
**EVALUATION OF FOLLOW-UP COMMITTEES OF
THE WORKSHOP SERIES OF IDRC'S
WARO COUNCIL OF REGIONAL ADVISORS**

Submitted by

Michael W. Bassey

For

IDRC WARO

April 30, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

WARO's Council of Regional Advisors

- ❖ Council established in September 2001 with the aim of reinforcing the responsiveness of IDRC to research needs in the region.
- ❖ Currently composed of ten experts from West and Central Africa (6 men and 4 women) representing fields of expertise that complement IDRC's three main program areas, namely environment and natural resources management, economic and social equity, and information and communication technologies for development, as well as some cross-disciplinary areas such as health and gender equity.

The Series of Researcher/Policy Maker Workshops

- ❖ Council decided to hold these workshops during its fourth meeting held in Cotonou, Benin in August 2003.
- ❖ Workshop series began in July 2004 and was implemented in six countries at roughly six month intervals.
- ❖ Aims to pragmatically explore the relationship between researchers and policy makers in Africa, identify bottlenecks to collaboration, and propose sustainable mechanisms to facilitate the transfer of research results into political decision-making.

Follow-up Committees of Workshops

- ❖ Each Workshop decided to continue the process of establishing lasting dialogue between researchers and policy makers in each of the six countries, and therefore formed Follow-up Committees to carry out specific activities.
- ❖ Follow-up Committees were given the mandate to: develop work plans; use the outputs of the workshop to identify activities that will be carried out in the medium term to enhance researcher - policy maker dialogue in a sustainable manner; inform stakeholders of results obtained through information/validation workshops.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

- ❖ Both formative and summative evaluation of the Follow-up Committees of the Researcher/Policy Maker Workshops, focusing mainly on issues of performance, effectiveness, organization, and IDRC support,.
- ❖ Intended audience: program and management staff in the WARO Office.
- ❖ Evaluation was conducted to ensure that it would be useful for its targeted audience and that it would inform decisions related to the Council and enhance the performance of the Follow-up Committees.

STRENGTHS OF THE WORKSHOP FOLLOW-UP COMMITTEES

Relevance to goal of the researcher/policy maker workshops

- ❖ Consistent with Regional Advisors' vision of ensuring that the process to enhance researcher/policy maker interaction would continue in each country after each Workshop.
- ❖ Consistent with IDRC's policy of empowering countries to develop their own agendas "to promote interaction, and foster a spirit of cooperation and mutual learning within and among social groups, nations, and societies through the creation, and adaptation of the knowledge that the people of developing countries judge to be of greatest relevance to their own prosperity."
- ❖ Consistent with IDRC's commitment to encourage the use of research results in decision making through improved and sustained researcher/policy maker interaction.

Relevance and effectiveness within countries

- ❖ Use of local expertise and knowledge to transform results of the workshops into activities that can improve researcher/policy maker dialogue. (p.4)
- ❖ Provides an effective mechanism to demonstrate the benefits of integrating multiple stakeholder groups (researchers, policy makers, civil society, etc.) in developing national agendas that mainstream research results into decision making (p.8)
- ❖ Provide opportunities to inform a wide national audience of stakeholders about the importance of dialogue and collaboration in obtaining benefits from research results (p.14)
- ❖ Provides an opportunity to strengthen capacity in the area of developing processes to enhance dialogue between stakeholders.

AREAS THAT NEED URGENT ATTENTION AND RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❖ Follow-up Committees do not meet regularly to plan and carry out their mandate. They are therefore unable to quickly produce expected results. (p. 16)
 - *IDRC should have discussions with Regional Advisors to ensure that they take a more active and leadership role. Work plans for each committee should be developed before the end of June 2007, with the aim of finalizing all activities of the Follow-up Committees before the end of December 2007.*
- ❖ IDRC does not provide adequate monitoring support to the committees. This has caused them to lag behind in delivering results. (p. 10)
 - *A systematic monitoring plan, lasting till the end of the activities of the committees, should be quickly developed and used by IDRC to encourage committees to meet their objectives.*
- ❖ None of the committees have so far completed the two main tasks of developing the action plans and holding a validation workshop. (pp. 11-14)
 - *IDRC should provide technical support and guidance to these committees to enable them to obtain these two outputs before the end of 2007.*

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The West and Central Africa Regional Office (WARO) launched its Council of Regional Advisors in September 2001, with the aim of reinforcing the responsiveness of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) to research needs in the region, according to the guidelines of its Corporate Strategy and Program Framework (CS+PF).

The Council is currently composed of ten experts from West and Central Africa (6 men and 4 women) representing fields of expertise that complement the three main program areas identified in the CS+PF, namely environment and natural resources management, economic and social equity, and information and communication technologies for development, as well as some cross-disciplinary areas such as health and gender equity.

During its fourth meeting held in Cotonou, Benin in August 2003, WARO's Council of Regional Advisors decided to initiate a series of workshops that would bring together researchers and policy makers in West and Central Africa. This series aims to improve the interaction between researchers and policy makers, and to develop mechanisms to better align the needs of policy makers and the research activities of scientists. The Workshops began in July 2004, and ended in January 2007, focusing on countries represented by current advisors (Senegal, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Cameroon and Benin). Participants of each Workshop chose a Follow-up Committee with the mandate of developing an action plan from the results of the Workshop and holding a validation workshop to ensure that the results of the workshop were used to develop activities to continue the dialogue between researchers and policy makers. These Follow-up Committees were given timelines to complete their mandates. It has however been noted by IDRC that these Committees are not functioning as expected and are generally not delivering the anticipated results.

1.2. Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation was both formative and summative. It assessed the Follow-up Committees of the Researcher/Policy Maker Workshop Series of the WARO Council of Regional Advisors, focusing on the following:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which workshop series and resulting Follow-up Committees constitute a relevant approach to improve researcher/policy maker dialogue.
- **Effectiveness:** The degree to which Follow-up Committees are achieving their objectives.

It should be noted that this evaluation did not address the influence of Committees on researcher/policy maker interaction.

SECTION 2

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine the performance and effectiveness of Follow up Committees, as well as the relevance of the Workshop Series as an approach to improve researcher/policy maker dialogue.

2.1 Sources of Information

There were five main sources of information for this evaluation:

- Relevant IDRC staff members
- Regional Advisors from the countries involved in the Follow-up Committees.
- Members of Workshop Follow up Committees.
- Documents related to the Council and Workshop Series and Follow-up Committees.
- Observations by evaluator during workshops.

2.2 Data Collection Methods

Three types of data collection methods were used to allow for triangulation of the data. More specifically, data were collected through the review of documents, interviews (face-to-face and telephone) and observation.

2.2.1 Document review

Documents such as Workshop Reports for the six countries, the 2005 Evaluation Report of the WARO Council, Monitoring and Evaluation Reports for some of the workshops, reports and minutes of meetings and correspondence (including email) related to the Follow-up Committees, were reviewed to understand the functioning and status of these Committees. The evaluator, who was also involved in the 2005 evaluation of the WARO Council and Workshop Series, had participated in the last four Researcher/Policy Maker Workshops in Ghana, Mali, Cameroon and Benin. He had useful background knowledge of the activities of the workshops and their follow-up activities.

2.2.2 Interviews

Interview guides were developed to ensure that all areas of concern for the Follow-up Committees were covered adequately. Key informants were mainly members of the various Follow-up Committees. Interviews were conducted with 20 people (see Annex 1 for the complete list) including:

- Members of the Follow-up Committees in the six countries.
- Regional Advisors who were involved in the work of the Follow-up Committees.
- The WARO Regional Director and the Research and Information Officer.

Depending on the location of interviewees, interviews were conducted by telephone or during face-to-face meetings. Interview guides served as a menu from which questions of relevance to the interviewee could be drawn. The choice of questions depended on whether the interviewee was:

- an IDRC staff member;
- a member of a Follow-up Committee;
- an IDRC Regional Advisor.

2.2.3 Observation

The evaluators have attended four of the six Researcher/Policy Maker Workshops. Their observations of these workshops, including how the committees were chosen and what they were asked to do, were used in this evaluation.

2.3 Data Analysis

Once interviews were completed, they were categorized according to three groups of interviewees, namely Follow-up Committee members, WARO staff members, and Regional Advisors, in order to capture differences between these groups, if any existed. Since there were no significant differences between the responses of these groups, data was analyzed across all groups. Interviews were content analyzed in order to identify patterns that emerged in the data. These patterns guided the process of defining categories within which to classify the data obtained. This data was cross-validated with the information collected through observation and the review of documents. Any information collected that was not consistent with a valid and reliable source of information, such as IDRC documents, was not included in the final analysis.

2.4 Limitations

Most of the people interviewed were very busy and it was therefore necessary to structure the interviews so that the maximum information would be obtained from them in the shortest possible time. Secondly, since most of the interviews were by telephone and telephone connections to some countries were not good, attempts were made, in some cases, to solicit supplementary information using email. Another limitation was the inability to conduct 9 of the 29 planned interviews, due to the unavailability of various persons or their lack of response to emails and/or phone calls. This was however not considered crucial given the homogeneity of responses received from those interviewed, and the fact that all countries were adequately represented.

SECTION 3

EVALUATION FINDINGS

3.1 Background on Follow-up Committees

This section reports and summarizes evaluation findings. The evaluation examined the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Follow-up Committees. More specifically, it focused on the accomplishments of the Follow-up Committees in each country, the extent to which their composition affected their achievements, the effect of the support provided by IDRC and others on their outputs, and the availability of resources to achieve their objectives.

Six workshops were held at intervals of approximately six months in Senegal, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Mali, Cameroon and Benin between June 2004 and January 2007 on various themes as shown in Table 1. Participants at the workshops chose various people as members of the Follow-up Committee. (See Box 1 for methods used to choose members of this committee). Members of the committees in the various countries are shown in Appendix 1.

Table 1. Locations, dates and themes of researcher/policy maker workshops

<i>COUNTRY</i>	<i>DATES</i>	<i>THEME</i>
Senegal	June 29-30, 2004	Agriculture : Reflection and exchanges on the synergy between researchers and policy makers in the area of agriculture in Senegal
Burkina Faso	January 27-28, 2005	Education : Reflection and exchanges on the synergy between researchers and policy makers in the field of education in Burkina Faso
Ghana	July 06-07, 2005	Promoting Private Sector Development: The Role of Research
Mali	February 08 -09, 2006	Desertification : Reflection and exchanges between researchers and policy makers on drought and desertification in Mali
Cameroon	June 21 – 22, 2006	Governance: Symposium for Reflection and Exchange on the Dialogue between Researchers and Decision-Makers in the Field of Governance in Cameroon
Benin	January 16 – 17, 2007	Health : Reflection and exchanges on the dialogue between researchers and policy makers for the reduction of maternal and neonatal death in Benin

Box 1. Method used to choose members of the Follow-up Committee

- ✚ Part of the organizing committee of the workshop and subsequently asked to be part of the Follow-up Committee.
- ✚ Invited to the workshop and chosen as part of the committee.
- ✚ Proposed by an Advisor to become a member of the Follow-up Committee.
- ✚ Chosen by a stakeholder group (researchers, policy makers, civil society, religious leaders, etc) to represent them as a group in the Follow-up Committee.
- ✚ Asked as a Regional Advisor to coordinate follow-up committee.
- ✚ Nominated by workshop participants to be part of the Follow-up Committee.

3.2 Organization of Work within Committees

3.2.1 Planning processes in committees

The experiences of Burkina and Benin point to the importance for committees to plan their work with specific objectives, activities to achieve them, responsible persons and timelines. More specifically, Benin has one of the most effective follow up committees. Processes for planning and organizing the work of the committee started even during the preparation of the workshop, which was probably the most structured and organized. There were regular meetings with minutes sent to IDRC. The follow up process was planned before the workshop, which included activities such as contacts with donors. It was obvious from the way the workshop was planned and organized that Benin drew lessons from previous workshops. As they worked together, in most cases, committees selected 2 or 3 people who completed the bulk of the work and then shared it with others for feedback. In the case of Benin, each member was given a specific responsibility, such as being responsible for communication, resource mobilization, treasurer, lobbying, etc. This appears to be a positive way of allocating responsibilities and ensuring ownership. Other committees do not have such a process as part of their methodology of work.

3.2.2 Information and communication

Because of busy schedules, it is difficult for committees to meet regularly. In the case of Cameroon, this problem was compounded by geographical distance between members located in 3 different cities (Yaounde, Douala and Bafoussan). Bafoussan is located 400 kilometers away from Yaounde. Nevertheless, a lot of work is facilitated by email. Therefore, for committee members to be able to work effectively, it is important that those selected have access to internet services as well as knowledge of how to send and receive emails. Communicating with policy makers in order to obtain information and/or meet with them is an important task for committee members. Having members in the committee who had/have high level positions in the researcher and/or policy maker community facilitated this task.

3.3 Follow-up Committee members' understanding of their objective

The evaluation of the WARO Regional Advisors Commission highlighted the need for clarity in the mandate given to the Follow-up Committees. It had been noted during that 2005 study that there might have been some misunderstanding of the mandates given to the Senegal and Burkina Faso committees. Observations of the outputs of subsequent committees in Ghana and Mali indicated that they did not follow the mandates given to them by their respective workshops. This evaluation therefore obtained an assessment of committee members' perception of their principal objective their mandate. The summary of various views expressed are outlined below:

- Translate the decisions of the workshop into reality by coming up with an action plan to enhance decision maker/researcher dialogue, and then hold a validation workshop involving a wide range of stakeholders.
- Ensure that mechanisms are developed that will allow the action plan to be implemented. (The committee is not responsible to implement the action plan but to put in place the plan and the process of implementation).

All the committee members felt that they now understand the mandate given to their respective Follow-up Committee. However, for some there was an initial lack of clarity regarding exactly what they were supposed to do. Subsequent discussions with other members of the committee clarified their role. Some points of clarification included: the extent to which the committee should carry out their work (when do they stop?); whether the committee should implement the action plans they develop; the structure that was responsible for coordinating the work and who had responsibility to report to IDRC; and, how the committee's recommendations will be implemented. Insufficient guidance was given regarding how the committee would be financed, nor what would be covered by the funds.

This apparent lack of clarity would have been a result of the manner in which the tasks were presented to the committee members at the end of the workshop. It is the opinion of the evaluators that since the setting up of the committees was basically done during the last session of the two-day workshop, this part was in most cases rushed. In the future, the mandate of each committee should be prepared in advance and discussed in the workshop. This should then be followed by a formal undertaking between IDRC and the coordinating institution of the Follow-up Committee, with detailed terms of reference being prepared and given to each committee member.

Most of the committee members would like to be involved in future activities regarding the implementation of the action plans, once they are developed. They also felt that the experience gained by the committee should be exploited in the future, by broadening the mandate of the committee to allow at least some of its members to continue to be actively involved.

3.4 Support by IDRC

3.4.1 General Support by IDRC

3.4.1.1 Clarification of roles and responsibilities of committees

Some committee members are confused about their status in relation to IDRC. In contrast, they pointed to the fact that the Regional Advisor's connection with IDRC is clear. They wish that there was a formal document stating that they are part of the committee, possibly with their title as well as their terms of reference and expected results. Formalizing the process would increase their level of motivation.

3.4.1.2 Funds

IDRC informed all Follow-up Committees at the start that it would provide some funding to cover the cost of the work to develop action plans, hire consultant support and hold validation workshops. To date only Cameroon and Ghana have not submitted budget requests. Cameroon has not yet organized its activities. Ghana has mentioned that it does not need IDRC funds because its vision of follow-up is different from that developed during the workshop. It will use the resources of the country to achieve the mandate of the committee. Senegal, Burkina Faso and Benin have submitted budgets which have been accepted and financed or will be financed. Mali's budget is completely different from others that were submitted. It developed a research project rather than the expected request of funds for the short-term work of the committee. Operational funds are needed by the committees to function. Some of them have experienced some hardship and have lost valuable time. This

can be attributed to committees not taking the initiative to quickly submit funding requests to IDRC.

3.4.1.3 Monitoring of committees

It is the general view that committees can become more productive if they are monitored more closely by IDRC. IDRC has not been very proactive in dealing with the various committees. Committee members would like IDRC to be more closely involved by encouraging them to respect their work plan and commitments, reviewing minutes of meetings and providing feedback, participating in some of their meetings if possible, and providing technical support to review work of consultants.

Visits by IDRC staff would help to boost the morale and confidence in committees. This has not been a common practice, but WARO has immediate plans to start doing this to encourage some progress in meeting the objective of the committees.

IDRC needs to provide some moral support to the committees. The expression of confidence in the work and outputs of the committees is seen as an important incentive for improved performance of the committees. This can be achieved through positive and critical comments and assessments of their work. For example, several committee members mentioned that this evaluation is an indication of IDRC's interest and faith in ongoing work.

IDRC could support committees by sharing with them what other committee members are doing and how they have done it. What works? What doesn't work? Such information will provide guidance for committees, and should help improve their effectiveness.

3.4.1.4 Lobbying and Partnership Development

IDRC would support the committees and improve their performance by having regular dialogue with government and other institutions regarding the work of the committees. For example, contacts with government institutions involved in the committees, explaining the work achieved, would inform key officials of efforts being made. It was suggested that a letter be sent to key researchers and policy makers, in particular those who attended the workshop, to inform them of progress made and to reassure them that the work begun at the workshop is continuing. This letter would sensitize them to the need for continued dialogue and should help renew their support, and possibly open avenues for future collaboration.

IDRC provides support for the functioning of committees, but as a research-oriented organization, it should probably partner with an organization that is more familiar with communicating and working with policy makers.

3.4.1.5 Technical Support

The position taken so far by IDRC regarding the committees has been to allow them to take initiatives to plan their work and then report the results. This approach has not produced quick results. Where it is possible, some committees may respond quickly. It should be noted that, in general, they do not have experience in carrying out such assignments. Thus, close support from the start in defining their work plans, methodologies to carry out the work, monitoring, and continuous encouragement would have been more productive. Only highly motivated committees have been able, given all the existing constraints, to plan and carry out their work,

in addition to their other daily duties. The fact that only one of the countries has been able to develop an action plan so far is an indication that there is a need to change the present approach. IDRC should therefore set up mechanisms to enhance closer involvement and contact with each of the Follow-up Committees to help them to plan and carry out their mandate. This should be implemented immediately so that each committee can make rapid progress before the end of 2007.

IDRC Advisors, unlike IDRC, which should play the role of catalyst, can make an impact by being directly in charge of coordinating the work of the Committees. The advantage of this has been seen in the case of one of the countries where the Advisor has played a key role in organizing and encouraging committee members. The advantage of this involvement is that the Advisors know (or should know) the expected outcomes of the work of the committee and will therefore be able to orient the energies of members in the right direction.

3.4.1.6 Committee Leadership

There is a concern being expressed of who is in charge of the work of the Follow-up Committees. In the case of Senegal, there was no ambiguity that ISRA should coordinate the activities. This however did not work out well due to administrative issues. In other cases Advisors had some responsibility to initially get the committees to meet. This has not worked out well either for most of the countries. Two options are available in terms of assigning responsibility for the work of the committee; giving it to an institution or to the Advisor. Institutions may slow down the work due to internal bureaucracy and conflicts, whereas Advisors may be seen as having authority and representing IDRC. These two options have advantages and disadvantages and a choice of leadership should therefore be based on country-specific issues and the quality and motivation of the Advisor.

3.5 Performance and Effectiveness

3.5.1 Summary of Achievements

The six workshops presented in Table 1 formed the Follow-up Committees. Each committee had the mandate to use the results of the workshop to produce an action plan that would be used to continue the dialogue between researchers and policy makers. The goal was to improve the interaction between these two groups, leading to the mainstreaming of research results into policies and the development process. They were also asked to organize a stakeholder workshop to validate the work done and to decide on the implementation of the work plan. Each Follow-up Committee was given the same mandate and 4 months to submit its action plan. A summary of the activities and accomplishments of each Committee is presented below.

3.5.1.1 Senegal

A final report was submitted to IDRC by the Committee in August 2005, more than a year after the workshop. It consisted of the results of a study, carried out by a consultant chosen by the committee, to obtain the status of researcher/policy maker interaction, and the action plan. The committee reviewed the whole document on April 16 – 18, 2005. The contents of this report were presented to the Institut Senegalais de Recherche Agricole during a seminar. The final validation workshop for stakeholders has not yet been held. Once this is done the committee will have completed its mandate.

3.5.1.2 Burkina Faso

The Follow-up Committee was constituted in January 2006 but was unable to function effectively in the beginning, due to the busy schedules of its members. However, it sent the work plan for its activities to IDRC in February 2006, based on which funds were provided by IDRC. The committee therefore started to work on its mandate to develop the Action Plan. An interim report from the committee dated March 2007 has been received by IDRC. The committee plans to complete its work by June 2007.

Thus, after a long period of about a year of inactivity, the committee has succeeded in achieving the following:

- Holding of meetings with the aim of meeting committee objectives;
- Developed instruments to guide discussions with researchers, policy makers and civil society. Prior to these discussions, the workshop report was sent asking for their feedback on 1) the relevance and effectiveness of such an approach to improve researcher/policy-maker dialogue, and 2) their suggestions on how to achieve this goal.
 - Main issues discussed included:
 - The need to find a framework for the researcher/policy-maker dialogue. In Burkina Faso, the *Atelier de Recherche sur l'Education de Base (AREB)* already gathers researchers, policy makers, NGOs, etc. regularly during meetings where researchers present their research proposals and research results. Therefore, the AREB could serve as a framework.
 - The specific type of activity that could help improve researcher-policy maker dialogue, such as meetings, conferences, directory of researchers and a list of all their publications.
 - Policy makers need to integrate researchers into key policy making structures, processes and activities (e.g. board of directors of ministry departments, joint mission for the monitoring of the 10 year plan for basic education, etc.)
 - Providing training in: a) understanding how research proposals are elaborated and how to read research results (targeting policy makers); b) statistical and word processing software for researchers, etc.
 - The idea of an observatory on education that would be sponsored by the Prime Minister's Office. This issue was raised during the workshop.
- Met with a wide group of actors comprising of high-level policy makers and researchers, both at national and regional levels;
- Developed and submitted a work plan to IDRC for financial support to carry out the work of the committee, which has received a positive response from IDRC.

3.5.1.3 Ghana

The committee in Ghana did not function according to the terms of reference given by the workshop. Their approach was to constitute a six-member committee consisting of members from the private sector, research and policy making. Its mandate was to take stock within one year of progress made since the workshop. The committee would report to IDRC on progress. It also planned to meet with select members of the Ghanaian parliament to inform them of the

Researcher/Policy Maker Workshop, as part of a lobbying mechanism. It also planned to work towards the training of researchers, serve as an advocacy group for the establishment of a unit at the level of the Presidency and push for tax exemptions of private sector institutions that support research. Information obtained during this evaluation indicates that the Ghana Advisor is actively involved in working with other Ghanaians and is succeeding in establishing close collaboration between both policy makers and researchers to promote the development of the private sector. As a result of the workshop and the interest of the Government the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research whose Director General is the Chairman of the Follow-up Committee is setting up a Science and Technology park to incubate all its scientific and industrial research efforts. This effort should be monitored to assess the effectiveness of the approach used in Ghana.

3.5.1.4 Mali

The IDRC Advisor from Mali was given the responsibility of supervising the Follow-up Committee. No significant progress has been made since the workshop was held in February 2006. However a work plan and budget was sent to IDRC in December 2006 to support the work of the committee. The budget was considered very high, and it was not clear on what basis the work plan had been developed. Only tables were submitted, with no text explaining the different components. The WARO Regional Director met with the committee in April to clarify this matter.

3.5.1.5 Cameroon

The committee in Cameroon was placed under the responsibility of a policy maker who did not have the time to devote to organizing meetings. Thus, since June 2006, the committee has not met and has not functioned. The IDRC Advisor in Cameroon has promised to re-orient the committee so that progress can be made. Responsibility may be transferred to a researcher who has shown his commitment during the preparations for the workshop and during the workshop itself.

3.5.1.6 Benin

The committee of nine members presided by the IDRC Advisor was constituted in January 2007. They immediately organized a meeting at which they gave responsibility to each member. They have held regular meetings at two week intervals since then. The committee intends to achieve all of its objectives by June 2007. The following has been achieved:

- Meetings have been held and minutes have been prepared and sent to IDRC;
- A work plan and budget for activities of the committee have been developed and sent to IDRC. They are at this time waiting for IDRC's reaction.
- Terms of reference for a study to understand the status of researcher/policy maker interaction and develop an action plan for subsequent work within the country have been developed.
- A consultant has been identified and hired to assist the committee in carrying out its work.

3.5.1.7 Overall Progress

In general, only Senegal has developed an Action Plan. Burkina Faso is making progress. Ghana decided against the development of an action plan, but instead is concentrating on

mainstreaming research into policy making, for private sector development, through high-level interaction between both researchers and policy makers. They appear to have made significant progress. In the case of Mali, a long period of inactivity was followed by efforts to submit a work plan and budget for the work of the committee. It appears that there is a lack of understanding regarding what the committee is mandated to achieve. Cameroon has not made any significant progress. Benin is full of enthusiasm and has advanced in its work. If all goes as planned, they will complete their mandate in less than six months.

3.5.2 Overall Effectiveness of Committees

The section on Summary of Achievements outlined the range of activities that the various committees have carried out. The main results expected from each committee were to develop the action plans and to hold the validation workshop. Only Senegal has developed its action plan, but the validation workshop has not yet been held. The rest of them, apart from Benin, which held its workshop in January, have not succeeded in obtaining any of the expected results. Cameroon, and Mali have not held any meetings.

The performance of the Senegal committee is noteworthy. They had neither the necessary institutional support, nor funds to carry out the work, although IDRC provided funds for its operations. Work done was due to the dedication of the committee. In hindsight, one can conclude that given the difficulties they experienced, the committee performed very satisfactorily. As a result of the work of the committee, many key policy makers have been sensitized through interviews and other discussions, of the need for researcher/policy maker dialogue. But they have not yet been effective in terms of promoting the sustained dialogue that was anticipated during the workshop.

Benin has maintained a high level of performance. Several meetings have been held in a short time based on a well structured outline of activities and timelines. If all goes well they will achieve the results in less than six months. They have also, as in the case of Senegal, initiated the work without any financial support due to the speed with which they are functioning.

Both the performance and effectiveness of all the other committees are not considered to be satisfactory. None of them have made significant progress despite being in existence for more than a year. The relatively poor performance of all the other countries can be attributed to lack of planning and overall supervision.

3.5.3 Capacity of activities of follow committees to create environment for dialogue

The workshops provided the opportunity for discussions between researchers and policy makers, enabling the building of dialogue between these two groups. The contents of the discussions during the workshops were very useful and served as a basis for Follow-up Committees to develop their action plans. The work of the committees involves continued dialogue with and sensitizing the various actors (policy makers and researchers). The action plans should therefore integrate input from all concerned groups.

The activities of the Follow-up Committee should create the necessary mechanisms that will improve dialogue in a sustained manner for the following reasons:

- Dialogue between researchers and policy makers has been initiated and the mandates given to the committees are clear and uncomplicated to carry out.

- The action plans developed are aimed at harmonizing activities and streamlining research results into decision making.
- The process of interaction between researchers and policy makers will be formalized but will remain flexible to accommodate changes within the research/development context.
- In general, committees are interested and willing to carry out the work.

The methodology adopted by committees is to have the involvement of all actors in the process of developing the action plans in order to have a wide ownership of its results. This approach should increase the chances of having long-lasting collaboration between all concerned.

3.5.4 Activities of committees to improve dialogue

The committee can increase the chances of achieving their results and having them used effectively if the following activities are put in place:

- Finalize the actions plans taking into account all the concerns raised during the various workshops while keeping close contacts with all stakeholders for their input as well as having the input of IDRC in the process.
- Hold a well planned validation workshop to inform key actors in research and policy making of the results and to agree on the next steps of implementation.
- Develop a revised action plan based on results of the validation workshop with well defined milestones and timelines regarding its implementation. The plan should be in phases so as not to attempt to do too much at the same time with limited resources.
- Develop a resource mobilization strategy in consultation with IDRC and Governments regarding support for the implementation strategies developed
- Creation of few but effective key “champions” that will work together to maintain the momentum of Follow-up Committees.
- Develop a monitoring and evaluation plan for each of the committees to determine their performance, effectiveness and impact.

3.6 Factors Affecting the Performance and Effectiveness of Committees

3.6.1 Motivation for committee members

In all 6 countries, committee members indicated that it is important to think about how committees can be motivated to do the work. They have a lot of competing demands and if this issue is not addressed, the quality of the work and probably the time it takes will be negatively affected. Some were paid a fee to organize the workshop, which provided an incentive for them to work effectively. Instead of a financial incentive, some interviewees suggested that IDRC find ways to integrate Follow up Committee members in IDRC activities and/or networks that are of interest to them as a means of motivating them.

Members of the committee stress the fact that they are involved in the committees due to interest in the expected results. The majority of them have professional interest in the subject area of the workshop. Therefore, they mention that commitment is based on the possibility of having good results. Nevertheless they are concerned that the activities involve significant amount of time and that they often have to let go of some more lucrative activities to attend meetings. They also use their own financial resources to cover expenses such as transportation

communication, etc. There is therefore a need to provide some remuneration to compensate the committee members for the above-mentioned expenditures.

Committee members will be motivated by monitoring of their work and appreciation of what is being achieved. Committees need to be reassured that they have strong support from IDRC, as well as within their country and that the work they are doing will not be in vain. The members need to feel that they have "an open arm waiting to receive the work".

Discussion should be encouraged between the various institutions of committee members. They should be made aware of the work being carried out and of the involvement of their staff member. This should help minimize resistance by institutions to the participation of their staff in the committees.

3.6.2 Effect of Team Composition of Committees on Results

The characteristics and effect of the composition of the various teams can be described as follows:

- The committees are made of members from different backgrounds and experiences.
- Some members are both researcher and policy makers.
- Women are present in all of the committees except that of Senegal.
- Members occupy positions of responsibility making it difficult in some cases to have them participate effectively in the committees. It is therefore, in some countries, difficult to hold meetings due to this constraint. It is also necessary, due to their busy schedule to hire a consultant to assist with various tasks of the committees.
- Most committees have three or four members. However some of them, as in the case of Benin and Cameroon and Ghana, have between 5 and 9. Based on the positive results being obtained in the case of Benin, which has 9 members, no conclusions can be made regarding the effect of the size of a committee on its effectiveness. In fact there may be arguments, according to some members, that it may be more useful to have a larger committee because having one or two persons absent will not adversely affect the work of the committee.
- Teams that are producing results are very motivated to the extent that they do not wait for financial support to work.
- Committees are interdisciplinary and are therefore able to discuss issues from a wide perspective.
- In general, all members of the committees felt that the diversity of interests within each group helps them to function well.

In general, the composition of the various teams was considered to be adequate. What is missing in the majority of cases is motivation. Strong leadership appears to be a solution, as noted in cases where progress has been made in achieving results. This leadership may come from an IDRC Advisor.

3.6.3 Regularity of Committee Meetings

Only in one case, Benin, have meetings been held regularly. To achieve this, the committee fixed meetings every second Tuesday and between specific times. This has worked reasonably well, although there have been cancellations because a critical mass was not available. Dates for achieving milestones were fixed at the start of their work and they have made efforts to abide by them.

The committee in Senegal was unable to meet regularly due to various difficulties with support from ISRA. Funds provided by IDRC for use by the committee were not made available due to internal problems between the administration and the ISRA person on the committee. However, the committee was still able to carry out the work, albeit several months late, and produce the action plan.

The rest of the committees have not succeeded in holding meetings needed due to a combination of lack of leadership and commitment.

Most of the committee members were located in the same city. In Cameroon, some of the members were far apart and this initially affected any attempt to regroup them. Based on discussion with committee members, however, this aspect may have played a role for Cameroon but it did not appear to have had a significant effect on the work of the other committees.

3.6.4 Effectiveness of Advisor in supporting committees

Advisors were not mandated to be involved in the work of the Follow-up Committees in Senegal. They were however asked to play a coordinating role in the committees in other countries. Their inputs have so far not been effective, except in the case of Benin. Advisors have not been able to quickly develop productive teams. However, in Benin, the Advisor has been very dynamic and effective in assisting the team to make good progress in a relatively short time. Through persistent facilitation by the Advisor, they have been able to hold meetings, plan and carry out various activities.

It is difficult to determine exactly which factors are responsible for the performance of an Advisor in providing support to the committees. Each Advisor played a key role in determining the subject matter of each workshop and in choosing the sector for researcher/policy maker interaction. Therefore, their interest in the topic was high. IDRC expressed its willingness to provide financial support for the work of the committee upon the receipt of a work plan and budget. The effort needed from each responsible Advisor and committee was to organize meetings to plan activities. The low level of output from most of these committees may be attributed to lack of time, lack of experience in initiating such activities, lack of initial resources to start the work, etc. The main cause for their overall ineffectiveness is linked to unavailability due to personal reasons, lack of time and low level of importance given to the work of the committee.

Since Advisors have the potential to play an effective role in getting the committees to produce results, IDRC should let them confirm their continued willingness to provide the desired leadership. If they are unable to do so, then someone within the committee should be asked to lead the group.

3.6.5 Involvement of policy makers in organization and follow-up of workshop

Policy makers have been involved in the planning and implementation of all six workshops albeit to different degrees. Visits were made to each country before the workshops by the IDRC Regional Director to inform and encourage the participation of policy makers in the organization of the workshops. In some countries, even though policy makers were not very involved in the organization of the workshop, their participation in the workshop and in the Follow-up Committees made a significant impact on the outcomes obtained. The representation of policy makers in Follow-up Committees is shown in the list of members in

Annex 1. An assessment of their involvement in the workshops and the follow-up committees are presented below for each of the six countries.

Senegal - Policy makers were not highly involved in the organization of the workshop. IDRC played an active role of coordination of the workshop and invited policy makers related to research to participate. However, the Follow-up committee was under the coordination of ISRA, the institution responsible for agricultural research. One of the three members of the committee represented government policy makers. During development of the action plan, policy makers were heavily involved in the data collection carried out by a consultant, who met parliamentarians, policy makers in government, researchers, etc.

Burkina Faso - Policy makers were involved by being made aware of the workshops through visits by IDRC.

Ghana - IDRC met with 4 government ministers before the workshop in Ghana. It was noticed that the lowest involvement of policy makers in a workshop occurred in this country. Even though they were invited, their attendance was below expectation. Those who attended did not stay for discussions. The Follow-up Committee did not function as expected. However information available from this evaluation indicates that policy makers and researchers are constantly in touch in developing programs regarding the application of science and technology in the development of the private sector.

Mali - Policy makers were involved in the preparations for the workshop. The presence of a dynamic parliamentarian contributed significantly to the workshop by explaining how policy makers can provide a leadership role in the improvement of the dialogue between researchers and policy makers. However, since the Follow-up Committee has not functioned, no concrete comment can be made regarding the involvement of policy makers in the committee.

Cameroon - The government institution, *Programme National de Gouvernance (PNG)*, responsible for good governance collaborated closely with the Cameroonian Advisor during the organization of the workshop. There was a strong presence of policy makers who came mainly from civil society.

Benin - Benin had the most policy maker involvement in organizing the workshop. The office of the director of research at the Ministry of Health had the responsibility to organize the workshop, in collaboration with the IDRC Advisor, and took care of all logistics. Follow-up Committee members reflected representation from various policy maker and research groups. Five of the nine members are policy makers. They were also given responsibilities within the committee to ensure adequate input from all involved.

3.6.6 Effect of giving coordinating role to an institution

All the committees, except one, are being coordinated by an Advisor. In the case where an institution had the coordinating role, this slowed down the work of the committee because of the unavailability of funds. But even though the person ensuring leadership of the committee was no longer part of the institution and the committee was without funds, the work continued to its completion. Thus, motivation to carry out the work appears to be the deciding factor in obtaining results. No conclusive statement can be made, at this time, regarding the effect of the coordinating role of an institution on the performance of Follow-up Committees.

There are however several arguments for housing the committees within institutions, including:

- Sustainability – The results of the work of the committees will be applied to improve researcher/policy maker dialogue over the long term. Thus, having an institution responsible for the activity should in principle ensure continuity, which is a condition needed for sustainability.
- Moral Responsibility – Having an institution being responsible gives stakeholders a reference point to which all queries, comments, etc. can be addressed.
- Credibility – An institution would have credibility in the eyes of both policy makers and researchers. Policy makers in particular may perhaps be more comfortable with such an arrangement especially if the institution is part of or close to decision making.

Such institutions should not necessarily be under government, as was the case in Cameroon. In fact, an autonomous but respected structure would ensure a neutral role and could be effective in bringing together a wide range of actors. It could be a willing NGO or private structure with the necessary experience and qualities of competence and impartiality. Preferably, one of the committee members should hold a high position in the selected institution.

3.6.7 Selection of theme for workshop

In the case of Accra and Ghana, workshops were organized on a theme considered a national priority, but not in the area of expertise of the Regional Advisors. In both cases, since there was little prior knowledge about who might be an effective committee member, committees were formed mainly to ensure representativity of different stakeholder groups (researchers, policy makers, civil society, etc). Such committees were less likely to operate effectively than those in which people knew each other.

SECTION 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions and recommendations obtained from the findings of this evaluation are presented in this section. Conclusions are followed by related recommendations. The latter are in italics.

4.1 Organization of Work within Committees

4.1.1 The most productive committees were those that planned their work with specific objectives, activities to achieve them, responsible persons and timelines. Moreover, some committees increased their effectiveness by assigning specific tasks (communication, lobbying, etc.) to each member. IDRC's approach has been to let committees plan and organize how to complete the work assigned to them. Although this approach has allowed some committees to find ways of being more effective, other committees have been delayed in their work because they were not sure how to proceed next.

Committees may be more effective if IDRC shares with them the outputs of other committees as well as information on processes used to achieve them.

4.1.2 Committee members faced two main challenges in communicating with each other: a) geographical distance (up to 400 kilometers), and/or b) lack of access to internet services for the use of email.

Every member was selected because of his/her potential to contribute to the committee. However, for practical reasons, committee work should not depend on gathering all committee members at every meeting. It would be more efficient to identify a core of members who work together and share outcomes with others. Ideally, these members would be located close to the majority of members and who have access to internet services and know how to use email.

4.2 Follow-up Committee members' understanding of their objective

4.2.1 Committee members in general expressed similar views regarding their principal objective. This was basically to use the results of the workshop to develop an action plan and mechanisms that would be used to implement activities aimed at improving dialogue between researchers and policy makers. Some committee members initially needed clarifications regarding various aspects of their work.

IDRC should in the future develop a clear mandate and a detailed terms of reference for each Follow-up Committee, which will be discussed and accepted during the workshop. It should contain guidance regarding; the scope of work, expected results, timing, responsibility for coordination, reporting requirements, source of funds and conditions to access and use them, etc.

4.3 Support by IDRC

4.3.1 Some committee members seem to be confused about their role, their terms of reference, as well as expected results.

In order to clarify the role of committee members as well as what is expected of them, IDRC could prepare a brief document specifying this type of information. Committee members have also expressed interest in obtaining background information about the WARO Council of Regional Advisors.

4.3.2 In discussing their budget requests, some committees did not seem to know what type and amount of financial support IDRC was willing and able to give them for their work. They understand that IDRC has limited resources. Therefore, they would like to integrate other donors, but would like IDRC to support them in this process.

IDRC could send a letter to each committee with an update to ensure that they all know the limits of available funding and for what purpose it may be used. It could also invite committees to begin identifying donors that could be potential partners for follow up activities. More specifically, as a research-oriented organization, it should probably partner with an organization that is more familiar with communicating and working with policy makers.

4.3.3 In general, committees believe that they would have performed better if they had been monitored more closely. Too much time elapsed between communications from IDRC requesting status of work completed. Therefore, especially due to heavy workloads, committee members tended to take longer to complete tasks assigned.

In order to monitor committee work more closely, it may be useful to prepare a calendar with main events and deadlines for each committee, integrating times for reminders. This calendar could be based on the action plan of committees, if available, or on dates negotiated with the committee contact person (usually the Regional Advisor).

4.3.4 Since the purpose of the Workshop Series and Follow-up committees is to help improve researcher – policy maker dialogue, lobbying was identified as an activity IDRC could engage in to facilitate this process.

A letter could be sent to key researchers and policy makers, in particular those who attended the workshop, to inform them of progress made and to reassure them that the work begun at the workshop is continuing. This letter would sensitize them to the need for continued dialogue and should help renew their support, and possibly open avenues for future collaboration.

4.4 Performance and Effectiveness

4.4.1 Each of the six Follow-up Committees achieved the expected results to varying degrees. Senegal has finalized its action plan but still has to hold the validation workshop. Burkina Faso, after a slow start, has carried out substantial work related to sensitizing and assessing the status of researcher/policy maker interaction in education. Ghana decided to not develop an action plan but rather to use members of the committee to influence government in developing policies that would develop the private sector. There is presently improved

collaboration between researchers and policy makers. Mali has not been able to meet as envisaged due to the busy schedule of committee members. A work plan and budget have been submitted but this does not seem to conform to the activities, which the committee was mandated to carry out. Discussions are underway to see how progress can be made. Cameroon has not been able to function because lack of adequate coordination. Steps are being taken, in collaboration with IDRC, to remedy the situation. Benin has rapidly established its committee and is developing its activities. Work is actively in progress and activities should end in May/June 2007.

IDRC should encourage all Follow-up Committees to set up a timetable to complete their work by the end of December 2007.

4.4.2 The committees, with the exception of one, have not been effective in starting up or completing their activities on schedule. This can be attributed to inadequate planning and dedication of time by members of the committees and inadequate financial and moral support.

Committees that have not done so should develop a work plan with time lines so that all activities can be concluded by December 2007. These plans should also consist of realistic budget requests to IDRC to help the committees to cover their operational costs. Both the work plans and budgets should be developed and approved by IDRC by June 30, 2007.

4.4.3 The work of the Follow-up Committees is very relevant to the objective of obtaining effective researcher/policy maker dialogue. In cases where work has been done by committees, they have been effective, after the workshops, in assessing the status of dialogue between researchers and policy makers and sensitizing them regarding the need to interact more productively. The committees should be catalyzed into planning and executing their work in a timely manner.

IDRC should work in close collaboration with the various committees so that the following are carried out: ensure strong leadership of each committee; finalize the action plans for each country and hold the validation workshop; develop a resource mobilization strategy to implement the action plans; disseminate the results of the work of the committees.

4.5 Factors that affect committee effectiveness

4.5.1 In all countries, committee members indicated that motivation was a key factor in determining how effective committees are. They expressed their commitment to the work of the committee, which is related to their area of expertise. They have particular interest in the outcomes of the committee and invest time and sometimes their own financial resources for transportation, communication and other operating costs. Nevertheless, it was suggested that IDRC seek financial and non-financial means of motivating committees.

In order to motivate committee members, IDRC could formalize the creation of committees by giving them a name and preparing a document that states the membership of the committee as well as its terms of reference. Where the committee is housed in an institution, those institutions should be informed of the work accomplished by committees, in particular their staff member(s) who may thus enjoy professional recognition.

4.5.2 Committees include members who are in leadership positions or who have been designated by a top manager. They are from diverse backgrounds and different stakeholders

groups (researchers, policy makers, civil society, etc.). In the case of committees that have worked effectively, this diversity has enabled them to reach actors in different sectors and to discuss issues from different perspectives. One concern regarding the composition of committees has been the difficulty of forming a working team when committee members do not know each other and were selected separately at the end of the workshop. In contrast, committees such as the one in Burkina Faso, which also constituted the organization committee for the workshop worked well right from the start.

In committees where members did not know each other before, it is important that the committee discuss how each member can contribute to the committee's work, assigning specific tasks and deadlines to get the work moving forward. Typically, such committees have expressed confusion as to who is supposed to do what.

4.5.3 Except for Senegal where the first workshop was held, Regional Advisors were asked to play a coordinating role in the committees in other countries. However, it is only in Benin that the Advisor was able to build an effective and efficient Follow-up Committee. In other countries, Regional Advisors are viewed as committed, but effective coordination of committees was negatively affected by factors such as lack of time, lack of experience in initiating such activities, lack of initial resources to start the work, etc. As a result, committees were less efficient and/or less effective than in Benin.

Since the coordination of committees seems to significantly affect the efficiency and effectiveness of committees, IDRC should ask Advisors to confirm their continued willingness and ability to coordinate Follow-up committees. If that is not the case, the committee should designate another person to play the role of coordination.

4.5.4 Except for Senegal, all committees are being coordinated by an Advisor who uses some of the resources of his/her institution for the operation of the committee. Several advantages were mentioned regarding having committees linked to an institution, including sustainability, moral responsibility, and credibility. However, findings indicate that the type of institution may affect the effectiveness of committees.

Ideally, institutions should be outside of government institutions to ensure that they are autonomous and that they are able to bring together all stakeholder groups (researchers, civil society, policy makers, etc.). Ideally, the institution would be an NGO, a research institution or an organization in the private sector, and a member of the Follow-up committee would hold a high position within the institution.

4.5.5 In the case of Cameroon, workshops were organized on a theme considered a national priority, but not in the area of expertise of the Regional Advisor. In this cases, since there was little prior knowledge about who might be an effective committee member, the committees were formed mainly to ensure representativity of different stakeholder groups (researchers, policy makers, civil society, etc). Such committees have been less effective than those in which people knew each other.

In order to ensure that the committees in Cameroon achieve its objectives, it may be necessary to provide the support of a consultant with expertise in the area selected as a workshop theme who could work with the committee to develop an action plan.

Final Thoughts and Next Steps

This evaluation is a manifestation of IDRC's interest in improving the output of the Follow-up Committees. It has shown that they are not performing as expected and corrective action should be taken immediately to encourage them to have some progress. Committee members interviewed have been impressed by IDRC's initiative and continued interest in the overall process of improving researcher/policy maker dialogue.

This initiative of IDRC is unique as noted by all members of the Follow-up Committees interviewed. The work of the committees is perceived to be an initiative that is being watched by several interested parties and it should therefore not fail to deliver the anticipated results.

The participation of some high-level persons in the workshops is an indication of the interest of Government in the work of the committees. This should be exploited by ensuring follow-up by IDRC to continue to inform these persons of the progress being made and encouraging their continued support.

The fact that the committees have not been effective so far shows the need to encourage them to stay on course and get the work done. IDRC has an important role in helping to create the enabling environment that will allow them to carry out their mandate effectively.

IDRC should have been more in charge of the work of the various committees from the start, by being involved in defining their terms of reference and work plans, and carrying out closer monitoring. An attempt can be made to remedy this by now devoting more time to supporting the work through regular interaction aimed at monitoring, encouraging and re-orienting the activities of the committees.

The results of this evaluation will be useful background and supplementary information for the final evaluation of the activities of the WARO Council planned for 2008.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boulmetis, J. & Dutwin, P. (2000). *The ABCs of evaluation: timeless techniques for program and project managers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Narayan, Deepa. *Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation*. World Bank Technical Paper Number 207. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Torres, T. T., Preskill, H. S. & Piontek, M. E. (1996). *Evaluation strategies for communicating and reporting: enhancing learning in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

UNESCO Internal Oversight Service (2005). *Basic evaluation concepts*. Retrieved September 30, 2005, from http://www.unesco.org/ios/eng/evaluation/tools/outil_01e.htm

WARO DOCUMENTS

Messages posted to Regional Advisors' electronic mailing list <http://www.conseillers-braco-cl>

Compte-rendu de l'Atelier de réflexion et d'échanges sur la synergie entre chercheurs et décideurs dans le monde de l'éducation au Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou, Hôtel Palm Beach, 27 et 28 janvier 2005. Février 2005.

Compte-rendu de l'Atelier de réflexion et d'échanges sur la synergie entre chercheurs et décideurs dans le domaine agricole au Sénégal, Dakar, Hôtel Savana, 29 et 30 juin 2004. Dakar, 5 juillet 2004.

IDRC Corporate Strategy and Program Framework (CSPF) 2005-2010, Africa Regional Consultations, Dakar, Senegal, January 20-22, 2004.

Synthesis of Discussions Around the Document Prepared by Oussouby Touré on Research for Development in Central and West Africa. 4th Meeting of IDRC (WARO) Regional Advisors Held in Cotonou (Benin) from August 5-6, 2003.

Council of IDRC Regional Advisors. Synthesis of discussions and contributions. Dakar, July 2002.

Council des conseillers régionaux du Bureau régional de Dakar. Compte-rendu de la Première réunion annuelle, 10-11 septembre 2001, M'bodiène (Sénégal) – Laguna Beach Hôtel. Dakar, septembre 2001.

Council de conseillers régionaux – BRACO.

Council de conseillers régionaux – BRACO – phase II.

Synthèse des premiers commentaires sur le rapport de M. Oussouby Touré.

Exemplaire de lettre de nomination au titre de Conseiller régional du CRDI. Dakar.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: methods for studying programs and policies*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Wiig, K. (1997). Knowledge management: Where did it come from and where will it go? *Journal of Expert Systems with Applications*, 13(1), 1–14.

Synergies entre chercheurs et décideurs dans le domaine agricole au Sénégal : Document de réflexion suivi d'un plan d'actions sur le partenariat chercheurs-décideurs, Comité de suivi des recommandations de l'atelier sur le partenariat chercheurs-décideurs. *Cheikh Oumar BA, ISRA (Coordonnateur), Gorgui Diallo, DAPS, Madieng Seck, Syfia, Financement CRDI, Août 2005*

Rapport du Comité Provisoire de Suivi des Conclusions de l'Atelier des 27 et 28 Janvier 2005, *BOURGOU Moussa, COMPAORE N D. Félix, ILBOUDO K Ernest, Mme TIENDREBEOGO Alice, Ouagadougou, Février 2006*

Rapport d'Activités, Comité de Suivi de la Rencontre Chercheurs -Décideurs dans le Domaine de l'Éducation, Burkina Faso, Avril 2007

Work Plan and Budget Submitted for Mali, Follow-up Committee, Researcher/Policy Maker Forum Mali, December 2006

Compte – rendu de la première réunion du, Mardi 30 janvier 2007, Comité de suivi des conclusions du symposium de réflexion et d'échanges sur le dialogue entre chercheurs et décideurs pour la réduction de la mortalité maternelle et néonatale au Bénin, tenu à Cotonou les 16 et 17 janvier 2006

ANNEX 1. LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
IDRC		
Forget, Gilles - <i>Interviewed</i>	Regional Director	WARO
Gérard, Jérôme – <i>Interviewed</i>	Research and Information Officer	WARO
Follow-up Committee, Dakar Workshop		
Ba, Cheikh Omar – <i>Interviewed</i>	Former Director - (<i>Researcher</i>)	BAME, ISRA
Diallo, Gorgui Djibril – <i>Interviewed</i>	Statistics Officer - (<i>Policy maker</i>)	Ministry of Agriculture
Seck, Madieng – <i>Interviewed</i>	Journalist - (<i>Civil Society</i>)	JADE/SYFIA West Sahel Agency
Follow-up Committee, Ouagadougou Workshop		
Compaoré, Félix – <i>Interviewed</i>	<i>Researcher</i>	Institut National des Sciences de la Société
Ilboudo, Ernest – <i>Interviewed</i>	National Coordinator - (<i>Researcher</i>)	ROCARE
Tiendrébéogo, Alice – <i>Interviewed</i>	Directrice Générale - (<i>Policy maker</i>)	Fonds pour l'alphabétisation et l'éducation non formelle
Bourgou, Moussa - <i>Interviewed</i>	Directeur General - (<i>Policy maker</i>)	Basic Education, Burkina Faso
Follow-up Committee, Accra Workshop		
Dzidonou, Clement – <i>Interviewed</i>	Regional Advisor - <i>Researcher</i>	Professor, Valley View University, Ghana
Follow-up Committee, Bamako Workshop		
Diarra, Lassine – <i>Interviewed</i>	Directeur Scientifique - <i>Researcher</i>	Institut d'Economie Rurale (IER)
Diarra, Birama – <i>Interviewed</i>	Chef de la Division Recherche et Développement - <i>Researcher</i>	Direction Nationale de la Météorologie
Konaté, Mama – <i>Interviewed</i>	Directeur - <i>Researcher</i>	Direction nationale de la Météorologie du Mali
Moustapha, Amadou – <i>Interviewed</i>	Directeur Général – <i>Policy maker</i>	Institut du Sahel (INSAH/CILSS)
Dr Bino TEME – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Directeur Général – <i>Policy maker</i>	Institut d'Economie Rurale (IER)
Follow-up Committee, Yaounde Workshop		
Tamba, Isaac – <i>Interviewed</i>	Professor - (<i>Researcher</i>)	
Yitamben, Gisèle – <i>Interviewed</i>	Regional Advisor – <i>Civil Society</i>	Director of ASAFE, Doula, Cameroon
Oyono, Dieudonne – <i>Not interviewed</i>	National Coordinator - (<i>Policy maker</i>)	National Program on Governance
Moto, Ferdinand – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Business Person - <i>Private sector</i>	
Sokoundjou, Rameau – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Traditional King - (<i>Civil Society</i>)	Traditional King, Cameroon

Follow-up Committee, Cotonou Workshop		
AYIVI Blaise (Mr) – <i>Interviewed</i>	Paediatrician; Head of Pediatrics, CNHU / HKM ; Professor (Researcher)	CNHU / HKM; Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Abomey -Calavi
GUEDOU Fernand (Mr) – <i>Interviewed</i>	Director of Research in Health, (Policy maker)	Ministry of Health
TCHIBOZO Hugues (Mr) - <i>Interviewed</i>	Health Economist / Health manager ; Assistant to General Secretary, Ministry of Health - (Policy maker)	Ministry of Health
VIZIR AKANDE Olofindji (Mr) - <i>Interviewed</i>	Geologist ; Président, Africa Cultures International Institute - (Civil Society)	Africa Cultures International Institute
Massougbdji A. Marina (Dr) – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Regional Advisor, Cardiologist, CNHU – HKM; Professor, Former Minister of Health, Researcher	CNHU/HKM ; Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Abomey-Calavi
Boko Nadjo, Genevieve (Mme) – <i>Note interviewed</i>	Magistrate, Justice Department; President, ONG “Women in Law and Development in Africa” (WILDAF) – Policy maker	Government of Benin
Ahoyo Veronique (Mrs) – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Sociologist; President, Network of African Women Ministers and Parliamentarians (REFAMP); Former Minister of Labor and Social Affairs; Former Ambassador to Canada – Civil Society/Policy maker	
Bio-Bigou, Leon (Mr) – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Lecturer, Former 1st Vice President, of the National Assembly - Policy maker and researcher	University of Abomey-Calavi
Perrin Rene (Dr) – <i>Not interviewed</i>	Gynecologist Obstetrician, Head Doctor ; Professor - Researcher	Women and Children's Hospital and University of Abomey-Calavi

ANNEX 2

LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Different sets of the questions below were used to interview the Regional Advisors, IDRC personnel and members of the Follow up Committees. Questions were selected from the list below, depending on the interviewee's role and his/her level and duration of involvement.

EVALUATION OF FOLLOW-UP COMMITTEES RESEARCHERS – POLICY MAKERS WORKSHOP CYCLE

Introduction

- My name is _____. I work as a consultant with the IDRC Regional Office for West and Central Africa (WARO) to evaluate its Council of Regional Advisors. This evaluation also studies the cycle of researcher-policy maker workshops. The evaluation puts emphasis on aspects related to pertinence, effectiveness and efficiency.
- The results of the interviews will be used to evaluate the Follow-up Committees of the workshops held in the six countries; Senegal (June 2004), Burkina Faso (February 2005), Ghana (July 2005), Mali (February 2006), Cameroon (June 2006) and Bénin (January 2007).
- I would like to thank you for your participation and assure you of the confidentiality of your answers.
- With your permission, I would like to record the interview to make sure that I have precise and complete information.
- Before starting, do you have any questions?

Context/ Background

- 1) Note the institution and full title.
- 2) In what workshops have you participated?
- 3) To what extent has the workshop allowed the development of an action plan?
- 4) a. How and when did you become a member of the follow-up committee?
b. Based on your understanding, what is the principal objective of the follow-up committee?

Organization of the Committee

- 5) To what extent did the policy makers participate in the organization of the workshops and their follow-up?
- 6) What was the mandate given to the follow-up committee?
Has this mandate changed with time?
- 7) To what extent were terms of reference of the follow-up committee clear?
- 8) In your opinion, to what extent has the composition of the team affected the level of results obtained?
How could this composition be improved?
- 9) To what extent were the results clear?

10) How regularly does the committee meet?

11) To what extent is it possible to meet regularly?

12) To what extent has the geographic distance between the members affected the work of the committee?

Support of IDRC

13) What is needed so that the committee can produce concrete proposals for the follow-up of the workshop?

14) What type of support from IDRC would help the committee to obtain the best results?

15) What suggestions do you have to motivate the members of the follow-up committee?

16) What level of involvement should IDRC have in the functioning of follow-up committees so as to make them more effective?

17) To what extent has IDRC monitored the work of the committees?

18) How could IDRC play a better role to supervise the committees?

Performance and Effectiveness

19) In your opinion what were the results of your committee?

20) How many reports or other documents has your committee produced?

21) To what extent have the advisors been effective in their support to the functioning of the follow-up committees?

22) What would have been the effect on the committee to have housed the committee within an institution?

23) In your opinion, to what extent have the follow-up activities of the workshops created the conditions and mechanisms, which improve dialogue between researchers and policy makers?
What type of activities would improve this dialogue?

24) Would you have other comments?

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.
If you have other comments please let me know by email.**