Table of Contents:

Annex, SAIC Mid-Term Evaluation

Annex 1: Evaluation Methods & Limitations

The methodology for this evaluation balanced the aspects of assessment and learning. The learning aspects are especially important for a mid-term evaluation, in that there is the opportunity to respond to emerging lessons within the current program. The assessment aspect is important in that it provides a mid-way point of reference for the final evaluation.

This section summarises the methods used in the mid-term evaluation process. The evaluation used diverse methods in order to develop a multi-dimensional understanding of the SAIC program. The analysis process triangulated between different perspectives and data sources to support robust recommendations. The methods included a document review process, key informant interviews, an online survey, workshop observation and interaction, and a set of learning cases with particular grantees and focussed on evaluation themes.

SAIC Mid-Term Formative Evaluation: Iterative Methodologies

Document Review
Key Evaluation Areas: All (program effectiveness, research quality, research uptake, gender, ethics)

Key Informant Interviews
Key Evaluation Areas: program effectiveness, research quality, ethics

Workshop Engagement & Discussions
Key Evaluation Areas: ethics, gender, network cohesiveness

Online Survey
Key Evaluation Areas: Research Uptake

Thematic Learning Cases

National and Cross-Regional Learning Cases

Document review

The document review process provided an assessment of the overall progress of the SAIC program for the mid-term evaluation. The review helped to answer specific evaluation questions across all the evaluation areas; in particular the questions related to program assessment. Through review and summary of key documentation, the review also helped to inform the subsequent data collection and analysis. During the document review, key gaps in knowledge were identified and then followed-up through key informant interviews, the construction of the online survey and peer-learning sessions.

The documents included in the review were those identified by IDRC program staff with further inclusion of key documents identified by the evaluation team as necessary for the evaluation questions. These documents included the original call for proposal documents; communications documentation; DFID assessments; IDRC and DFID program documents (proposals and budgets, logical framework and Theory of Change); IDRC Strategic Plan 2015-2020; Inception workshop 2013; Mid-term workshop 2015; Monitoring and evaluation documentation; Program level and project level approval, monitoring and reporting documents, peer review documents, ethical protocols, documents from IDRC's Policy and Evaluation Division and other secondary literature as appropriate.

Qualitative key informant interviews

The intention of conducting in-depth, qualitative interviews with key informants was to provide data relevant to the evaluation areas, for both the assessment and learning dimensions. Based on gaps and inconsistencies identified in the document review process, the interview schedules were designed to be specific for each individual respondent, based on their role and engagement with the program.

In total, 20 key informant interviews were held, each approximately one hour in length:

Number of Informants	Category
5	IDRC and DFID staff
4	Key external stakeholders (identified by IDRC)
11	Project grantees

The interviews were conducted in two waves. Two interviews with key IDRC staff members were held prior to the Mid-term workshop in Cape Town, in order to assist the Evaluation Team in setting the stage for engagement within the workshop. The remaining interviews were held after the workshop, and the iterative interview agendas were largely influenced by arising themes and areas of interest highlighted throughout the MTW as well as the gaps identified through the document review.

Online survey

The goal of the online survey was to determine the extent to which research and information produced by the SAIC program has been effectively disseminated and taken up by key external stakeholders. The survey was sent to 570 external contacts identified by IDRC and project grantees. In total, 73 responses were collected in three different languages (English, French and Spanish).[1]

Survey questions included "To what extent are you familiar with the program?" "Have you attempted to use research produced by the program?" "What would be the most useful output that the program could produce?" etc.   The survey used a combination of open and closed questions.

While the main intention of the online survey was to target relevant stakeholders involved in policy work or research on urban violence and poverty, interestingly, the majority of respondents who responded to the survey were individuals who had applied for SAIC grants, but who were unsuccessful in receiving funding. The full findings of the on-line survey are included in Annex 5.

Mid-term Workshop observation and participation

Although the Evaluation Team had originally planned to facilitate a session during the MTW in order to engage research teams and IDRC staff in the co-construction of a learning framework for the evaluation, unfortunately time constraints did not permit this to happen. Nonetheless, the continued observation, discussion and interactions with staff and researchers during the MTW formed an integral part of the evaluative process. In particular, the Evaluation Team was able to host a discussion on Ethical Practice during one of the Open Spaces, which allowed for in-depth discussion on the topic with several research teams. In addition, the clinic on Gender Analysis allowed for a greater understanding of that evaluation area. The clinic on Participatory Research contributes towards understanding the area of research quality. Finally, one-on-one conversations with research teams and IDRC staff throughout the week assisted in identifying some of the major challenges and strengths of the network, as well as highlighting areas for follow-up during key-informant interviews.

Learning Cases (thematic and national/cross-regional)

Learning Cases were conducted as a means through which to share knowledge generated within the mid-term evaluation both internally with SAIC collaborators, and externally with the wider research and practice community on addressing urban violence. These were envisioned as opportunities to capture the praxis of

---

[1] For a full review of survey questions and results, see Annex 5.

researching urban violence and to ground future initiatives and interventions in the experience, innovations and aspirations of SAIC research grantees. In total, five Learning Cases were conducted, two "In-depth learning cases" and three "Thematic learning cases."

In-depth Learning Cases:

The two in-depth learning cases (See Annex 3) generate insight on the experiences of two project cases at the national and cross-regional levels. Learning was drawn out in relation to the specificities of the different research and knowledge partnerships. These learning cases provide a holistic understanding of the challenges and opportunities within different SAIC initiatives for internal and external audiences. Lessons emerging from the learning cases have been incorporated into the overall findings and recommendations of the report.

Thematic Learning Cases:

Thematic learning cases provide an exploration of the issues that have emerged around three evaluation areas that underpin the overarching assessment of program effectiveness – Research Uptake, Gender Analysis and Ethical Practice. These cases use different project examples to draw out key challenges in relation to the theme and explore the implications of these challenges. The thematic learning cases also raise questions for further learning.   The thematic learning cases were used as a source of data for recommendations in the overall evaluation report.

Analysis

The multiple methods involved in this evaluation have helped to enable a multi-dimensional review of the SAIC program, structured around the evaluation questions. The analysis process was iterative in nature, and has focused on understanding patterns and dissonances across the program between different data sources. The analysis was also geared towards generating program-wide and contextually specific learning and recommendations. The recommendations outlined in this report have largely depended upon the robustness of data that has been generated through this process. The analysis was conducted for each of the evaluation areas separately, in accordance with the table in Annex 4. Recommendations and findings were triangulated through multiple sources of data as far as possible. The evaluation team worked closely with IDRC staff in both Programs and Policy and Evaluation for the formulation of the report, and developed the analysis in response to substantive comments and contributions from IDRC.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this methodology. We have tried to account for these as far as possible in our approach.

Bias: Most data about individual projects has been provided through the perspectives of IDRC staff or collected from grantees rather than through primary research to verify claims. This was due to the time restrictions and scope of this evaluation. We have triangulated as far as possible within the analysis process to mitigate against this problem and have drawn conclusions on the basis of multiple points of evidence.

Despite the language skills of the evaluation team, we did not cover every main language within the SAIC program. This limited our ability to interact with some grantees, particular French-speaking grantees from West Africa. To help counteract this, one evaluator carried out a face-to-face interview with the grantee in Kinshasa.

Sampling: There was a limited sample of key informant interviews, based on the lack of availability of some external stakeholders, IDRC staff and project grantees; and the budget for this evaluation. We originally proposed 30 key informant interviews and 2 in-depth case studies with grantees in different regions, but due to budgetary constraints, we were only able to include 20 key informant interviews and conduct rapid case studies in the same location as the MTW.

One of the SAIC research teams asked to be excluded from the evaluation and their project has thus not been considered within the reported findings and recommendations.

Document review: The Evaluation team did not have access to the original proposals submitted by grantees, therefore it was difficult to understand feedback provided by IDRC for finalisation of proposals

Co-construction of the learning framework: The Evaluation Team was not allotted time during the MTW to engage SAIC grantees and staff directly in the co-construction of a learning framework for the evaluation due to time pressures during the event. The lack of an opportunity to engage the grantees and IDRC staff directly in the formulation of the learning framework limits the extent to which the evaluation findings are based on the experiences and conclusions of IDRC grantees and staff, themselves.

Annex 2: Feedback on the SAIC Logframe

On the basis of this evaluation we have aggregated some specific feedback about how the indicators, outputs and outcomes for the Safe and Inclusive Cities program have been framed. It is important to note that this is not an output-to-purpose review and we are not making an assessment of findings against the log-frame. It is important that these findings are read in conjunction with the lessons outlined in the formative evaluation report. In reviewing the logframe, the following overarching insights emerged:

- The regular tracking of data against indicators is integral, in particular at the outcome level which are less easily monitored in SAIC project grantees interim reports. It is important that the interim reports are not over-depended on and qualitative interviews are undertaken comprehensively across the log-frame in order to be able to measure targets.
- Key terms within the logframe need to be defined and guidance provided both to grantees and IDRC program officers on how key indicators are being assessed. This is important at the output level as the assumptions being made here will impact what is being counted, and the extent to which targets are being met. These definitions should be clear in the interim reporting template.
- The extent to which there is flexibility in these definitions needs to be articulated both to enable inductive learning, contextualised assessment and also to support indicators to respond to capacity-building objectives within the wider program.

Outcomes

Outcome and Indicators	Evaluation feedback
Outcome 1: Relevant policies, strategies, or programs that seek to reduce violence, poverty and inequalities are informed by SAIC-generated research • Indicator 1: Number, type, focus, and target group(s) of initiatives that are informed by SAIC research • Indicator 2: Examples of direct references to SAIC-generated research results by policy actors	In order to generate data for the indicators, especially indicator 1, there needs to be ongoing tracking and collecting of evidence by research partners. Reporting templates completed by SAIC researchers on a quarterly basis support this, however more continuous process of tracking and monitoring against a project specific research influence strategy would be valuable. This information is also captured by 'interviews with key stakeholders' (as outlined in the logframe), however the extent to which these interviews comprehensively cover the project grantees as well as external policy actors is unclear; this is important in order to ensure accurate counting and 'clear evidence' as outlined in the June 2017 target.
Outcome 2: Relevant development actors and researchers are better informed by SAIC-generated research findings (that may challenge dominant assumptions), or analytical tools on the relationship between poverty, inequalities and violence in urban areas • Indicator 1: Number of references and citations to SAIC research in academic journals, policy documents, and non-academic publications, including op/eds, blogs, and other social media • Indicator 2: SAIC-generated new or adapted conceptual frameworks or methodologies are shaping scientific or practical discourse among researchers or development actors in contact with SAIC researchers.	This overlaps a little with the first outcome, especially indicator 1 which refers to references in policy documents (as does indicator 2 of outcome 1 above). The same comments as above apply regarding the accurate tracking of indicators. It is very hard to report on these outcome indicators accurately unless they are being tracked regularly. Retrospective assessment by google searches and interviews will not be very effective. In order to ensure that differentiated learning is gleaned from the two indicators it could be helpful for the first one to be quantitative and measured through collecting data on the number of references and citations through a combination of partner reporting, google and academic database searches. The second one should be qualitative and develop a narrative and examples about uptake of methodologies and conceptual frameworks generated by the SAIC program.

Outputs

Output 1: New high-quality knowledge or analytical tools on the relationship between urban violence, poverty, and gender and other inequalities are generated and communicated to key stakeholders • **Indicator 1:** Number and type of publications, tools, briefs, etc. produced • **Indicator 2:** Number and type of key stakeholders who receive SAIC research results • **Indicator 3:** Degree to which technical quality standards (scientific integrity and scientific merit) are visible in reports prepared by research partners	It is not completely clear how indicators are being defined. The first indicator needs some definitions: What types of publications? Academic in peer reviewed journal? What constitutes a 'tool'? Isn't a brief a type of publication? Also the targets for indicator 1, specify that "meeting IDRC's quality standards'. This relates to recommendations under 'Research Quality' in the evaluation, it is important to clarify who is judging if a specific publication or tool meets these. The definitions in Indicator 2 could also be strengthened. The milestone targets say that "Ten examples of evidence that key stakeholders have received SAIC research results." But what does it even mean to "receive results"? To read an academic paper or brief? To attend an event with a presentation of findings? As such it is unclear how data is being collected. Furthermore, relating to findings in the Research Quality section of the evaluation report, clarity is needed in Indicator 3 regarding what is being measured, by which criteria and by whom? Also, the extent to which SAIC grantees are clear on the technical quality standards being assessed here. What are the definitions of 'scientific integrity' and 'scientific merit'? Regarding publications in international 'peer reviewed' journals, which is implied as an important measure of success, will publication success rate be assessed? What about detailed comments of peer reviewers for journals?
Output 2: SAIC-funded researchers produce and communicate relevant evidence on the most effective strategies and interventions to reduce urban violence to key stakeholders • **Indicator 1:** Number and type of publications of SAIC findings on the most effective strategies and interventions to reduce violence • **Indicator 2:** Number and type of key stakeholders (by category) who received SAIC-generated information on effective strategies and interventions	There is overlap with output 1 and the first two indicators are almost the same. This output seems to focus on programming / strategies / interventions to respond to violence rather than output 1 which concentrates more on analysis of the drivers and consequences of violence. In terms of the measurement of indicator 1, again it is unclear what types of publications qualify and which do not. Based on evaluation findings we recommend a broad interpretation of this indicator, including events and innovative methods such as video to enable effective and accessible communication to target audiences. Indicator 2 also needs strengthening for many of the same reasons as above. For example the target reads "Fifteen examples of evidence that key stakeholders have received SAIC-generated information on effective strategies and interventions, including through SAIC outreach activities, and seem inclined to improve policy based on SAIC research results." What does 'received' mean, and how do you measure whether they 'seem inclined to improve policy based on SAIC results?'
Output 3: A multi-disciplinary urban violence research network supports knowledge exchange among researchers and research partners, particularly in the Global South, and fosters a new generation of specialists to engage in high-	Indicator 1 looks fine on the surface as long as it is clearly defined and there are clear processes for collecting the data. However it is important to ensure that there is clarity on what constitutes 'evidence' that exchanges are happening among SAIC researchers and with non-SAIC researchers? For example, are non-SAIC researchers interviewed on their perspectives.

quality policy-relevant research.
 	
   • **Indicator 1:** Number, type, and examples of knowledge exchange among SAIC researchers, and between SAIC researchers and non-SAIC researchers on SAIC topics.
   • **Indicator 2:** Number of junior and community researchers (disaggregated by sex) who are learning through project activities
   • **Indicator 3:** Evidence that SAIC projects are able to leverage new funding from sources other than DFID and IDRC for projects involving one or more SAIC research partner(s)
	Indicator 2 is important for the program, but again, it is unclear how this is being measured. Assessment appears to rely on reports by SAIC partners, it will be important to undertake a set of interviews with these junior and other researchers.
	
	Indicator 3 is a pertinent question to ask, but how is it being tracked and by whom? Are IDRC looking at where and when SAIC projects are specified in new funding applications and then how many are funded?
	
	What is missing here is any result or indicators that measure changes in capacity of SAIC researchers and research institutions. Output 3 starts to get at this but also tries to measure the quality of the network. We propose that these could be separated into two different outputs, see revised output 3 here, and 4 below.
	
	Output 3: "A multi-disciplinary cohesive urban violence research network established which supports knowledge exchange and mutual learning among researchers and research partners, particularly in the Global South."
	
	Example indicators:
	   • Indicator 1: Number, type, and examples of knowledge exchange among SAIC researchers, and between SAIC researchers and non-SAIC researchers on SAIC topics.
	   • Indicator 2: Examples cited by SAIC researchers where they have applied new knowledge (e.g. theory, methods) to their research activities gained through participation in the SAIC network.
	
	Output 4: "Increased capacity of southern researchers and research institutions to engage in high-quality policy-relevant research".
	
	Example indicators:
	   • Indicator 1: Number of junior and community researchers (disaggregated by sex) who can cite specific examples of where engagement in SAIC activities has improved their own research, teaching, or career prospects.
	   • Indicator 2: Evidence that research institutions funded by SAIC are able to leverage new funding from sources other than DFID and IDRC for projects involving one or more SAIC research partner(s)**.**

Annex 4: Compiled Ranking of Sub-Evaluation Questions

EVALUATION QUESTION	RANKING	EXPLANATION
PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS		
Thematic Question: How effective and appropriate has IDRC's implementation of the program been, relative to the purpose and objectives of the program?	🟩	• Program is well-managed and the emerging research is generally of high academic quality. • The diverse range of projects spanning empirical, conceptual and programmatic research is enabling a comprehensive and cutting edge evidence base. • Substantive conceptual and theoretical contributions led from the global South are emerging within SAIC, including from cross-regional initiatives. • Areas for expansion within future SAIC initiatives include looking at intersecting forms of inequality in relation to violence, and more contextualised and collaborative approaches to research uptake. • Network-building and collaborative aspects of the program need to be foregrounded from the outset in order to ensure ownership and commitment across the program.
How could the call for proposals and other implementation processes be improved for greater effectiveness currently and in future?	🟧	• The Call for Proposals process was generally well developed and implemented. • There were procedural points that could be improved, such as having an initial concept note stage. • There were some negative implications of the call for proposal process on program implementation (e.g. low allocation of IDRC staff relative to increase size of program).
What role if any has IDRC's grant-plus model played in contributing to the program's effectiveness?	🟩	• Substantive involvement of program officers has ensured meaningful inclusion of gender analysis and ethical practice in research programs. • Program officers with regional expertise are valued for their understanding of internal and external constraints, and for linking grantees to opportunities within local contexts. • Evidence of over-reliance on sole point of contact within IDRC for grantees.
To what extent are the SAIC Logframe and M&E Strategy contributing to the program's effectiveness?	🟧	• There are effective monitoring procedures in place to ensure accountability between grantees and IDRC. • The logframe could be revised to include more responsive indicators on capacity building, indicators for research uptake that take account of the different contexts for influence, and indicators that reflect the importance of quality of the network in the achievement of other program objectives. • The M&E strategy has been limited in its effectiveness by the lack of a comprehensive baseline at the outset of the program. • The M&E strategy could make a greater contribution to program effectiveness by strengthening the learning and feedback components in conjunction with grantees.
RESEARCH QUALITY		
Thematic Question: How well have research quality mechanisms been established and	🟩	• IDRC's contextualised understanding of how to achieve research quality is important for grantees working in insecure, violent and complex contexts; there is a diversity of research approaches within the program, which shows that this is valued. • IDRC's flexibility and openness within the research cycle has enabled adaptation and responsive research design, thus strengthening research quality.

applied in the program's first year of implementation?	 	• Project grantees value IDRC'S review mechanisms that emphasise learning and knowledge exchange in order to enhance quality; assessment for accountability should be situated in this learning relationship. • Research quality mechanisms at the outset of research, such as proposal review, have played a key role in ensuring excellence. • The support provided by IDRC program officers throughout the project varied significantly across the program, with some projects forming more meaningful and substantive relationships than others. • Dimensions of research quality, including participatory research methods as well as ethics and gender analysis need stronger support from inception, in some cases. • Current peer review mechanisms enabling knowledge exchange between project grantees are valued but need to be strengthened and to focus on key elements of research quality. • There is a bias towards academic peer review as a tool to assess research quality at the end of the project; mechanisms for assessing excellence need to be equally relevant to applied research projects, and used throughout the research cycle.
What are some examples of good practice?		• *See examples under 2.2.1*
How could SAIC peer review mechanisms be strengthened?		• *See Recommendations under 2.2.2*

RESEARCH UPTAKE

Thematic Question: To what extent have SAIC projects and the program put in place strategies and practices to position research for use by target audiences, such as influencing government policy or modifying practice by implementing agencies?	 	• There is a well-articulated communication strategy at the program level, including a 'situational analysis' of program-level audiences. At the grantee level, no consistent evidence beyond the proposal stage of analysis of audiences (context analysis, etc.). Some grantees do not have strong skills in research communication. Lack of capacity across the network to identify and engage audiences. • As many of the research projects have not yet undertaken many communication activities and do not have documented communication strategies, it is difficult to assess the practices in question. To support upcoming activities, IDRC may wish to explore mechanisms to improve and provide support for translating findings from grantees into different policy and practice spaces. See Learning Case: Research Uptake.
What are some examples of good practice?		*See examples highlighted under 2.3.1*
How could positioning for use be enhanced?		*See Recommendations under 2.3.2*

ETHICAL PRACTICE

Thematic Question: How successfully are SAIC grantees applying acceptable	 	• SAIC grantees show a meaningful commitment to ethical practice in research supported by ethics and security protocols, institutional policies and reflective practice throughout the research cycle.

research ethics and security practice in the implementation of their research projects?	*(green)*	• IDRC should continue to encourage an environment of openness and transparency in the research process so that researchers feel confident in raising difficult issues around ethical practice • While some space was created for a discussion of ethics during the MTW, IDRC should continue to offer opportunities to discuss and overcome ethical challenges within the research process both within projects and across contexts to share strategies and perspectives. • Further support is needed to encourage grantees to go beyond ethical practice as a procedural issue, towards substantive engagement with ethics as a set of principles established from the outset of research, and engaged reflexively throughout.
What are some samples of best practice? What should be avoided?		• *See examples of best practice highlighted in 2.4.1* • *See section '2.4.2 Recommendations'* • *See Learning case on Ethical Practice*
How should the particular needs of vulnerable groups be taken into consideration by SAIC projects or the program?	*(orange)*	• SAIC grantees recognise the significance of researching the issues that affects the most marginalised with a view to addressing the inequalities and violence in their lives. • There are ethical considerations in how to communicate research findings that make visible marginalised groups, which can potentially increasing levels of risk. • Researchers need to treat informed consent as an on-going negotiation with marginalised groups whose contexts may change and their involvement in the research may cause them harm.
How can ethical research practice in SAIC be strengthened?		• *See Recommendations 2.4.2* • *See Learning case on Ethical Practice*

GENDER ANALYSIS

Thematic Question: How successful have the SAIC program and project grantees been in integrating meaningful gender analysis into the design, implementation and communication of research?	*(green)*	• IDRC's positioning of gender analysis as integral to research excellence on urban violence, and mechanisms of accountability for SAIC grantees on this issue have been embedded throughout the program. • Three studies with a core gender-focus are effectively and innovatively integrating gender into research. • Knowledge on gender is not systematised within SAIC and further support is needed to translate knowledge from IDRC and gender research projects to the wider cohort • Capacity building on gender analysis needs to be integrated from the outset of the project. • Project grantees asserted the importance of ensuring gendered dynamics are explored through qualitative research, which draws out the specificities of men's and women's gendered experience. Some of the projects have implemented such an approach.
To what extent does gender differentiated analysis at the project and program level include men and masculinities?	*(orange)*	• Issues of urban violence in relation to gender identity and masculinities are explored in specific projects, notably those showing leadership on gender analysis. • Urban violence and constructions of male identity is explored in many projects but not necessarily analysed in relation to gender, or named explicitly. • Analysis of gender identity could be extended, within future programs, to explore issues of sexual orientation and violence as a form of social control. • In communicating findings, grantees need clarity on how to articulate findings from gender analysis, including those on masculinity and gender identity.
How can gender analysis in SAIC be strengthened?		• See Recommendations under 2.5.2 • See Learning case: gender analysis

Annex 5: On-line Survey Results

The goal of the online survey was to determine the extent to which research and information produced by the SAIC program has been effectively disseminated and taken up by key external stakeholders. The following findings reflect the raw data from the survey which have been further analysed and incorporated into the evaluation findings and recommendations.

Type of respondents with respect to geographic location and type of stakeholder

- Altogether **73 responses were collected** from a sample of 570 people that received the invitation to complete the survey. Out of these 73 responses 15 were not completed (only email and language preference), and cannot be used for analysis.
- A large proportion of respondents of the survey **are located in countries of the Global South** (37), 18 are from the Global North. In the group of organisations located in the Global South, the majority are from Latin America and the Caribbean (17), followed by respondents from Sub-Saharan Africa (14), and 5 organisations are from South Asia,
- 31 (53.4%) of respondents were **unsuccessful applicants of the SAIC program**. 51.2% of these unsuccessful applicants are from Latin America and the Caribbean.
- 40 of the 73 respondents are **from academic and research institutions**. 13 participants identify as policy advisors and lawmakers, 11 as service delivery agents, including non-governmental organisations, eight are international donors, and six are in-house researchers. In the group of international donors, half of the respondents (4) belong to IDRC and DFID. Additional international donors are from GIZ, Germany/South Africa, Oxfam Canada, UNHCR Canada and the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development.
- The majority of respondents **hold a senior position in their organisations** indicating a high level of (strategic/organisational) interest in the program.

Relationships with SAIC and Engagement and Knowledge of SAIC research

The majority of survey respondents (more than 82%) **noted that their work "engages significantly with themes of violence, poverty/and or equality."** Similarly, most of the respondents had reported that they *had* heard of the SAIC program (over 62%), and most of these have heard about SAIC through the Call of Proposals. International meetings were mentioned 5 times as the way participants heard about the program, and 3 people had heard about SAIC through IDRC. One person had heard of the program through social media.

47% of respondents were either very familiar (10 respondents) or familiar (16 respondents) with the goals and intent of the programme. However, a third of all respondents were not familiar with goals and intent of the programme. Despite this, the vast majority had not used any research produced by the program. However, given that much SAIC research is not yet published, it is more interesting, that at this point 70.9% had never tried to access the research. Of these more than 27% did know about SAIC research, and 43% did not know any research products of SAIC.

Perceptions of usefulness of SAIC research for own work

Only 19 people responded to this question, eight of these are either IDRC and DFID staff or grantees of the program. Out of the other 11 respondents five respondents say that SAIC has: informed their own research work (2); provided advice and support to local stakeholders such as government and service providers (2); enabled learning on the topic more generally (1).

Perceptions of success of the program to fill knowledge gaps

20 people have responded to this question, six of these are either IDRC and DFID staff or grantees of the program. They views of respondents on the program's success are diverse. Almost half of the people who responded to this question (8) say the research is indeed making good progress to fill the knowledge gaps (2 are unsuccessful grantees, 2 are somehow related to successful grantees, and 4 are either donor or a research institution). The following comment highlights the contributions of the SAIC program with regards to overcoming traditional focus on the nation state as the main unit for analysis:

> *"This is one of the most comprehensive programs globally on these issues. It has helped foreground the nexus between cities and security in global governance, thus challenging the traditional focus on nation-states as the main (and often only) unit of analysis. SAIC has successfully demonstrated that 21st-century global governance and security is to a large extent about understanding complex urban dynamics."*

Others, however, are more doubtful whether the research contributes innovative and new knowledge. Two respondents highlight that through this research new knowledge gaps are emerging. Two people were doubtful of the program's ability to fill the gaps:

> *"The research is "of academic value perhaps, but not very meaningful at the grass-roots level. Frankly, our own work reveals the dynamics of urban growth in much greater depth. The SAIC program seeks to identify how planning could mitigate violence and poverty. This may be putting the cart before the horse, as such research is not able to highlight how planning actually creates the conditions for poverty, inequality, and violence."*

Outreach Mediums

Only 15 people responded to the question on ways of engaging with the program other than research. 11 people said that they had no interaction with SAIC at all. Those who had engagements with the program mention in particular that they have been involved in policy discussions with IDRC / DFID (13); furthermore, eight have attended a workshop/conference hosted by SAIC, six have attended a conference where SAIC research teams discussed their work, and six have been involved with policy discussions with SAIC research teams.

In terms of outreach mediums, the most utilised medium was the IDRC website. This is an opportunity for IDRC as there is room to improve upon up-to-date and/or interactive forms of engagement, such as blogs, links to social media, etc. In addition, the survey reveals that interaction with social media is particularly low. Only three survey respondents reported having engaged with the program via social media (Youtube (2), Twitter (1), Facebook (0). This will be an important consideration in research dissemination, and building up an audience and online community in advance will help strengthen the reach of the research.

Some respondents have expressed their concerns with the program's communication with stakeholders. This concerns both ways of communication as part of the Call for Proposals process, but also the program's way of communicating research results:

- *"As a member of a team whose project was rejected (without any feedback), the subsequent lack of proactive engagement by the organisers in the programme makes the process even more marginalising. This is an initiative on inclusivity yet the programme itself is exclusionary and has not made any attempt to reach out to those who were not successful".* (Unsuccessful applicant)
- *"I was not aware of accessing or receiving research results from SAIC. The last e-mail communication received just mentioned that I was not successful in receiving the grant. It is sad to learn that there are research results available but no proper information received on how to access it. Please send me an e-mail with further instructions on how to access results and read publications."* (Unsuccessful applicant)
- *"Although I heard of it about 3 years ago, I have not seen anything else until this survey. I think you need to promote it more on relevant web discussion groups etc."* (Unsuccessful applicant)
- *"The reading should be made more user friendly".* (SAIC academic grantee)
- *"Information packaging should be mindful of the audience at different as their information need and utilization might be different."* (Academic external stakeholder)

In terms of the most desirable or 'useful' mediums of engagement for packaging and utilising knowledge created by the program, the majority of respondents reported that Policy Briefs would be the most useful (named 35 times), with "peer reviewed journal articles" in second place (named 29 times). This is an important note as the program logframe is aligned to the production of published journal articles and books rather than tools for policy engagement. Open forum discussions (named 23 times) and workshop and conference notes (named 21 times) are considered as another important medium, and to lesser extent web pages (named 18 times) and short videos (17 times). Social media such as Facebook, Twitter, as well as blogs are only named 11 times, which may reflect the low engagement with the program through social media within this respondent group. The type of media preferred must be seen in light of the fact that the majority of respondents are either from academic institutions or policy advisors/law makers, for who policy briefs and peer reviewed articles are the most common forms of sharing information. If IDRC/SAIC would like to increase its outreach to other stakeholders such as in-house researchers and research participants the communication strategy should include other media such as social media and open forum discussions.

Annex 6: Primary Sources and Citations

Mid-Term Workshop	Key Informant Interviews	Learning Cases	Document Review
MTW, PG1	KII, KS 1	LC, Team1	Interim Reports
MTW, PG2	KII, KS 2	LC, Team2	Project Approval Documents
MTW, PG3	KII, KS 3	LC, Team3	SAIC Communications Strategy
MTW, PG4	KII, KS 4	LC, Team4	Call for Proposal Document
MTW, PG5	KII, KS 5	LC, Team5	IDRC Website
MTW, PG6	KII, IDRC 1	LC, Team6	SAIC Promo Videos
MTW, PG7	KII, IDRC 2	LC, Team7	IDRC Reports to DFID
MTW, PG8	KII, IDRC 3	LC, Team8	Ethics and Security Protocols
MTW, PG9	KII, IDRC 4	LC, Team9	SAIC Theory of Change
MTW, PG10	KII, IDRC 5		SAIC Logframe
MTW, PG11	KII, PG1		
MTW, PG12	KII, PG2		
MTW, PG13	KII, PG3		
MTW, PG14	KII, PG4		
MTW, PG15	KII, PG5		
MTW, PG16	KII, PG6		
MTW, PG17	KII, PG7		
MTW, PG18	KII, PG8		
MTW, PG19	KII, PG9		
MTW, PG20			
MTW, PG21			
MTW, PG22			
MTW, PG23			
MTW, PG24			
MTW, PG25			
MTW, PG26			
MTW, PG27			
MTW, PG28			
MTW, PG29			
MTW, PG30			
MTW, IDRC1			
MTW, IDRC2			
MTW, IDRC3			
MTW, IDRC4			
MTW, IDRC5			
MTW, IDRC6			
MTW, IDRC7			
MTW, IDRC8			
MTW, IDRC9	**MTW = Midterm Workshop**	**KS = Key Stakeholder**	
MTW, Advisor1	**LC = Learning Case**	**IDRC = IDRC Staff**	
MTW, External 1	**KII = Key Informant Interview**	**PG = Program Grantee**	
MTW OSD		**OSD = Open Space Discussion**	