEPA) | None at this time |

Health and Health Systems

| Program Initiative | New Evaluations | On-Going Evaluations |
|--|---|---|
| Global Health Research Initiative | <p>Study on how the GHRI identifies, documents and shares lessons learned and best practices</p> <p>Study on what project teams funded by the GHRI perceive as the value added of the GHRI compared to other funding agencies they are familiar with, and why?</p> <p>Teasdale-Corti program evaluation (\$7,000)</p> | <p>Teasdale-Corti Impact Evaluation</p> <p>Write up of Thailand case study</p> <p>GHRI indicators</p> <p>Update Study on Mapping out of health topics in which GHRI is involved</p> <p>Finalization of projects profiles, a companion document to study on Mapping out of health topics in which GHRI is involved</p> |
| Governance for Equity in Health Systems | <p>Ongoing developmental evaluation of the Research, Capacity Building and Policy Response for Equity in Health and Health Financing project (\$280,000)</p> <p>Learning-based approach to GEH new programming cycle</p> | <p>Strategic Evaluation of eHealth (\$150,000)</p> |
| Non-Communicable Disease Prevention | None at this time | None at this time |

Innovation, Policy, and Science

| Program Initiative | New Evaluations | On-Going Evaluations |
|---|---|----------------------|
| IDRC Challenge Fund | None at this time | None at this time |
| Information and Networks | None at this time | None at this time |
| Innovation for Inclusive Development | <p>S&T Innovations for the Base of the Pyramid in SE Asia</p> <p>Gender and innovation (\$80,000)</p> <p>SIID Asia network – evaluation of ITS work and exploration of phase II (\$100,000)</p> | None at this time |

Social and Economic Policy

| Program Initiative | New Evaluations | On-Going Evaluations |
|--|---|---|
| Governance, Security, and Justice | <p>Building Peace and Security Research Capacity in Eastern Africa - PhD Awards Project (\$60,000)</p> <p>“The Global Consortium on Security Transformation” project evaluation</p> <p>How effective is the Social and Health Protection of Women Migrants from Sénégal in Agricultural Activity and the Personal Care Industry in Spain project in striving interactions between state-non-state actors?</p> <p>Gender and Democratic Governance – Evaluative component for project cohort</p> | None at this time |
| Supporting Inclusive Growth | <p>National Transfer Accounts -Africa, LAC and Asia (\$25,000)</p> <p>Programme de troisième cycle interuniversitaire - Capacity building (\$25,000)</p> <p>IDRC Pre-International Competition Network Forums</p> <p>Economic Research Forum (ERF-led evaluation; multiple funders)</p> | 101378 Poverty and Economic Policy (PEP) |
| Think Tank Initiative | Think Tank Initiative External Evaluation (\$550,000) | <p>Policy Community Surveys –Latin America and South Asia (with GlobeScan) (\$300,000)</p> <p>Peer Review – Latin America and South Asia (\$30,000)</p> |

Special Initiatives Division (SID)

| Program Initiative | New Evaluations | On-Going Evaluations |
|--|--|--|
| Fellowship and Awards | None at this time | Review relevance and effectiveness of PCD and F&A awards projects with UPEACE – Africa Programme, inform continuation of programs (\$30,000) |
| Canadian Partnerships | Coalition for the Protection of African Genetic Heritage | North-South Knowledge Partnerships : Promoting the Canada-Latin America Connection - Phase II (\$25,000) |
| Middle East Special Initiatives | None at this time | None at this time |

Other Program Units

| Program Initiative | New Evaluations | On-Going Evaluations |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Communications | None at this time | None at this time |
| Evaluation Unit | Strategic Evaluation on Communicating Research for Influence Strategic Evaluation on Research Excellence | None at this time |
| Donor Partnership Division | None at this time | None at this time |

Annex 2: Evaluation Reports Received by the Evaluation Unit in 2010–2011

Project- and Program-Level Evaluation Reports

| Date, Title, Author(s) | Related PA, PI | Projects Covered | Period Covered | Country / Region | Cost | Link |
|---|------------------|---|----------------|---|----------|---|
| March 2010, The Policy Influence of LIRNEasia , Dr Zenda Ofir | ICT4D, PAN | 102450, 103017, 104918 | 2004 – 2010 | Asia | \$65,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=240054 |
| April 2010, Gender Evaluation Final Report: Pan Asia Networking Program , Neena Sachdeva and Dana Peebles | ICT4D, PAN | 103669, 106253, 104161, 104332, 104170, 104918, 104333, 103941, 104390, 102791 | 1998 - 2005 | Asia | \$50,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=293833 |
| May 2010, Evaluation of Phase II of the SDC/IDRC/GEH Research Matters Project , Andrew Barnett, Christina Wille, Anna Khakee, and Gareth Williams | RHE, GEH | 104024 | 2006-2010 | Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean | \$61,253 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=291089 |
| February 2010, Final report evaluation of ACACIA III: the Acacia approach and its most significant outcomes 2006-2009 , Ricardo Wilson-Grau and Jennifer Vincent | ICT4D, Acacia | 13 Acacia Networks | 2006-2009 | Africa | \$90,500 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=256744 |
| May 2010, Development Research Forum of Cambodia , Jenny Pearson | A&E, RPE | 105029 | 2008 - 2010 | Cambodia | \$10,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=294047 |
| November 2009, Evaluation of the IDRC Project on Capacity Building | DPD | 102564 | 2003 - 2010 | All Regions | \$42,500 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=235455 |

| Date, Title, Author(s) | Related PA, PI | Projects Covered | Period Covered | Country / Region | Cost | Link |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| in Resource Mobilization , Michael Bassey | | | | | | |
| October 2010, Evaluación institucional, FLACSO, Sede Académica Argentina, INFORME FINAL, 105457 , Nilton Bueno Fisher, Juan Ignacio Piovani, Isabel Rodas | LACRO | 105457 | 2002 - 2009 | Argentina | \$40,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=267441 |
| August 2010, An External Review of the Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade (ARTNeT-Phase II-2007-2010) , Sailendra Narain and Truong Thi Kim Anh | SEP, GGP | 104247 | 2007 - 2010 | Asia | \$15,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=294053 |
| August 2007, Gender Network Project in South and South East Asia: An Evaluation , Sarah Cook and Shalini Sinha | SEP, GGP | 003461, 101037, 102194 | 1998 - 2005 | Asia | \$35,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=141747 |
| September 2010, Final Report on Review of Global Health Research Initiative , KPMG (Geoff Golder) | RHE, GHRI | All | 2006 - 2010 | Global | \$56,500 (IDRC paid 11,300) | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=300195 |
| Avril 2010, Institutionnalisation de l'approche écosanté en Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre , César AKPO et Amidou BABA-MOUSSA | A&E, Ecohealth; DPD | 103916 | 2007 - 2009 | Afrique de l'Ouest et du Centre | \$8,750 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=298667 |
| Octobre 2010, Rapport d'évaluation à mi-parcours du projet – Projet de renforcement des stratégies locales de gestion des zones sylvo-pastorales inter-villageoises dans le bassin | A&E, RPE | 104648-001 | 2008 - 2010 | Sénégal | Unknown | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=303198 |

| Date, Title, Author(s) | Related PA, PI | Projects Covered | Period Covered | Country / Region | Cost | Link |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| arachidier du Sénégal, André Bihibindi | | | | | | |
| November 2010, Evaluation of “Strengthening ICTD Research Capacity in Asia”(SIRCA) Programme , Ann Mizumoto | ICT4D, PAN | 104921 | 2008 – 2010 | Asia | \$190,000 (done under DECI evaluation) | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=326179 |
| September 2010, Review of CBAA Projects in Kenya, Uganda, South Africa and Zimbabwe , Bernard Owuor, Joan Kungu | A&E, CCAA | 104898 | 2008 – 2010 | Kenya, Uganda, South Africa, Zimbabwe | \$26,546 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=294417 |
| June 2010, WaDImena - Regional Water Demand Initiative for the Middle East and North Africa Final Project Review , Eng. Gert Soer and Prof. Dr. Fethi Lebdi | A&E, RPE | 101806 | 2005 – 2010 | MENA | Unknown | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=336196 |
| January 2009, Telecentre.org External Program Review , Simon Batchelor & Pena-Lopez | ICT4D, Telecentre.org | All | 2005 - 2009 | Global | \$60,834 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=268774 |
| July 2010, External Review of the Research for International Tobacco Control (RITC) Program, 2005-2010 , Burke A. Fishburn, Mira Aghi, and Shirley Addies | RHE, RITC | All | 2005 - 2010 | Global | \$62,750 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=290573 |

External Review Reports

| Date, Title, Author(s) | Quality Assessment | Link |
|--|--------------------|---|
| July 2010, Government, Equity and Health Program, IDRC 2006-2011 , George F. Brown, Demissie Habte, Suneeta Singh, Emily Taylor | Acceptable | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=294172 |

| Date, Title, Author(s) | Quality Assessment | Link |
|---|--------------------|---|
| July 2010, External Review of the IDRC Acacia Program: Final Report , Daniel Pare, Zenda Ofir, Jonathan Miller, Emily Taylor | Acceptable | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=301236 |
| July 2010, Pan Asia Networking External Panel Review , Beth Kolko, Tim Unwin, Dieter Zinnbauer | Acceptable | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=301231 |
| July 2010, External Review of the Connectivity and Equity in the Americas/Institute for Connectivity in the Americas (CEA/ICA) Program , Manuel Acevedo Ruiz, Martha A. Garcia-Murillo, Adriana Gouvêa | Acceptable | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=300912 |
| July 2010, Report of the External Review of the Innovation, Technology and Society (ITS) Program , Carlos Aguirre-Bastos, Andy Hall, Janice Jiggins | Acceptable | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=300920 |

Expert Opinion Reports

| Date, Title, Author(s) | Related PA, PI | Projects Covered | Period Covered | Country/Region | Cost | Link |
|--|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|---|
| May 2010, Lebanese-Palestinian Dialogue Committee (LPDC) Mid-Term Review - Final Report , David Viveash | SID/MESI | 105536-002 | 2006 – 2009 | MERO | \$35,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=294043 |
| July 2009, Gender and Work in MENA: Research Capacity Building Activities - Mid-Term Evaluation , Moushira Elgeziri | SEP, WRC | 104993 | 2007 – 2009 | MENA | \$5,000 | http://irims.idrc.ca/getDocument.asp?documentNumber=294055 |