Intent to Build Capacity through Research Projects:
an examination of project objectives, abstract and appraisal documents.

Draft Report

Prepared by: Odilia Maessen
For: The Evaluation Unit, IDRC
April 14, 2005

1.   Introduction

The Evaluation Unit is currently engaged in a strategic evaluation to investigate the Centre's contribution to building capacities of those with whom the Centre works. As part of this strategic evaluation, the Unit has commissioned a review of the objectives, abstract and appraisal of each of the 561 research projects approved during the period April 1, 2000 to September 30, 2004 in order to determine the proportion of projects that intend/are expected to build capacity among Southern partners (as indicated by statements in the planning documents reviewed), and to identify whose capacities and what capacities project activities intend to build. This review is meant to give an indication of the level of "effort" that is going toward capacity building in the South through research projects approved during the selected time period, to compare this to the data on capacity building effort available using EPIK statistics, and to provide an indication of the types of beneficiaries and capacities targeted by capacity building efforts through the research projects. The results of this review are reported on here.

The methodology used for the review and a discussion of some limitations of the data are discussed in section 2 of this report.

Results from the review are presented and discussed in section 3. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 report on the proportion of projects whose reviewed documents indicate intent to build capacity at the project objective level and as a more general component/benefit of the project, respectively. The geographic distribution of the beneficiaries of capacity building activities, as well as the IDRC program group and project sub-type distribution of projects that indicate intent to build capacity are also presented.

A note on the congruence between references to planned training activities in the reviewed documents and the presence of a training flag recorded in EPIK for each project is provided in section 3.3. This data provides an indication of how well the training flag indicator reflects the actual amount of training planned for through the supported research projects.

Section 3.4 and 3.5 report on the beneficiaries and capacities, respectively, targeted by capacity building efforts through the approved research projects as revealed in the reviewed documents.

Finally, the list of projects whose objectives, abstract and appraisal were reviewed for this exercise and decisions about whether they indicate intent to build capacity is attached as Appendix 1.

2.   Methodology

2.1   Project Selection

Projects selected for this review included all research projects approved between April 1, 2000 and September 30, 2004, inclusively. This data set corresponds to the research projects approved "to date during the current CSPF period" when this review and an earlier one were first conceived back in September, 2004.

The objectives, abstract, and appraisal of each of the 561 research projects approved during the selected time period were drawn from EPIK and provided by Catherine Shearer, Manager of Grant Information, IDRC. Additional information provided for each project included the training flag indicator, the project impact area, the project total budget, the project sub-type category (i.e. capacity building; applied research; utilization and related activities; policy and project development; and background studies and surveys), and the responsible program grouping as per the standard definitions used in EPIK[1].

2.2   Determination of the Proportion of Projects with Intent to Build Capacity

In order to determine the proportion of projects that have intent to build capacity in the South as either a project objective per se or as a component of the project, the objectives, abstract, and appraisal of each project were read for indications of intent to build capacity among Southern partners. To keep the exercise as objective as possible and to help the reader of this report interpret the results, each project was initially categorized into one of 5 groups, depending on whether intent to build capacity was or was not evident in the reviewed documents, on whether intent to build capacity was explicitly or implicitly indicated in those documents, and following a number of definitions and assumptions. A description of the five categories used, assumptions made, and examples of the types of statements that would fall into each category follows.

---

[1] The standard definitions for the various program groupings in EPIK are as follows: PA ICT4D which includes program groups ACACIA, PAN, PAN-AM; PA ENRM which includes program groups ALT, CBNRM, CFP, ECOSYS, PLAW, SUB; PA SEE which includes program groups GEH, MIMAP, PBR, TEC, GENDER; PB CORP which includes program groups ASPR, CORPORATE, FORWARD, ONGOING, BIOTECH, LCS, PBDD, SMME, SECRTS, SUNSET; PRES OFFICE which includes program groups REG-RAF, EVAL, PRES; and PB-SID which includes program groups SPECIAL, ROKS.   Since this review only looks at research projects, only program grouping that apply to this category of projects would apply in this case. For example, SECRTS and (most) REG RAFs would be excluded by definition because they are not identified as research projects. (C. Shearer, personal communication).

<u>Category 1 (Explicit indication of intent: 1)</u>:   This category includes:

All projects classified in EPIK as 'capacity building sub-type projects', including those for which intent to build capacity is implicitly indicated rather than explicitly (e.g. RP 101442, RP 101252) and the few in which intent is not evident in the reviewed documents (e.g. RP 102033, 100550)[2], but excluding those that were deemed to indicate intent to build capacity in Canadian partners only (i.e. RP 100539; RP 101965; RP 102170, RP 102685).
All projects where intent to build capacity in the South is explicitly stated in the reviewed documents using the words "enhance/strengthen/build..." "capacity" among target beneficiaries in the South, regardless of whether or how capacity and capacity building is defined. And
All projects with statements that the project "fits" under Centre or Program/PI objectives to build capacity. This group includes 5 projects where statements of fit are the only evident indications of intent to build capacity in the project documents reviewed (i.e. 102478, 101420, 102218, 101465, 102419). While some statements in this group may be border line implied, the assumption is made that if the project is considered to "fit with" an objective to build capacity then it must have an intent/expectation to build capacity.

Some examples of explicit statements that fall into Category 1 include:

- "*To enhance the capacity of Lao researchers at NUOL to conduct critical analysis and action-oriented research on issues of CBNRM through training and applied research*" (RP 101605, Project Objective 1).

- "*To simultaneously build organizational capacities to promote gender equality and generate knowledge on useful conceptual approaches and development practice for institutional change in three selected Indian organizations.*" (RP102361, Project Objective 1).

- "*To improve human resource capacities of herders, community leaders, governors and researchers, and to empower communities.*" (RP 102429, Project Objective 4).

- "*to build capacity of resource constrained peri-urban farmers*" (RP 101452, Project Objective 4).

---

[2] While there are only a few projects that fall into this group, there is no way to determine whether such projects are "mis-classified" as a capacity building sub-type project or whether intent to build capacity is just not indicated in the documents reviewed. Indeed the latter situation could well be the case for RP 100550 for example, because only the abstract and project objectives were available in EPIK and not the appraisal, where reference to capacity building is usually found (this and other data quality issues and their implications are discussed later in the methodology section of this report). The assumption is made here that all capacity-building sub-type projects are properly classified and 'by definition' have explicit intent to build capacity.

- *"To build regional capacity on issues and matters under consideration.*" (RP 102465, Project Objective 6).

- *"This project fits well with IDRC¿s and PBR¿s aim to support knowledge generation, policy development and research capacity building as a tool to assist post-conflict and war torn countries in their transition to peace and sustainable development"* (RP 101494, Appraisal Section 20: The Project in Relation to Centre Objectives).

- *"The establishment of an information clearinghouse on water issues in the Altiplano is conceived as a tool and a method to promote an integrated vision on water resources management in the region. It also aims to stimulate and support a multi-stakeholder approach to water management by creating a common space for information and dialogue on the issue which in turn can contribute to level the playing field among the actors working on understanding and resolving water-related conflicts in the region. For these reasons, the project is in line with Minga's general objective of "enhancing the capacity of all sectors of society to define, develop and implement effective decisions regarding natural resource management" and will contribute directly to Minga's second objective of "generating effective tools and methodologies to support multi-stakeholder approaches to natural resource management".* (RP 101420, Appraisal Section 20: The Project in Relation to Centre Objectives).

- *"To build the capacity of ICT policy and advocacy champions, both individual men and women as well as organizations, to use the methodology"* (RP 100994, Project Objective 2).

- *"To strengthen developing countries trade negotiators' and policymakers' capacity to promote proactive positions in the multinational environment and trade negotiations which are underway at the WTO.*" (RP 101851, General Objective) .

- *"To build the capacity of different stakeholders to adopt and implement a CBNRM approach in their institutions rural development projects/ interventions and activities."* (RP 100828, Project Objective 4).

- *"Formal outputs of this study will include: research reports, a value chain manual, academic publications, policy research papers and presentations to policy, research and academic audiences, and capacity building.*" (RP 100793, Appraisal Section 80: Impact of the Project and its Results)

Of note is that while all of the above statements explicitly indicate an intention/expectation that the project will contribute to building capacity [in the South - although this is often indicated elsewhere in the reviewed document], not all of the above statements are explicit in indicating what that intent is - i.e. whose capacities and what capacities are targeted.   In many cases this information is elaborated on elsewhere in the document (e.g.100828, 102429) or can be inferred (e.g.101494). In other cases, it is not clear exactly whose capacities and/or what capacities are being targeted (e.g. 100793).

Category 2 (Explicit indication of intent: 2): This category includes:

> All projects where intent to build capacity in the South is explicitly stated in the reviewed documents, but rather than referring to building "capacity", statements of intent refer to creating or improving the ability of Southern "individuals, communities and institutions to generate, use and promote knowledge in ways which support equitable and sustainable development" [3], or to help others to do so.

> Some examples of explicit statements that fall into Category 2 include:

- *"The project will also seek to strengthen the ability of local communities to protect traditional knowledge through active involvement in the research, and improved understanding of the issues and policy processes*." (RP 102018, Appraisal Section 100: Ethical Considerations).

- *"The overall objective of the project is to establish a participatory learning environment for technicians working in Latin American institutions directly involved in community forestry programs, in order to improve their qualifications and ability to develop and manage projects within their respective organizations*" (RP 101385, General objective).

- *"And finally, the case studies will assist indigenous researchers with developing skills and confidence to carry out and document evaluations of their own experiences and present them to international fora*." (RP 101342, Appraisal Section 80: Impact of the Project and its Results).

- *"RM will respond to and support GEH teams in developing more effective skills in sharing and applying evidence and experience among each other and with a range of research users"* (RP 102283, Project Abstract).

---

[3] This definition of capacity in the context of IDRC is from "Framework for Evaluating Capacity Development in IDRC" Prepared for the Evaluation Unit, IDRC by Anne Bernard and Greg Armstrong, February, 2005.

- *"To strengthen and build Nirantar's abilities as a resource group which provides theoretical inputs to other organizations in the production of gender-sensitive material.*" (RP 102332, Project Objective 6).

Category 3 (Implicit indication of intent): This category includes:

All projects where intent to build capacity in the South is not explicitly indicated but is implied by the activities that will be undertaken during the course of the project which are suggestive of having intent to help people acquire the knowledge, skills or attitude required to improve their ability to "generate, use and promote knowledge in ways which support equitable and sustainable development" [4], or to help others to do so. Included here is the assumption that training implies an intent to build capacity and as such this category includes those projects that refer to training but do not explicitly refer to it as mechanism to build capacity per se, and the half dozen projects with a training flag but no mention of training or intent to build capacity within the reviewed project documents (i.e.101595, 102073, 102369, 101517, 101098, 101937). The latter case reflects the assumption that the training flag indicator is correct. Projects where training is explicitly referred to as mechanism to contribute to building capacities (the majority of those with training) are placed in Category 1 or 2 above, as appropriate.

Some examples of implicit statements that fall into Category 3 include:

- "*To develop a multi-media CD-ROM on all aspects of watershed management in developing countries. This will serve as an electronic textbook for a distance education, graduate level course delivered via the Internet and provide a stand-alone reference document*". (Note that the (Canadian) recipient "*plans to involve institutions in developing countries in the delivery and use of the course resulting from this project*", and that there is a training flag indicated, so the assumption here is that the project includes the delivery of the course) (RP 100915, Project Objective 1).

- "*To train women and men as knowledge managers, including at least 50% women;*" (in the context of a large project assessing the impact of ICTs on poverty reduction in the rural areas of India). (RP 102340, Project Objective 5).

- "*CSVR puts a strong emphasis on training more junior researchers in the course of its projects, taking account of racial as well as gender criteria. The present project is no exception: four junior researchers and two community facilitators will benefit from such training*".(RP101688, Appraisal Sec. 110: Social/Gender Considerations).

---

[4] This definition of capacity in the context of IDRC is from "Framework for Evaluating Capacity Development in IDRC" Prepared for the Evaluation Unit, IDRC by Anne Bernard and Greg Armstrong, February, 2005.

- *"During the monitoring of this project, punctual support to include gender considerations will be provided by the IDRC-Honduras program as well as by one of the gender specialist from CIDA who will be directly or indirectly looking at the methods of research and actions among researchers and stakeholders in general, in order to properly advise the team."*(Appraisal Section 110: Social/ Gender Considerations)....*"Within IDRC, the Ecohealth PI will be responsible for the technical supervision of the project, especially regarding the research components, with IDRC local staff (in Honduras) collaborating and offering support in situ. CIDA's health technical advisor from the Pro-Mesas will assure the technical supervision of the intervention components."* (RP 102058, Appraisal Section 140: Collaboration within IDRC or Other Donors).

- "*A development communication specialist will be hired internationally to provide the team with the required expertise and a junior fellow will be hired locally to assist and learn from the senior expert.*"(RP 100259, Appraisal Section 120: Appraisal of Institution and Project Personnel).

- *"ICRAF, IER and WVM will undertake with farmers, research on ways to develop viable options for seed production: research on ways to reduce the costs of seedling production, to simplify tree establishment and to accelerate early growth. Meetings will be organized with the different categories of farmers to discuss on possible and proposed new options. ICRAF/IER will train WVM and extension staff operating in the region of Segou on the techniques of collecting and processing seed, on seed production, conservation techniques as well as on nursery techniques. Trained WVM will train development organizations staff operating in Segou who will train farmers on the same previously quoted aspects.*" (RP 100832, Project Abstract).

- *"The project will also lead to the completion of 5 post-graduate degrees (3 M.Sc. degrees in Medical Entomology, Community Health (Anthropology), Agricultural Economics, and 2 M.A. degrees in Anthropology and Sociology (Economics).*" (RP 100482, Appraisal Section 80: Impact of the Project and its Results).

Category 4 (maybe): This category includes:

Projects where there may be intent to build capacity. This would include situations where the wording in the document is suggestive but there is not enough information available in the document to make a determination (e.g. RP 100836, 102673, 102224), or when it is unclear whether certain training or other capacity building activities are actually planned to happen ("*The chances are very high that the project will achieve its objectives, especially if some capacity building is done with the researchers through training and networking"* (RP 101318).

Category 5 (no indication of intent indicated/evident): This category includes:

> All projects where intent to build capacity in the South was deemed not evident in the project documents reviewed. Note that this does not necessarily mean that the project did not have intent to build capacity, just that it was not evident in the project abstract, objectives and appraisal documents reviewed. This includes the handful of projects that were deemed to indicate intent to build capacity among Northern (Canadian) partners only.

2.3 Identifying Beneficiaries and Capacities Targeted in the Research Project Documents Reviewed

The beneficiaries of capacity building efforts and the types of capacities targeted for development that were identified in reviewed documents are reported on in section 3 of this report.

As noted above, the specific beneficiaries or capacities targeted for development are not always provided in the reviewed documents. In many cases, documents that are explicit about an intention to build capacity through the project are not explicit about what those intentions are. In these cases the specific beneficiaries and capacities targeted are implied, and/or are unclear because a) the statements are deemed ambiguous; b) the reader is referred to the proposal for details of expected capacity building project outcomes; and/or c) the target beneficiaries and capacities are referred to in a collective way (e.g. "actors", "partners", "researchers and stakeholders", "build capacity", or "build research capacity"). Such situations prevent or limit the identification of the specific intended beneficiaries (e.g. individual policy- makers, a research institution) or specific capacities targeted (i.e. skills to write a research proposal, or an increased ability to use a certain research methodology or to formulate policy). In the project documents reviewed for about 20% of the projects, there is explicit reference or inference to additional beneficiaries other than those provided in the reviewed document.

Given the above, the data provided in this report should be considered indicative of the beneficiaries and types of capacities targeted in the portfolio of projects supported during the selected time frame, rather than exhaustive.

2.4 A Note on Some Limitations of the Data and Their Implications

The types of documents selected to use in this review, the nature of the reporting in those documents, and some data retrieval issues have an effect on the ability to do quantitative analysis of the aggregate data obtained from the review and on the kinds of conclusions that can be made based on the data obtained from the review.

Quantitative analysis on the specific capacities or specific beneficiaries targeted by the aggregated group of projects is limited because findings cannot be aggregated with confidence

due to the diverse nature of reporting within the documents reviewed. More specifically, as indicated above, beneficiaries and capacities targeted for development are referred to with varying specificity and clarity in the reviewed documents. Since it is often not possible to know when a "collective"
category (e.g. "stakeholders" or "research capacity") includes a specific "sub-category" (e.g. individual researcher, government department, sampling techniques, advocacy skills), it seems prudent to conclude that quantitative analysis of such data could lead to misleading results.

While not expected to be significant to the "big picture", it is possible that the results reported here on the proportion of projects indicating intent to build capacity in South may underestimate actual intent. As such the results on intent to build capacity presented in this report reflect the "minimum effort to build capacity in the South" by the reviewed projects. Intent to build capacity may be underestimated for three reasons. Firstly, while not systematically noted, there were at least 23 projects for which only an abstract and list of objectives were available from EPIK[5]. In 7 of these 23 cases intent to build capacity was deemed not indicated. Obviously in those 7 cases, intent to build capacity may be indicated in any appraisal sections that were filled out but not 'retrievable' for review. Also, for some unknown reason, parts of some sentences were noticeably incomplete in a few retrieved documents[6]. While this is considered to have a negligible effect on the overall estimate of the effort to build capacity, it is possible that in such cases intent to build capacity was indicated in the missing sentence(s).

And finally, there is the possibility that some projects have intent to build capacity but that intent is simply not mentioned in the reviewed documents. The difficulty is that it is impossible to know the extent to which this may be the case. It may be relevant that as far as I can tell, the guidelines provided in Quick-tips require that authors of appraisals for projects that exceed $150,000 must *"describe how the project contributes to institutional capacity-building activity"*, but do not appear to require reporting on activities targeting capacity building at the individual level, where much of the capacity building effort through research projects is known to be focused. Notably, even the requirement to *"describe how the project contributes to institutional capacity-building activity"* is not mandatory in the appraisal for projects less than $150,000 in value[7].

---

[5] This group includes more than 15 projects over the $150,000 value, including several at $0.5M. According to Catherine Shearer, Manager of Grant Information, some regional offices used to enter appraisal items 'elsewhere' in the system, for example in the note for project descriptions which is used for pipeline but not for project approval purposes. Catherine also noted that there is no mechanism in EPIK that controls for the sections of an appraisal entered.

[6] I.e. For "complete" appraisals.

[7] From Research Project Quick Tips forwarded by email by D. Deby, October 15, 2004.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Intent to Build Capacity in the South through Research Projects

The review revealed that at least about 76% of the 561 research projects approved during the selected time period have intent/an expectation to build capacity in the South, as indicated by explicit statements in their objectives, abstract or appraisal documents. When implicit indications are added, the percentage of projects with intent to build Southern capacity goes up to around 80% (see Table 1 below).

Table 1 also shows that around 69% of the projects categorized in project sub-types other than "capacity- building" have intent to build capacity in the South, as indicated by explicit statements of intent in their objectives, abstract or appraisal documents.

These estimates of the proportion of projects with intent to build Southern capacity obtained from reading project documents far exceed the estimate of 26% that is indicated by the proportion of projects that are categorized as "capacity-building" project sub-types in EPIK.

Table 1: Number of Research Projects in Which Intent to Build Capacity in the South Is Explicitly, Implicitly or Not Indicated in Their Objectives, Abstract or Appraisals Documents.[8]

Project sub-type category	Category 1: Intent Explicitly indicated with word "capacity" or by definition[9]	Category 2: Intent Explicitly indicated (ability/skills)	Category 3: Intent Implicitly indicated	Category 4: # Might have intent	Category 5: # No intent indicated/ evident	Total # of projects [10]
Capacity Building	142	0	0	0	4	146
Applied Research	121	7	16	5	26	175
Background Studies and Surveys	25	2	3	0	13	43
Policy and Project Development	103	3	6	3	43	158
Utilization and Related Activities	24	0	3	0	12	39
Total	415	12	28	8	98	561
As a % of all projects approved	~74%	~2%	~5%	~1.5%	~17.5%	100%
	Explicit Intent		**Implicit Intent**	**Intent Not indicated**		
Total	427		28	106		561
As a % of all projects	~76%		~5%	~19%		100%
	Explicit and Implicit intent to Build Capacity			**Intent Not indicated**		
Total	455			106		561
As a % of all projects	~80%			~20%		100%

---

[8] See methodology section 2.2 for full definitions of these groupings

[9] All capacity building sub-type projects are assumed to have explicit intent at the project level by definition of their categorization into this project sub-type regardless of the wording in the project documents.

[10] Total number of projects approved between April 1, 2000 and September 30, 2004

Table 2 below shows the distribution of projects with explicit indications of intent to build capacity in the South by program grouping and region of beneficiary location.

Table 2: Distribution of Projects with Explicit Indications of Intent to Build Capacity by Program Grouping and Region of Beneficiary Location. [11]							
Program grouping	LAC	SSA	ASIA	MENA	MULTI-REG	GLOBAL	Total
ENRM	40	44	49	9	7	14	163
SEE	31	41	23	23	4	23	145
ICT4D	20	37	23	3	1	4	88
PB-CORP	3	4	2	1	0	2	12
SID	2	5	0	1	0	2	10
PRES-OFF	1	0	7	0	0	1	9
Total	97	131	104	37	12	46	427

[11] In all but a handful of cases the geographic distribution of the beneficiaries of capacity building activities and the project impact area indicator were identical based on the information provided in the reviewed documents. LAC=Latin America and the Caribbean; MENA=Middle East and North Africa (MERO); SSA=Sub-Saharan Africa; ASIA; MULTIREG = if more than one region identified, could include North and Eastern Europe; GLOBAL = if the only entry is global. See methodology section 2.1 for definitions of program groupings.

3.2   Intent to Build Capacity in the South as a Research Project Objective.

Table 3: Number of projects in which intent to build capacity in the South is explicitly indicated in their general and specific objectives[12]

Project sub-type category	# Explicitly indicated in **any** project objective (i.e. general or specific objective	Explicitly indicated in **any objectives** as a % of all projects	# Explicitly indicated as a specific project objective	Explicitly indicated as a **specific objective** as a % of all projects
Capacity Building	98	(of 146) = ~ 67%	80	(of 146) = ~ 55%
Applied Research	71	(of 175) = ~ 41%	60	(of 175) = ~ 34%
Background Studies and Surveys	9	(of 43) = ~ 21%	6	(of 43) = ~ 14%
Policy and Project Development	60	(of 158) = ~ 38%	46	(of 158) = ~ 29%
Utilization and Related Activities	14	(of 39) = ~ 36%	12	(of 39) = ~ 31%
Total	252	(of 561) = ~ **45%**	204	(of 561) = **~ 36%**

As shown in Table 3, about 45% of the 561 projects approved during the selected time period have capacity building explicitly indicated as a general or specific project objective. Thirty six percent of the projects were found to have capacity building explicitly indicated as a specific project objective. When capacity-building sub-type projects are removed from this group, about 37% of the non-capacity-building projects were found to have explicit capacity building project objectives.

General objectives generally refer to the development goal being pursued by the research while the specific objectives are generally the objectives against which the success of the project will be judged[13]. Not all projects reviewed have both general and specific objectives - that is some projects only have a general objective (e.g. 101972; 102280; 100603; 102770; 101207), while others have no general objective but only (specific) objectives (e.g. 101874; 102123).

---

[12] I.e. Category 1 & 2 as defined in methodology section 2.2. See methods for a detailed discussion of the interpretation of wording in documents.

[13] While there are no guidelines in Quick Tips on how to write objectives, this distinction between general and specific objectives is provided in the "How to Apply" brochure posted on the public website (Sylvain Dufour, email communication, March 31, 2005). Note that objectives in EPIK are referred to as "Project General Objective" and "Project Objective 01, 02", etc. The word "specific" is not used.

The estimates provided in Table 3 will underestimate intent to build capacity as a general or specific project objective because implied indications were not included in the estimate. This will likely have the largest effect on underestimating intent among specific objectives since in many cases these are written as "the means" through which to achieve the general objective (e.g. to network, to train, to provide technical support). As discussed in the methodology section, activities which are suggestive of building capacity but don't state it as an expected or planned outcome are defined as implied in this exercise, and thus would not be captured in Table 3.

As it turns out for a number of projects, training activities described in specific objectives without reference to increasing someone's ability to do something were often identified as capacity building activities in the project appraisal. However, in these cases the original designation of "implied intent" (by definition) was not subsequently changed to "explicit intent" (as revealed in the appraisal) because intent in objectives was determined independent of the abstract and appraisal in order to see how well intent in objectives would indicate for intent in the project as a whole. Comparing the proportion of projects with explicit intent to build capacity as indicated in the projects' objectives only (i.e. ~ 45%, as per Table 3) to the proportion of projects with explicit intent to build capacity at the project level as revealed by reading the abstract and appraisal as well (i.e. ~ 76%, as per Table 1) shows that the effort towards building capacity at the project level is underestimated by reading objectives only.

3.3   An Observation about Support for Training

As an aside, it is noted that more training is being directly supported by, or otherwise associated with (e.g. cross-project support), the set of approved research projects than is indicated by a "Yes" training flag as recorded in EPIK for each project. Planned training in some form or another is mentioned within the objectives, abstract and/or appraisal documents of about 85 projects which do not have a "Yes" training flag. In numerous projects which were not flagged as having training, planned training was identified as a specific objective of the project, and included both formal academic (e.g. university degrees) and non-formal training (e.g. training workshops). This is not to suggest that anyone was remiss in checking the training box - there are guidelines stating that the training flag addresses training which is indicated in a project's training budget line and the guidelines list the types of training activities and expenses that should be included there (these generally relate mostly to degree-training or major non-degree courses). The guidelines also state that "*training for project staff that relates to the implementation of research activities should be shown under research expenses*"[14], and thus those activities would not "trigger" a "Yes" in the training indicator box.[15] Planned participation in a training activity that is associated with a different project would also not likely trigger checking "Yes". The point here is simply that while tallying up the "Yes" checks should indicate for much of training going on, it will not necessarily indicate the full extent of the amount of

---

[14] From QTip 7 provided by Sylvain Dufour by email, January 24, 2005

[15] Email communication with Sylvain Dufour, January 24, 2005

training supported by and/or otherwise associated with approved research projects.

3.4   Beneficiaries Targeted through Sampled Research Projects

The beneficiaries identified as the targets of capacity building efforts through the sampled research projects can be grouped as individuals, communities and organizations/institutions. Beneficiaries identified in the reviewed documents include:

Individuals and teams/groups of researchers and research users including: experienced and junior researchers, students, university professors, policy-makers, decision-makers, policy analysts, trade negotiators, city planners, urban architects, digital experts, development workers, government staff and officials from all levels of government, correspondents, journalists, health workers, community leaders, teachers, men, women, youth, natural resource users/user groups (e.g. farmers, herders, traditional health practitioners), multi/trans disciplinary teams of researchers, and teams of researchers and users. Many of these individuals and groups are affiliated with a range of institutions including various research institutions, development organizations, universities, government departments and agencies at all levels (e.g. local, municipal, provincial, national), various international and national organizations, the private sector, NGOs, and CBOs.

Communities

Organizations/Institutions and Networks including: government agencies and departments at the local, municipal, provincial and national level, university departments and other affiliations, civil society organizations, NGOs, CBOs, research institutions, development organizations, independent inter-governmental organizations, donor organizations, various international and national organizations, private sector companies (e.g. mining), networks of researchers/research institutions, networks of researchers and users and/or their institutions.

In some project documents, the overall capacity development objective is described in terms of broader targets, such as building the capacity "within" or "of" a:

Sector (e.g. public health sector), as in:
"*To inform and strengthen public health sector capacity to implement an effective, accountable and equitable ART rollout in the Free State and potentially other provinces and other parts of Southern Africa.*" (RP 102770, 3rd General Objective).

Research System (e.g. Agricultural R&D system, health system), as in:
- "*The project will support several institutional innovations aimed at enhancing the capacity of the region's agricultural R&D system to respond to the AIDS challenge: (i) a network to increase learning among countries (ii) emerging national and local platforms that are coordinating sectoral and intersectoral actions, (iii) research partnerships between agricultural and public health institutions, (iv) collaborative links with NGOs and CBOs working with affected and at-risk groups, (v) new financing mechanisms, and (vi) improved information sharing among partners with different levels of connectivity*". (RP 100776: Project Abstract). Or

Developing country, as in:
Project General objective: "*To enhance the capacity of developing countries to better formulate their biotechnology strategies and priorities as they relate to trade and sustainable development, and integrate them into national, regional and international policy-making processes.*" Project objective 1: "*to improve the understanding of the flexibities provided by the multilateral trade system for designing biotechnology -related policies and regulations*"; Project objective 2: "*to effectively participate in international negotiations on biotechnology, trade and sustainable development in the various relevant negotiating forums*"; and Project objective 3: "*to develop domestic and/or regional policies that adequately address countries' biosafety concerns, as well as prospects for biotechnology development and potential benefits, while balacing them with international trade obligations.*" (RP 102724).

Inevitably, although with varying detail and explicitness, the reviewed documents of projects with sectoral, country and system level capacity building objectives refer to an intention to develop the capacities of individuals and/or organizations in order to contribute to the capacity building objective at those "higher levels". For example, projects with the capacity development outcome objective of building the indigenous research capacity in a nation/region and/or particular field of study, for example, aim to build capacity at the individual researcher and/or organizational level through the supported research project (e.g. in agrobiodiversity globally in 101425 ; in the use of feminist approaches to macro- and international economics globally in 101891; in the use of an ecosystem approach to human health in the Middle-East, North and West Africa in 100586; and in participatory action oriented research methodologies in China in 100732).

As pointed out in the methodology section of this report, it is not possible to say with confidence how many projects intend to build capacity at the individual or organizational level, or to quantify intentions at the various sub-grouping levels because the necessary information to make such determinations is not consistently available in the reviewed documents for all projects. For example, when targeted beneficiaries are referred to collectively as "stakeholders" or "partners", there is no way of knowing whether individual or organizational level capacities, or both are being targeted. There is also no way of knowing whether all intended beneficiaries are identified when some are. Indeed as mentioned earlier, in the documents reviewed for about 20% of the projects, there is an explicit or implicit reference to additional beneficiaries beyond those identified in the reviewed document.

Another factor that prevents quantifying effort toward developing capacities of certain beneficiaries is that in many documents the actual wording used and/or multiple references to capacity building intentions and expectations throughout the document are confusing, and in numerous cases it was unclear who the beneficiaries of capacity building efforts are. This situation creates opportunity for interpretation, and potentially misinterpretation, of capacity building intentions.

Nonetheless, it is possible to report that the reviewed documents for many projects refer only to an intent to build capacity at the individual level or at the organizational level (although as per above, we cannot really know with certainty what was not reported on). At the individual level, projects target building capacities among researchers, or users of research results, or both. Similarly, capacity at the organizational level is targeted at research institutions, or users' institutions, or both.

The distinction between a researcher and a research results user is not always a clear one. Researchers use research results in numerous ways, such as to influence / inform policy-makers, to train other researchers and practitioners, and to advance research forward for example. Other "users" or "recipients" of research results, such as some policy-makers, farmers, development programmers and advocacy groups for example, use research results generated by others for their respective purposes. However "researchers" and "users" are not necessarily a mutually exclusive group. The reviewed project documents suggest that there appears to be a large group of people who are both the generators of the research and the (end-) users of the research results. For example, a number of projects aim to develop the capacity among consumer organizations and community-based organizations to generate the evidence (i.e. do the research) and to develop and implement advocacy strategies (i.e. use the research to mobilize change). Similarly, researchers in government and development organizations for example, are involved in projects which aim to build their capacity to generate the research results and to use them to develop (and often implement) management plans, policies or programs for example in the context of the research project. In these cases, the researchers are also the research end-users. In many of these cases, these researchers/end-users are joined by researchers from universities or various other research

institutions as part of the research team.

The distinction between researchers and research result end-users can get obscure in participatory action research projects, for example, where multiple (and sometimes unidentified) stakeholders are involved with varying (and sometimes unspecified) levels of participation in a variety of project activities (e.g. identifying problems, finding possible solutions, implementing developed "solutions" and monitoring and evaluating them).

This distinction is raised only because I was struck by the apparent emphasis among the sampled projects on building the capacity of research result end-users (who may or may not also be researchers) to use research results (and maybe also to conduct the research).

Reviewed documents also reveal that many projects have intent to build capacity at both the individual and organizational levels. Very often this intent refers to building capacity of researchers and their institutions, but also refers to researchers and networks, researchers and user organizations, and practitioners and their organizations. Indications of intent to build capacity at multiple levels was revealed in the reviewed documents by single sentences, or by multiple statements presented together or spread out among different sections of the project appraisal. Some examples of statements indicating intent to build capacity in multiple beneficiaries and/or at multiple levels through a single project follow.

Text Box 1: Some Examples of statements indicating intent to build capacity in multiple beneficiaries and/or at multiple levels through a single project:

1. *"The project effectively responds to the Centre's and the mandate of the TEC PI in several ways. The project's emphasis on strengthening the negotiation and policy analysis capacity of developing countries is in line with the Centre's overall mandate of capacity building. This also fits squarely with TEC's objectives of improving the capacity of developing countries in trade negotiations and promoting coherence between domestic and international policies. Given the complexity of the rules and regulations associated with WTO agreements, the project will respond to a major challenge facing developing countries in trade negotiations by enhancing their understanding of the rules of the game, by promoting their effective participation in trade negotiations, and by strengthening their capacity to ensure that the outcomes are in line with their overall development goals. This will be achieved through the provision of analytical and technical support to negotiations in the form of background research, negotiation briefs, skills enhancement and negotiation training, facilitation of the emergence of a multidisciplinary network of trade experts, and on-going advisory support. ILEAP's capacity building effort is also aimed at building the next generation of trade/development experts to remedy the lack of professional trade advisors in developing countries. This will contribute to the development of a critical mass of well-trained trade and development analysts in the South, capable of providing sound policy advice on matters of domestic, regional and international trade policies and negotiations."* (RP102829, Appraisal Section 20: The Project in Relation to Centre Objectives).

2. *"To build human resource capacity amongst researchers and other groups and to empower local herder and farmer organizations with NRM responsibilities."* (RP 100875: Project Objective 6).

3. *"More specifically, the research outputs of the project will: ....- Build the capacity of local governments and community groups to engage in monitoring impacts of mining activities and, develop and implement policies and programs to maximize benefits to the population while minimizing the negative impacts of mining operations. - Sensitize and strengthen the capacity of mining companies in planning more sustainable management practices in mineral development."* (RP101276; Appraisal Section 80: Impact of the Project and its Results).

4. *"This project will support testing of SAS and enhance the capacity of researchers and research institutions to do participatory social and cultural analysis."* (RP 102600: Project Abstract)

Text Box 1 continued: Some Examples of statements indicating intent to build capacity in multiple beneficiaries and/or at multiple levels through a single project:

5. *"Contribute to building the capabilities of the region¿s researchers and research institutions through training in methodology and mentoring provided by the Project Coordinator."*(RP 102257: Project Objective 3).

6. *"For development practitioners, the expected outcome is a strengthened capacity for systematic documentation, analysis, learning and sharing of lessons, both individually and institutionally, along with an enhanced ability to influence research agendas and development programming priorities."* (RP 101944: Appraisal Section 80: Impact of the Project and its Results).

7. "*The key development outcomes expected from the project are:- Increased capacity and knowledge among policymakers in the ESCAP region, particularly those in the least developed countries, to make informed decisions on trade policy issues. - Increased capacity within policy research institutions in the ESCAP region to undertake high quality and wide-ranging trade-related research, and the effective dissemination of research results to policymakers.*" (RP102568: Appraisal Section 80: Impact of the Project and its Results).

8. *"To promote ongoing capacity development among researchers through training programs, institutional development, postgraduate education and technology transfer. Greater capacity development will also be pursued directly among community participants and policy makers using workshops and public education initiatives and indirectly through the newly formed Coordinating Commission and other institutional means.*" (RP 101157: Project Objective 3).

3.5   Capacities Targeted through Sampled Research Projects

A number of capacities are identified in the reviewed documents as targets for development through the sampled research projects. In general, these capacities fit well into Anne Bernard's "*capacity develop map*" which she first produced in 2002 and later updated based on an analysis of the aims, activities, and results of various individual and institutional capacity development initiatives of some 40 IDRC projects[16].

From her analysis, Anne Bernard found that the specific capacities which the IDRC attempts to support through research projects could be grouped in to five "capacity categories". These five categories and part of her accompanying descriptions are copied here[17].

From Bernard, Feb 2005:

1. "*The capacity to conduct research: This refers to the technical, disciplinary and/or sectoral knowledge, mastery of research methods and analytical skills appropriate to conducting either a current or an evolving research investigation.*"

2. "*The capacity to manage research: This refers to the professional knowledge and practical experience of management principles, processes and procedures within the research context appropriate to conceiving, initiating, facilitating implementation and ensuring monitoring of a research activity, programme or institution.*"

3. "*The capacity to conceive, generate and sustain research: This refers to the sophisticated and comprehensive disciplinary, sector or problem area expertise, coupled with strong and experienced-based knowledge of the field, appropriate to engaging with, inventing and exchanging new ideas and to generating research. It includes capacities to reconceive a development problem in ways which account for its interaction with other problems and sectors, and to present the problem in ways that reach beyond the immediate moment and/or local conditions. It includes being able to perceive the importance of the specific issues within the context of the wider whole.*"

---

[16]See "Mapping Capacity Development in IDRC". Prepared for: Evaluation Unit, IDRC by Anne Bernard, February 2005.

[17] From "Mapping Capacity Development in IDRC". Prepared for: Evaluation Unit, IDRC by Anne Bernard, February 2005, pages 2-5. Examples of specific capacities which would fall under each of these general category headings are also provided in the Bernard document but are not copied here.

4. *'The capacity to use research results -- in policy-making and implementation, programme development and management, development/sector practice, and to facilitate contributions to other research activities.*

   For <u>researchers</u>: This refers to the professional knowledge of factors (concepts and processes) underlying communication and adoption of innovation and management of change, and of the nature and implications of the research outcomes in terms of potential risks and benefits, constraints and opportunities for users, appropriate to moving from the generation of ideas and analysis to enabling their dissemination and application -- and helping others to engage with this process.

   For <u>users</u> (practitioners, programmers, policy-makers in the specific research context): This refers to having a knowledge of the substance, processes and/or technologies involved in the research, including its underlying justification and rationale, theory and assumptions and its potential risks and benefits, appropriate to applying it in their policy and/or practice environment."

5. *"The capacity to create or mobilize research links to systemic policy formation or change, and to promote systems change: This refers to knowledge of the research area, particularly in relation to development problems/issues and dimensions of risk or benefit in dealing with the research problem at national, regional and/or global levels; and professional and practical knowledge of policy systems and processes in general and within the specific contexts relevant to research application appropriate to mobilizing and facilitating application. This is arguably among the most institution-intense of the capacity areas, requiring people with capacities to think and act in terms of organizations as systems and individuals as part of coherent groups and able to work collaboratively with common goals."*

As mentioned, Bernard identifies numerous specific capacities that are subsumed under each of the five broad categories listed above in her document "*Mapping Capacity Development in IDRC*".   In this review, a number of the same capacities were identified in project documents as targeted for development through the research projects. In general however, the range of competencies targeted and level of detail that Bernard was able to provide was not available in the project documents reviewed here (i.e. project abstract, objectives, and appraisal). In some cases, there was not even enough information provided in the reviewed documents to categorize intent at the level of Bernard's 5 broad research capacities presented above. In part this is because the capacity objective is often referred to as "research capacity" which could of course include any one or all of the 5 broad "sub-capacities". But the task of slotting capacity building intentions into categories was also complicated by the fact that capacity development objectives are often presented as the final capacity objective - for example, to develop the capacity of local governments to better understand cause-effect chains leading to conflict and insecurity, and develop local peace and security building processes (102123), or to develop the capacity of

partner organizations to manage small-scale fisheries and coastal resources (101457). When the specific capacities targeted for development in order to achieve such outcomes are not elaborated on, or in the case of participatory action research projects where "users" partake in research activities, it can be difficult to determine if the intent is to build capacity to conduct the research needed to generate the knowledge to develop the plan for example, or if the focus is on learning how to interpret the research results and apply it appropriately in a particular policy/practice environment (i.e. to "use" the research results), or both.

Capacities identified in the reviewed documents as targeted for development through the selected research projects follow. Capacities are grouped below in (slightly modified) categories based on Bernard's 5 capacity categories which emerged from her capacity mapping exercise as shown above [18]. This review found that many projects have intent to develop a broad range of research competencies among individuals and/or organizations within a single project[19]. Notably, the documents for these projects often indicate an overall capacity development strategy/objective to develop a critical mass of researchers in a field of research or using an approach to research which is new to a region, to the field of study, or to the researchers/organizations involved. In contrast, many other projects appear to focus on developing a specific skill or particular gap in knowledge needed to keep the research on track or moving forward (e.g. 100961). As pointed out earlier in the methodology section, more intent may well be planned than is indicated in the reviewed documents for any single project. Capacities identified in the reviewed documents as targeted for development through the selected research projects include:

---

[18] See "Mapping Capacity Development in IDRC". Prepared for: Evaluation Unit, IDRC by Anne Bernard, February 2005.

[19] For example in 101605: *"The emphasis in this capacity-building project will be on all aspects of the research process, from proposal-writing through research design, field methods, and report writing, and including research administration skills"*. 101891 aims to *"Intégrer la ayant une formation avancée aux approches féministes de la macroéconomie et de l'économie internationale. Les dimension genre aux politiques et programmes macroéconomiques."* (Gen obj:); *"Familiariser les économistes principaux bénéficiaires du projet seront des jeunes affiliés à des universités, des institutions de recherche, des organisations gouvernementales et internationales, et particulièrement en provenance du Sud"* (Obj 01); *"Accroître la capacité des bénéficiaires à appliquer les outils de recherche et les méthodologies féministes en macroéconomie et en économie internationale."* (Obj 02); *"Accroître la capacité des bénéficiaires à formuler des questions de recherche féministes."* (Obj 03); *"Dans le cas des bénéficiaires ayant des charges d'enseignement, améliorer leur capacité à intégrer l'économie féministe et l'analyse de genre dans les cours de macroéconomie, commerce international, finance internationale et économie du développement."* (Obj 04); *"Augmenter leur capacité à formuler des politiques dans ce domaine."* (Obj 05); and *"Améliorer leur capacité de réseautage avec d'autres spécialistes et activistes travaillant sur des problématiques similaires et en particulier accroître le réseautage Nord-Sud."* (Obj 06). 101055 aims to *"To strengthen the research capacity of key Southern ICT partners by developing their skills in collecting, analysing, synthesizing, publishing and marketing content"* (Obj 3). And 100586 aims to create and reinforce multidisciplinary teams by training researchers in the practical and theoretical tools of the Ecosystem approach to human health, assisting the teams to convert their preliminary proposals into ones based on the ecosystem approach to human health, financing the research through small grants, and facilitating partnerships among researchers and donors.

The Capacity to Conduct Research. Reported for development at both the individual and organizational level and includes developing the following specific capacities and skills:

- to understand the theoretical and practical knowledge appropriate to the field/subject of study (e.g. 100622;.101095; 100864; 100586);
- technological capacities among researchers/ institutions (and sometimes users) in order to conduct the research. For example:
  - among <u>researchers</u>, the capacity to use and deploy ICTs in the specific research application (e.g. 4458, 102248);
  - among <u>users</u> in order for the research to be conducted and/or to improve the applicability of the innovation/research results and/or to sustain its application. There are many examples in the case of action research on the application of ICTs (e.g. 101210 aims to develop skills in IT and content development of youth and women re-integrating into society; 100739 aims to build capacity of students, teachers and educational administrators to use ICTs effectively for teaching and learning in order to develop a deeper understanding of the educational processes, benefits and constraints relating to use of ICTs in education and to provide practical experiences and lessons to the ongoing policy formulation and implementation process. 100900 aims to build capacity of NGOs, extension staff and farmers to produce vegetables on a sustainable basis, at least in part so that the researchers can get evidence and information on the scope and performance of urban and peri-urban agriculture as well as its social and gender related opportunities and constraints. In 100670, farmers will receive training in the application of the innovation, visit other farmers who are using it, and develop and monitor indicators (i.e. do research) as a strategy to sustain the intervention - *"These two PIs, as well as the Centre as a whole, believe that participation of all stakeholders at strategic times, in the research process, is key to find adapted solutions that the communities and other stakeholders will implement even after the research is completed and the research teams are no longer directly involved. As an example, a team of farmers will be trained to do a part of the research to develop indicators. Participation is considered a key element of sustainability.";*
- analytical skills to derive, interpret and present results for users (e.g.100815; 101032);
- methodological skills and knowledge required to conduct biological and social research fieldwork and data analysis, for example in:
  - agricultural economics (e.g. 102127); participatory social and cultural analysis (e.g. 102600); gender analysis (e.g. 101095; 101093); participatory monitoring and evaluation; economic modeling techniques (e.g. 100740); trans-disciplinary research methods (e.g.101631);
  - sampling design (e.g. 102155);
  - field sampling techniques (e.g. 100555);
  - laboratory analysis of samples (e.g. 102411; 101817);
  - understanding the ethics involved in carry out participatory field research (e.g. *"Researchers will be well informed of the risk inherent in participatory techniques of generating unfulfillable expectations, and will be coached in how to manage local*

expectations from the research effort while still trying to ensure fair benefits flow to local farmers as a result of their voluntary participation in the project" (101402); similarly 101414);

- to collaborate and work with others (e.g. 101054);
- to communicate research results (writing skills) (e.g. 101178);
- for researchers conducting participatory research the capacity to communicate with a range of stakeholders (e.g. communities, government officials, development workers, community organizations, NGOs) and through improved communication skills be better able to facilitate the participation of various actors in the research activities by helping them to develop research skills and/or other more general life skills such as leadership, decision-making, self-organization, advocacy, and the capacity to access information and opportunities (e.g. 101019; 101967; 100488; 102048; 100876; 100652; 101402; 102446).

The Capacity to Manage Research. Reported at both the individual and organizational level, although most project documents report targeting these capacities at the organizational level, and includes developing the following specific capacities and skills:

- to manage the administrative, organizational and financial aspects of a research program/project (e.g.101433; 101068; 100607;100925; 101273; 102237; 100721; 101605), including the ability to:
    - plan and conduct a research program, including co-ordinating research agendas among network membership (e.g.102140);
    - engage with other institutions on applied research issues or outcomes (101605);
    - write proposals (e.g. 101605; 101272);
    - write reports (e.g.101605);
    - identify and secure the expertise needed to conduct the research and facilitate participatory planning (e.g.100983).

The Capacity to Conceive and Generate Research. Reported for development at both the individual and organizational level and includes developing the following specific capacities and skills:

- to identify problems, formulate research questions, and develop an appropriate research design and methodology to address them; this requires having understanding of the research problem and contextual issues, as well as of research approaches to/and experiences with addressing them (e.g. 101414; 101891; 101478; 101605);
- to conceive or reconceive development problems, and an approach to finding their solution through research which takes account of their interaction with other problems, sectors and/or stakeholders (e.g. to use a "new" research approach/ paradigm such as the Ecosystem Approach to Human Health which typically requires researchers to move from their disciplinary approach to defining the research problem and seeking solutions to using transdisciplinary, participatory and gender-integrative methodologies (100586; 102463; 100775). These approaches can be new to the field of study, to the region, and/ or to the particular researchers/institutions involved in the project (e.g.100732; 102463).

The Capacity to Use Research Results.   Reported for development at both the individual and organizational level for both researchers and research result users, and includes developing the following specific capacities and skills[20]:
- among researchers:
  - to target research to respond to local and regional priorities (e.g.101621);
  - to orient the design and conduct of the research, and to present, document (write-up, video), package, and communicate/disseminate the research results to specific users (other researchers or other research users) for specific purposes (e.g. for planning, decision making, advocacy, and practice) (e.g. 100999; 101592; 101055; 102165; 101060; 101019). This involves the capacity to understand the constraints to and opportunities for the application based on users' knowledge, skills and attitudes (preferences) and the particular context of their environment (physical, cultural, socio-economic, political, bureaucratic, institutional) (e.g. 101726; 101402; 101835; 100487 for example aims to increase the capacity of researchers to document, analyze, understand and share cases of best practice and the current institutional and policy framework that either supports or retards community-based approaches);
  - to use research results and experiences to develop training materials (e.g.102048; 100641);
  - to facilitate the use of research by others (e.g. 101019).

- among research results users. By engaging users in various ways in research project activities, many projects aim to build capacity in research results users (e.g. practitioners, policy-makers, programmers, and their organizations) to use research results (e.g. for better policy/program planning and practice in the context of sustainable development planning (e.g. 101276), for peace and conflict management (e.g. 102123; 100870; 100831); for human health management (e.g. 100661; 101938;) and natural resource management (101778; 101592;101276; 4566)). While the specific capacities targeted to achieve an increased capacity to use research results are not always identified in the reviewed project documents, there is explicit reference to increasing the capacity in the users to:
  - understand the issues around, and the context of, the development problem under investigation, the research processes used to find possible solutions, as well as the implications associated with applying the solution(s) in a particular context (e.g. 102764; 101466). In many cases this involves developing the skills and capacities of the users that are needed to play an active role in generating the research results, in testing/analyzing their suitability, adapting them as appropriate, being able to make informed decisions as to whether to adopt/use the research results and having the ability to do so if desired. For example:
    - some capacity development activities for policy-makers/negotiators aim to increase their understanding of the "rules of the game", enhance their capacity to

---

[20] Often this capacity building objective is coupled with intent to build capacity to conduct research.

determine priorities for promoting and negotiating proactive positions which reflect their own agenda, and can include developing their negotiating skills (e.g. 102829; 102720,101851); similarly other projects aim to develop the knowledge and skills of policy makers that are necessary to understand and analyze the issues and use the research results to formulate policy and legislation (e.g. 100864, 100816, 101039).

- A number of projects aim to increase the capacity of farmers/extension workers to participate in the development, testing and adoption of various technologies (e.g. 101835; 101631 - *"Farmers will participate actively in the development and testing of the identified technologies...Training will be given to ensure that the end-users, especially the women are empowered to play an active role in the technology generation, dissemination and adoption, also in partnerships with farmers, policy makers, NGOs, extension services and services providers."*. 101307 - "*In order to ensure the sustainability of the system [*developed*] , the proposal also places an appropriate emphasis on training and local capacity-building of all stakeholders from farmers and supporting NGOs, to seed producers and supporting laboratories and researchers. At one level, this series of planned local capacity building activities will contribute to meeting one of the Centre's objectives of building local capacity so that people can in turn manage their own affairs as appropriate.*"

- And for community members, their organizations and other participants involved in community based natural resource management research and development activities, capacity building efforts may include developing skills in leadership, decision-making, self-organization, facilitation, and advocacy which are necessary to facilitate their understanding of, and access to the research process and results (e.g.100652; 101402; 102446; 102252; 102252).

The Capacity to Create or Mobilize Policy and Bureaucratic Change with Research Results. Reported for development at both the individual and organizational level and often in the context of building capacity to conduct and use research. Specific capacities and skills targeted for development include:
- to advocate for change which includes developing:
  - the knowledge and the skills to articulate their interest to influence policy in targeted written publications, and in presentations and dialogue at various fora (e.g. 101032; 102397; 102209; 102651; 102829);
  - leadership skills which builds the confidence to advocate for change (e.g. 101205; 102145);
  - the knowledge and skills to develop strategies to affect change in policies, programs and practices (e.g. 101205; 101046); and the
  - the ability to identify opportunities and form alliances to use research results to promote change (e.g.102331).

The Capacity to Support Research. Reported for development at both the individual and organizational level and includes developing the following specific capacities and skills:

- The capacity to teach/train. Reported predominantly at the institutional level, the reported capacities targeted or expected to be developed through projects include the capacities to develop training materials and deliver training. Capacity development activities reported to achieve this include conducting research for content development (e.g. on various theoretical and practical issues related to the conduct of the research or the discipline/sector, or on best practices for example), receiving training (i.e. train the trainers), developing and testing content and delivery, and practice with support in the context of a small grants program for example (e.g. 100718, 102048). Some projects have the joint objective of increasing the capacity of the trainees and of the trainers/training institution (e.g. 100641 and 101640).

- The capacity to provide general research support to others, often including the capacity to train others, but also to provide information, facilitate networking and collaboration among others, provide technical advice, provide technological services, research and evaluation support, and to help others learn how to learn, for example (e.g.101635; 102391, 102267; 102101).

- Institutional support capacities. These include the capacities that are targeted for development that allow the recipient organization to be better able to support its research function. Reported capacity building objectives include developing the organizational human resource capacity, as well as the technological, financial and managerial capacities. The project documents of at least 22 projects made explicit reference to support for organizational strengthening. Examples of organizational strengthening activities supported by some projects include:
  - Activities to diversify donor support, reduce administrative costs, and improve communications with membership/partners (e.g. 100603, 100886 (INBAR)).
  - Strengthening ICT technical, managerial and training capacity in Asean Foundation to be able to manage a capacity building project "being devolved" to them by, at least in part, hiring staff with ICT expertise and through the provision of support from IDRC in terms of coaching, consultations, consensus-building, teaching and training (101224).
  - Organizational strengthening of ICRISAT's research and development program in East and Southern Africa involves hiring an expert to work in the organization to strengthen programming integration within the organization, develop public relations and fund raising activities, enhance team dynamics and develop human resource capacity (through provision of advice and guidance to graduate students and research project leaders) (102562).
  - Strengthen the management and financial capacity of the AAU secretariat and facilitate resource expansion. The project provides support for upgrading equipment and facilities at participating membership universities, for staff exchanges and the

completion of theses/ dissertations (101991).

- Strengthen the executive secretariat of a network so it can better support it membership by supporting activities to capture additional resources and institutionalize its support activities (e.g. administer an electronic mailing list and website, manage a data base of experts and reference materials, produce electronic bulletins for members, form strategic alliances with players, and seek funding) (100503).
- Support LINK Centre to help it provide leadership, build relationships, and act as a resource base for an African ICT research network by providing the resources to let LINK develop and maintain a network website with online tools to support research, promote communication among centres, disseminate information, support periodic seminars, workshops and conferences, improve interaction and facilitate participation of African centres in international work, allow development of Africa's first Masters and PhD programmes in the field of ICT policy and regulation (101584).

References:

1. Bernard, Anne and Greg Armstrong. February, 2005. *Framework for Evaluating Capacity Development in IDRC*. Prepared for the Evaluation Unit, IDRC.

2. Bernard, Anne. February 2005. *Mapping Capacity Development in IDRC*. Prepared for Evaluation Unit, IDRC.

Appendix 1: Table showing the list of 561 projects whose objectives, abstract and appraisal documents were reviewed in this exercise, and decisions of explicit (exp) and implicit (impl) indications of intent to build capacity at the project objective and/or general project level. (n/i = intent not indicated)

Proj #	Proj level	Obj level	Proj #	Proj level	Obj level	Proj #	Proj level	Obj level	Proj #	Proj level	Obj level
100539	exp	exp	101247	exp	exp			sure	101026	exp	exp
100603	exp	not nec	101262	exp	exp	101386	exp	exp	101029	exp	exp
100622	exp	exp	101402	exp	exp	101390	exp	exp	101030	exp	exp
100815	exp	exp	101414	exp	impl	101391	exp	exp	101039	exp	exp
100886	exp	exp	101442	exp - by def	n/i	101783	exp - by def	not nec	101082	exp - by def	not nec
101032	exp	exp	101468	exp	exp	102203	exp	exp	101090	exp	exp
101425	exp	exp	101478	exp	exp	102209	exp	exp	101101	exp	exp
101874	exp	exp	101554	exp	n/i	102237	exp	exp	101151	exp	exp
101891	exp	exp	101605	exp	exp	102245	exp	impl	101172	exp	impl
101965	exp	exp	101657	exp	exp	102267	exp	exp	101204	exp	exp
102123	exp	exp	101694	exp	not nec	102321	exp	exp	101207	exp	exp
102170	exp	exp	102005	exp	exp	102390	exp	exp	101210	exp	exp
102680	exp	exp	102042	exp	exp	102397	exp	exp	101338	exp	impl
102794	exp	exp	102064	exp	exp	102563	exp	exp	101340	exp	?
100473	exp	impl	102077	exp	exp	102685	exp	exp	101346	exp	exp
100586	exp	exp	102119	exp	impl	100864	exp	exp	101579	exp	exp
101019	exp	exp	102248	exp	impl	100971	exp	exp	101592	exp	exp
102127	exp	imp	102304	exp	exp	102142	exp	exp	101617	exp - by def	n/i
102600	exp	exp	102309	exp	exp	102198	exp	impl	101621	exp - by def	not nec
102610	exp	exp	102361	exp	exp	100550	exp - by def	n/I	101635	exp	exp
4458	exp	exp	102429	exp	exp	100675	exp - by def	impl	101744	exp	exp
100487	exp	exp	102454	exp	exp	100695	exp - by def	impl	101915	exp	exp
100488	exp	exp	102770	exp	exp	100719	exp	n/I	101967	exp	exp
100732	exp	exp	102463	exp	imp	100739	exp	exp	101978	exp	n/i by def
100740	exp	n/i	102562	exp	exp	100792	exp - by def	impl	101991	exp	exp
100763	exp	exp	102580	exp	exp	100796	exp - by def	impl	102033	exp	n/i by def
100811	exp	exp	102607	exp	exp	100816	exp	exp	102078	exp	impl
100828	exp	exp	102633	exp	exp	100868	exp - by def	impl	102095	exp	exp
100875	exp	exp	102651	exp	maybe	100877	exp	n/i	102121	exp	exp
100876	exp	exp	102655	exp	imp	100985	exp	exp	102145	exp	exp
100961	exp	exp	3690	exp	n/i				102178	exp	exp
100962	exp	exp	100503	exp	exp				102443	exp	exp
100963	exp - by def	impl	100581	exp	n/i						
100967	exp	n/i	100600	exp	not nec						
101012	exp	exp	100730	exp	exp						
101086	exp	exp	100775	exp	exp						
101093	exp	exp	100831	exp	exp						
101095	exp	exp	100997	exp	exp						
101214	exp	not nec	101107	exp	impl						
101221	exp	exp	101212	exp	impl						
101223	exp	exp	101252	exp - by def	impl						
101224	exp	exp	101383	exp	not						
101226	exp	impl									

ID		
100645	exp	exp
100646	n/l	n/i
100731	n/l	n/i
100827	exp	exp
100836	maybe	n/i
100915	impl	n/i
100994	exp	exp
100999	exp	exp
101092	exp	exp
101255	exp	exp
101259	exp	exp
101378	exp	exp
101395	n/l	n/i
101923	exp	exp
102018	exp	n/i
102129	exp	exp
102172	exp	exp
102331	exp	exp
102440	exp	exp
102457	n/l	n/i
102478	exp	not nec
102660	exp	exp
100700	exp	exp
102415	exp	exp
102803	exp	not nec
100421	exp	not nec
100422	exp	n/i
100483	exp	impl
100561	n/l	n/i
100580	n/l	n/i
100607	exp	n/i
100800	n/l	n/i
100835	n/l	n/i
100925	exp	n/i
100953	exp	imp
101037	exp	n/i
101054	exp	exp
101060	exp	exp
101216	n/l	n/i
101277	exp	exp
101318	probably	n/i
101344	exp	n/i
101413	exp	exp
101429	exp	n/i
101433	exp	exp
101511	exp	n/i
101527	exp	exp
101528	exp	exp
101595	impl	n/i
101608	exp	exp
101672	exp	n/i
101793	exp	n/i
101803	exp	exp
101878	exp	n/i
102046	exp	exp
102048	exp	exp
102050	n/l	n/i
102168	n/l	n/i
102194	exp	n/i
102291	exp	n/i
102332	exp	exp
102340	impl	impl
102434	exp	exp
102446	exp	exp
102792	exp	n/i
102793	exp	n/i
4440	exp	n/i
100133	exp	exp
100405	exp	exp
100494	exp	n/i
100504	exp	n/i
100568	exp	n/i
100584	n/l	n/i
100641	exp	exp
100721	exp	exp
100854	exp	n/i
100955	exp	not nec
100983	exp	exp
101067	exp	n/i
101068	exp	n/i
101156	exp	n/i
101159	exp	impl
101178	exp	exp
101200	exp	exp
101209	n/i/	n/i
101232	exp	exp
101385	exp	exp
101389	exp	probably
101416	exp	n/i
101420	exp	n/i
101545	n/l	n/i
101598	exp	not nec
101630	exp	n/i
101647	exp	impl
101810	exp	n/i
101893	exp	not nec
101898	exp	exp
101944	exp	impl
101984	n/l	n/i
102058	impl	n/l ?
102072	impl	n/i
102073	impl	n/i
102118	exp	n/i
102197	exp	exp
102201	n/l	n/i
102224	not nec	
102369	impl	n/i
102373	exp	n/i
102391	exp	exp
102778	exp	exp
100880	exp	exp
100980	exp	exp
101115	exp	exp
101132	n/l	n/i
101323	exp	n/i
101839	exp	n/i
101954	exp	n/i
102206	exp	exp
102376	exp	n/i
102574	n/l	n/i
100259	impl	n/i
100371	impl	impl
100376	exp	exp
100482	impl	n/i
100555	exp	impl
100649	n/l	n/i (only ab & obj)
100776	exp	impl
100832	impl	n/i
100900	exp	exp
100902	exp	n/i
101125	exp	exp
101203	exp	n/i
101205	exp	exp
101309	n/l	n/i
101446	n/l	n/i
101452	exp	exp
101535	n/l	n/i
101569	impl	n/i
101640	exp	exp
101696	exp	n/i
101697	exp	exp
101778	exp	exp
101807	not nec	n/i
101833	exp	n/i
101918	exp	exp
101938	exp	n/i
102019	exp	exp
102069	exp	exp
102079	exp	exp
102139	exp	exp
102146	exp	exp
102155	exp	exp
102208	exp,	exp,
102241	exp	exp
102250	exp	exp
102252	exp	n/i
102272	exp	exp
102411	impl	n/i
102447	exp	exp
102673	probably	n/i
102750	n/l	n/i
102507	exp	exp
102280	exp	exp
102303	exp	exp
102111	exp	exp
101831	exp	n/i
101832	exp	n/i
101517	impl	n/i
101444	impl	n/i
101171	exp	n/i
101177	exp	exp
101195	exp	n/i
101098	impl	n/i
101100	n/l	n/i
100844	maybe	n/i

```
100538 n/l    n/i
100540 n/a    n/a
101363 exp    impl
102283 exp    n/i
102341 n/l    n/i
102764 exp    exp
100570 impl   n/i
101426 exp    exp
100582 n/l    n/i
100661 exp    exp
100662 exp    n/i
101028 n/l    n/i
101035 n/l    n/i
101158 n/l    n/i
101233 exp     impl
101415 exp    n/i
101812 n/l -  n/i
101814 n/l -  n/i
101817 exp    n/i
102140 exp    exp
102217 exp    imp
102218 exp    n/i
100887 exp    impl
101199 exp    n/i
101272 exp    exp
102130 exp    exp
102202 exp    exp
101293 n/l    n/i
100484 impl   n/i
100520 exp    n/i
100666 exp    n/i
100670 exp    n/i
100718 exp    exp
100861 exp    n/i
100888 exp    n/i
101465 exp    n/i
101577 exp    n/i
101578 exp    n/i
101581 exp    exp
101618 n/l    n/i
102413 n/l    n/i
102419 exp    n/i
102462 impl   n/i
```

ID		
100471	exp	exp
100505	exp	n/i
100647	exp	exp
100728 n/I -(ab & obj)	n/i	
100840	expI	n/i
100968	n/I	n/i
101040	n/I	n/I
101042	impl	impl
101047	n/I	n/i
101236	exp	exp
101241	n/I	n/i
101342	exp	n/i
101656	exp	exp
101674	exp	exp
101713	n/I	n/i
101724	n/I	n/i
101851	exp	exp
101937	impl	n/i
102037	maybe	n/i
102210	n/I	n/i
102279	exp	exp
102631	n/I	n/i
102675	exp	exp
102701	exp	n/I
102720	exp	exp
102724	exp	exp
102755	n/I	n/i
102449	n/I	n/i
102650	exp	exp
102450	exp	exp
102829	exp	exp
100472	exp	not nec
100507	exp	n/i
100556	exp	exp
100713	exp	exp
100759	n/I	n/i
100809	maybe	n/i
100863	exp	exp
100897	exp	n/i
101053	exp	n/i
101273	exp	exp
101681	exp	exp
101835	exp	n/i
101925	exp	n/i
101947	exp	exp
102043	exp	n/i
102330	n/I	n/i
102335	n/I	n/i
102421	n/I	n/i
102568	exp	exp
102652	exp	exp
100496	n/I	n/i
100501	exp	n/i
100648	exp	exp
102736	n/I	n/i
100697	n/I	n/i
100982	n/I	n/i
100996	n/I	n/i
101034	exp	exp
101046	exp	n/i
101088	exp	exp
101157	exp	exp
101322	exp	exp
101367	exp	impl
101406	impl	n/i
101423	exp	n/i
101471	exp	exp
101476	exp	n/i
101490	exp	exp
101646	impl	n/i
101650	exp	n/i
101666	n/I	n/i
101862	exp	exp
101876	exp	n/i
102002	exp	n/i
102003	n/I	n/i
102101	exp	exp
102107	exp	n/i
102116	exp	exp
102211	exp	exp
102228	exp -	n/i
102244	exp	n/i
102417	exp	exp
102608	exp	exp
102622	exp	impl
102657	exp	maybe
4566	exp	exp
100063	cancel- led	
100067	exp	n/i
100594	exp	exp
100596	n/i	n/i
100908	n/i	n/i
101018	exp	exp
100583	exp	impl
102204	exp	exp
101174	n/i	n/i
101430	exp	exp
101494	exp	n/i
101590	exp	exp
101610	exp	n/i
101687	n/i	n/i
101726	exp	exp
101806	exp	exp
101931	exp	n/i
102080	exp	impl
102235	exp	n/i
102236	n/i	n/i
102257	exp	exp
102742	exp	exp
101334	n/i	n/i
100519	n/i	n/i
100572 n/i (ab & obj)	n/i	
100577 n/i (abst & obj only)	n/i	
100604 exp - (abst & obj)	n/i	
100633 exp (abst & obj)	exp	
100674	n/i	n/i
100692	n/i	n/i
100733 exp (abst & obj)	n/i	
100737	impl	impl
100754	exp	n/i
100793	exp	n/i
100810	exp	n/i
100830	exp	n/i
100870	exp	exp
100883	exp	n/i
100913	exp	exp
100954	exp	exp
101007 n/i (abst & obj)	n/i	
101061	exp	n/i
101064 n/i (abst only)	N/A	
101112 exp (abst & obj)	exp	
101134 n/i (abst & obj)	n/i	
101160	exp	exp
101191	exp	n/i
101196	exp	exp
101237 n/i - (abst & obj)	n/i	
101339	exp	exp
101477	n/i	n/i
101489	exp	maybe
101550	maybe	n/i
101560 exp (abst & obj)	exp	
101566 n/i. ab and obj only	n/i	
101570	exp	n/i
101584	exp	exp
101644	exp	exp
101688	impl	n/i
101781	exp	exp
101914	n/i	n/i
101939	n/i	n/i
101972	exp	impl
102008	n/i	n/i
102041	exp	exp
102103	exp	impl
102135	exp	n/i
102162	exp	exp
102470	n/i	n/i
102509	exp	exp
102611	exp	exp
102787	exp	n/i

100881 maybe   n/i
101457 exp exp
102165 exp exp
102182 exp exp
102378 exp exp
102427 n/i   n/i
100709 n/i   n/i
100746 n/i   n/i
101055 exp exp
101154 exp impl
101276 exp exp
101466 exp   n/i
101671 exp exp
4026   exp n/i
100669 exp exp
101050 impl impl
101662 n/i   n/i
101749 n/i   n/i
102465 exp exp
102618 exp n/i
101493 exp n/i
101536 exp exp
101980 exp n/i
100652 exp - exp
(obj, abstr, stat and rel)
100691 n/l   n/l
101043 exp not nec
101198 n/l   n/i
(abs and obj)
101202 n/i   n/i
101307 exp impl
101551 exp exp
101631 exp exp
101906 n/i   n/i
101981 exp exp
102240 exp impl
102420 exp n/i
102617 n/i   n/i
100735 impl n/i
100862 impl n/i
102314 n/i   n/i