

# **Strategic Evaluation on Capacity Development**

Strengthening the Core and  
the Periphery:

Organizational Case Study  
of the Peru Economic and  
Social Research

Prepared for:  
IDRC Evaluation Unit

Prepared By:  
Katrina Rojas y Mariane Arsenault  
Universal Management Group

## Executive Summary

The Evaluation Unit of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is leading a strategic evaluation of the Centre's contributions to the development of capacities of those with whom the Centre works. The fourth phase of the evaluation consists of organizational case studies. This document presents the organizational case study on the Peru Social and Economic Research Consortium (CIES, from its acronym in Spanish). IDRC has committed more than \$3 million in funding to CIES since its origins as the Peru Economic Research Consortium (PERC, from its acronym in Spanish) in 1989. This has been complemented by over \$15 million from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

The objective of the case study is to describe how IDRC's support over time contributed to the development of capacities of individuals, member organizations, and the Consortium itself as a network or umbrella organization. The methodology included a review of all four IDRC-funded projects in support of the Consortium between the years of 1999 and 2006. Two of these projects provided core institutional support. The data collection phase included document analysis, group and individual interviews in Peru (Lima and Arequipa) and in Canada, as well as a self-administered questionnaire for the members of CIES.

The case study includes six sections: a review of the research for development context; highlights of the evolution of CIES; a description of the capacity development intentions at the outset of the CIES and IDRC relationship; an overview of the capacity development interventions; identification of the capacity development results; and finally, a concluding section on strengths and weaknesses in IDRC's approach and reflections on issues to consider in the future of the relationship between IDRC and CIES.

## Research for development context

### **Peruvian Context**

The Peruvian research for development context has gone through significant changes since the Consortium was created in 1989. After several years of political conflict and economic instability in the late 1980s and 1990s, Peru's situation began to improve. The subsequent years of stability in macroeconomic policy provided a foundation for the impressive economic growth that the country is now experiencing. Nonetheless, poverty and inequalities are still widespread. The recent growth and increase in government revenues has not been accompanied by corresponding levels of public sector investment in social programs, due in part to limited government capacity. In addition, since the creation of regional governments in

2002, decentralization has become a growing area of attention. Today, several of the provinces or regions are experiencing growth rates that are higher than those in Lima. These changes in context have provided opportunities for CIES - a consortium with a national membership that provides policy relevant social and economic research and develops capacity for doing such research.

The context also presents challenges for research for development. On the one hand, the scarcity of government resources for social science research means that research, including that of the Consortium, depends heavily on external funding. Over time, limited public investment in tertiary education has created a gap in the research capacity of Peru's public and private universities; these differences are exacerbated between the educational institutions in Lima and those in the provinces. The research context is also marked by divergent ideological perspectives among researchers that have been deeply engrained, making efforts to collaborate more challenging. Another feature of the context, posing a challenge to an organization like CIES, is the still limited use of evidence to support public policy formulation and evaluation.

### **IDRC Context**

Since the late 1980s, IDRC has been supporting networks as part of its capacity building in research for development. The Centre's successful experience with the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) and other partners in Africa provided background to the support of CIES, a similar initiative but at a national level in Peru. The rationale for investing in networks can be found in their potential to influence systemic change and facilitate a long-term perspective, in addition to the enhanced communication and coordination that takes place through networking.

IDRC's strategic direction and structure has also determined elements of the IDRC-CIES relationship. The Centre's planning framework, for example, is based on Program Areas and thematic transdisciplinary Program Initiatives, rather than on country strategies. CIES has been part of the Social and Economic Policy Program Area and managed as a corporate project until recently when it was integrated into the PI on Globalization, Growth, and Poverty. IDRC has supported CIES in partnership with CIDA. Within this partnership, IDRC has been a co-contributor as well as an executing agency for CIDA funds during earlier phases of the Consortium.

### **E v o l u t i o n   o f   t h e   C o n s o r t i u m**

The Peru Economic Research Consortium (CIE, the predecessor to CIES) originated in an unstable political and economic context at the end of the 1980s. This context was inauspicious for the development of a research community and both CIDA and IDRC feared that more of Peru's

social science researchers would leave the country. The two Canadian organizations agreed to finance five Peruvian research centres to join as a Consortium in order to conduct applied economic research. The Consortium aimed to build the capacities of researchers, increase the level of the political debate in Peru, and promote dialogue among researchers. After ten years, CIE had established its credibility and the Consortium's stakeholders viewed its results in positive terms. However, given the changing context of the 1990s and PERC's experience to date, IDRC and CIDA began to question the sustainability of the existing model and worked with PERC members to identify a new form of collaboration.

A proposal to create CIES was presented to IDRC in 1998. The transition from PERC to CIES was not an easy one. It involved a number of changes that had important implications for organizational capacity development such as: the addition of new members from Lima and the provinces (growing from five members to 23 initially); the creation of a Board of Directors and an Executive Office; a shift to a competitive process for the allocation of research grants (from a formula that allocated funds on pro rata basis among the five centers), the introduction of social policy issues as part of the research agenda; an increase in efforts to ensure use of the research results through outreach and dissemination for policy influence.

Today, CIES has evolved from the initial project funded by Canada into a nationally recognized institution in Peru. CIES is legally incorporated as an NGO and is made up of 40 member organizations in Peru. Its heterogeneous membership includes: private and public universities, private consulting firms, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and government institutions that are engaged in social and economic research. The Consortium engages in a wide range of activities in addition to its research grant competition, including training, seminars, publication of books, journals, and others.

## C a p a c i t y   d e v e l o p m e n t   i n t e n t i o n s

As illustrated by previous phases of the strategic evaluation, for IDRC, capacity development normally revolves around the identification of the research *problematique*. When the Consortium was established, the central problem was the potential deterioration of economic research capacity in Peru given the country's unstable conditions. Once the context stabilized, the *problematique* changed, with the primary concern becoming the potential contribution of research to better public policies (based on evidence and developed through public debate).

IDRC's intentions at the outset appear to have been to influence the research system in Peru, namely the people, organizations, and institutions doing and using social science research. The Centre has maintained explicit capacity development intent in each of the

phases of its support to CIES. In more recent phases, the objectives of its support have been to strengthen the organization and contribute to its sustainability.

The five original member organizations of PERC valued the access to resources, exchange, and other elements of that model that were key to expanding their capacity. The expectations of each of the Consortium members have changed over the years as it evolved into CIES. Today, for some of the more consolidated member organizations, the most important component of CIES is its research grant competition. For other organizations, with relatively more limited capacity, it is the training, exchange, and related opportunities to improve their ability to do research.

## Capacity development strategies

CIES developed an array of activities oriented towards strengthening the research capacity of its member organizations and associated researchers. The activities have included:

- Organizing research grant competitions- CIES has introduced a number of measures (such as closed categories and organizational quotas) to improve access to the funds for younger researchers and members that have relatively less research capacity. The winners are identified through a peer review process.
- Mentoring younger researchers and researchers in the provinces before and during the research process- CIES assigns advisors and holds a workshop at the beginning of the research project to review the methodology, objectives, and expected impact on public policies.
- Training researchers - CIES has offered training opportunities to its researchers on research methods, developing research proposals, and project design.
- Providing internship/research awards - CIES gives awards that allow researchers to carry out research at another CIES research center. It also offers awards to Canadian academics to conduct research in Peru.
- Promoting collaboration among the centres - The "networked" research projects (one category of the research competition) require that centres of greater and lesser research capacity work together.
- Implementing projects - CIES has implemented specific initiatives with funding from other donors that involve its members. A key example of this is the project on Regional Elections.
- Providing Executive Office services- The Office conducts bibliographic research, disseminates publications, negotiates access to data bases, and other services for the members.

IDRC did not define a grand or overarching strategy for supporting CIES in this effort. The approach taken by the Centre, which appears to have succeeded, has been largely based on learning by doing. IDRC responded to the needs of the Consortium as they came up. The only exception perhaps has been its proactive involvement during key inflection points, such as the transition from CIE to CIES. This strategy or lack thereof has given the Consortium considerable flexibility and autonomy, which is valued by its representatives.

IDRC's capacity development support includes the core funding that it has provided directly (the importance of which cannot be underestimated) and support in facilitating the on-going engagement of CIDA over the years. It has also had different types of interactions with the Consortium such as providing a sounding board for ideas, supporting staff training, supporting CIES' annual visit to Ottawa, etc. IDRC has played a number of roles in the Consortium's development. It has been a friend, advisor, donor, change agent, fiscal agent, and a member of the board of directors. Both IDRC and CIES promoted a strategy to improve links to researchers outside of Peru and, particularly, to the research and policy networks in Canada. Strategies to date appear to have strengthened individual relationships, but have had a less evident effect on organizational linkages.

## Capacity development results

### **Research capacities**

Many of the contributions of CIES have been at the level of *individual* researchers, who were able to build their body of research because they won CIES grants and could publish their work. CIES has provided a crucial opportunity for young researchers to develop professionally and continue in social science research. CIES has also improved individual capacity through access to national household survey data from the National Statistics Institute or learning how to design research methodology.

At the *organizational* level, CIES has helped to build the capacities of its member organizations. The long-term support for grant competitions have allowed organizations to plan their research agenda, in some cases establish and build a track record for their research program, and recruit young researchers or analysts. Winning a CIES competition gives credibility to the organization and may lead to other sources of funding. The trainings and access to household survey data have also enabled the members to expand their research.

At the *systems* level, CIES has without a doubt helped to build the stock of Peruvian research and knowledge. It has helped to maintain a critical mass of researchers active in Peru over this 20-year period and has contributed to a more enabling research environment.

From the outset, the Consortium focused on applied research that should be used by government and development programs to take better public policy decisions. Over the past five years, CIES has increased its capacity for policy influence. It has been recognized for developing a successful communications/external relations program and becoming increasingly visible in the media and public fora. It has also implemented a project in support of the Presidential and regional elections in 2006 that combined a series of strategies to promote public debate. CIES effectively used strategic partnerships with the public sector (such as the Congress) or with civil society groups to enhance use of research for policy formulation or advocacy. The Consortium's efforts to influence policy have faced both external and internal challenges including an unstable and limited demand from policymakers, the need for CIES researchers to take into account the demands and characteristics of the policymakers, and managing the heterogeneity of CIES members in this process.

### **CIES institutional development**

CIES has strengthened organizational capacities in several areas over a short period of time. It is still a relatively young organization and as it has evolved, new organizational challenges also have emerged.

CIES is widely recognized for operating a transparent and prestigious research grant competition. It has also expanded capacity to offer different kinds of programming and services to its members. In financial management, CIES' Executive Office developed increasingly sophisticated systems that would allow it to manage and report on projects from numerous donors (10 different funding sources in 2006, each with different requirements).

The Consortium's capacity to mobilize financial resources has also increased over time as illustrated by its diversification of funding. In 2000, IDRC/CIDA represented 76% of CIES financial resources. By 2006, this had fallen to 51%. The diversification has been driven by project-based funding; CIES has continued to face challenges in generating alternatives to IDRC and CIDA for core institutional support. It now has in place a strategy to create an endowment that would facilitate the financial sustainability of its annual research grant competition, which has been the most difficult to finance on a project basis.

The governance structure consists of the Board of Directors, General Assembly, and Executive Director. The Board's composition is made up of representatives from Consortium members (elected from the general assembly), the public sector, civil society, and donors, in such a way that both those who produce and use the research are represented. With almost 40 members in the General Assembly, CIES has begun to face new challenges of integrating and promoting cohesion among these diverse organizations from the provinces and from Lima. As an

umbrella organization, CIES can provide individual members with access to resources and opportunities that they would not have on their own. At this stage, CIES is facing calls for strengthening these value added services and strengthening its role as an umbrella or network organization.

CIES has amplified its capacity through strategic partnerships. These partnerships have been crucial for its broader policy influence but also for providing value added services to all of its members. Examples of this can be found in the agreements that it established with the National Statistics Institute, to give CIES members access to the national household survey data base, and with the Central Bank in order to sponsor special thematic research competitions. CIES is also involved in networks of both national and global reach such as the Evidence-Based Policy in Development Network and the Civil Society Partnership Programme, both supported by Overseas Development Institute (ODI) and el Department for International Development of the United Kingdom del Reino Unido (DFID).

## Final thoughts

CIES represents a unique model for strengthening research capacity at a national and systems level. The case study attempts to illustrate the transition from a project to an institution. Because of the amount of resources invested over 20 years, it may be a difficult one to replicate. In this effort, IDRC and CIES have used a variety of strategies for developing research capacity and over time it appears that these have made positive contributions to a more enabling environment for development research in Peru.

IDRC's approach to supporting CIES reflects several of the good practices that contribute to capacity development as adapted from the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD (2003) and IDRC's Corporate Assessment Framework (2006). One of the characteristics of the IDRC and CIES relationship is persistence. Indeed, the continuity in the relationship and the financing over 20 years has been a key element of strengthening capacity. Second, IDRC's flexibility in providing core support has also allowed CIES to negotiate the use of funds and the timeframe for implementation. This has facilitated a degree of autonomy for CIES that has translated into a locally defined research and organizational agenda. The construction of relationships (partnership) between IDRC and the Executive Office, Board members, and associated researchers has been fundamental. Other strengths of IDRC's approach include generally well-coordinated efforts among IDRC's different divisions (Programs, PBDD, and GADD) as well as its work in partnership with CIDA.

The case study also reveals certain challenges inherent in IDRC's approach to capacity development. For example, IDRC's structure



(which is organized by PIs), variable budget allocations, and pressures to approve new projects may limit capacity development efforts that require a long-term perspective and sustained engagement. In the case of CIES, IDRC's strategy of trial and error appears to have supported capacity development. The question remains as to whether IDRC could have done more to support CIES' organizational development if a more integrated or systematic approach had been taken.

In developing the relationship with CIES in the future, IDRC may wish to consider emphasizing a few of the key organizational challenges that the Consortium is facing and discuss how the Centre could scale up its support via linkages, strategic intelligence, or other means. Governance is one of these key issues to be reviewed. In particular, it seems that this is an appropriate moment to consider how the Consortium could improve on its governance structure, processes, or systems in order to respond to CIES' current organizational needs. In a related area, IDRC could support CIES in its effort to strengthen the development of a collective vision or strategic direction for the Consortium, including an assessment of its mandate and role as an umbrella organization and the relation between its mandate and regional work. IDRC may also want to contribute to discussions on the Consortium's strategy for creating an endowment fund, particularly in light of its experience with other partners that have adopted this kind of a strategy. The potential for financial sustainability of CIES without Canadian funding is a critical issue at this time. This case study has described a number of the strategies that CIES employed to strengthen research capacity among its members, yet there have been few opportunities to assess which of these strategies have been more effective. This is another point for potential further collaboration between IDRC and CIES.

In general, the case study points to a great appreciation on the part of CIES for the characteristics of IDRC's support and the roles that have been played by its staff. The study did identify a few areas of potential improvement such as generating more dialogue/analysis on PI funding for individual members of the Consortium, facilitating greater linkages between CIES and IDRC-supported global and regional networks, exploring alternatives to enhance relationships between Peruvian and Canadian researchers, and providing more strategic intelligence on issues in the research for development context in Latin America.

## Table of Contents

---

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 The Case Study	2
1.3 Document Structure	3
2. Methodology	3
2.1 Sources and Data Collection	5
2.2 Case Study Framework	6
2.3 Methodology Limitations	7
3. Background to Capacity Strengthening	7
3.1 The Peruvian Research Development Environment	7
3.2 IDRC Context	13
3.2.1 Consortia and Networks in IDRC	14
3.2.2 IDRC Strategic Direction and Structure	14
3.2.3 Alliance with CIDA	15
4. Evolution of CIES	15
5. Capacity Development Goals	19
5.1 From IDRC's Viewpoint	19
5.2 Through the Eyes of Peruvian Research Centres	24
6. Capacity Development Strategies	25
6.1.1 Strengthening Capacities of Researchers and Partner Organisations	26
6.1.2 Other Services Offered to Partner Organisations	33
6.3 Links Between Public Policy Researchers in Peru and Canada	37
7. Capacity Development Results	39
7.1 Research Capacity Strengthening	39
7.1.1 Individual Capacities	39
7.1.2 Partner Organisation Capacities	41
7.1.3 Contributing to a Favourable Environment	45
7.2 Impact on Public Policy	45
7.2.1 Different Ways of Influencing	47
7.2.2 And the Effects on Policies?	49
7.2.3 Influencing Challenges	50

---

---

7.3 CIES' Institutional Development	51
8. Final Considerations	59
8.1 Strengths and Challenges of IDRC's Approach	59
8.1.1 Good Practices that Contribute to Capacity Development	59
8.1.2 Other Strengths	61
8.1.3 Challenges Inherent in IDRC's Approach to Capacity Development	62
8.2 Areas to be Considered for IDRC-CIES Relationship in the Future	66

---

## Tables and Charts

Table 2.1	IDRC Projects in support of CIES 1999 - 2006	4
Table 2.2	Case Study Framework	6
Table 3.1	Some figures on the Peruvian Economy	8
Table 4.1	Phases of IDRC-CIDA Aid Projects to the Consortium	17
Table 5.1	Evolution of general goals in IDRC aid projects to the Consortium	20
Table 6.1	CIES Competition: Project Type and Features	26
Table 6.2	Competitions Won by Centres in the Provinces 1999-2007	28
Table 6.3	Training offered by CIES: Type and Characteristics	29
Table 6.3	Types of IDRC Activities in Support of Capacity Development in CIES	34
Table 7.1	Important Factors in CIES' Capacity Development	40
Table 7.2	The Contribution of the Following Aspects to Strengthening the Group of Partners	43
Table 7.3	Based on your experience, please evaluate CIES' strengthening in its capacity as a Consortium to:	46
Chart 7.4	Diagram of a Network with Two Supra-Functions	51
Graph 7.5	CIES Revenues between 2000 and July 2007	53
Table 7.6	Additional Sources of Financing (not CIDA/IDRC) 1999-2007	53

## A p p e n d i c e s

---

Annex I List of Abbreviations Used	70
Annex II Terms of Reference	72
Annex III Persons Interviewed	84
Annex IV Survey	90
Annex V Survey Results	94
Annex VI Bibliography	101
Annex VII CIES Partners	107
Annex VIII Biographies of the Authors	109

---

## A c k n o w l e d g e m e n t s

This case study would not have been possible without the support provided by many individuals in Peru and Canada who took time out to speak about their experiences and to share their visions and opinions with us.

The team from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) helped with the methodology, the collection of documents from the Economic and Social Research Consortium (CIES) and contributed through interviews and a revision of the first draft of this document. We also had the support of former officials of the IDRC programme as well as personnel from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), who generously contributed their time to the preparation of this document.

In Peru, the team from CIES' Executive Office made space for us in their cramped schedules to exchange ideas about the development and research processes in that country and the activities of the Consortium. We received help coordinating the mission, especially from Javier Portocarrero and Rocío García, and Daniela Camacho who was essential in the area of logistics.

We would also like to thank all the researchers, ministry representatives, universities, companies and non-governmental organisations for sharing their opinions during interviews.

Finally we could not fail to acknowledge the great assistance received from our editor María del Pilar Albareda.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Capacity development for research is the cornerstone of the work and philosophy of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). It is also one of its corporate objectives and is included in the Centre's strategy for the period 2005-2010. In 2005, IDRC began a strategic evaluation, led by its Evaluation Unit, to examine its contributions toward strengthening the capacities of the groups and organisations with which it was working. This evaluation sought to describe and analyse the processes used and the results obtained in the area of capacity development with a view to creating a conceptual framework and a common language, as well as systematising experiences and outcomes in this area.

The appraisal has been conducted in distinct phases. The first three phases were in the following areas:

- Creation of a definition of "development" or "strengthening" of capacities and an identification of how and with whom this work was done within the IDRC context;
- Development of a set of typologies that can help IDRC personnel and their partners to conceptualise, plan, monitor and evaluate capacities development; and
- Formulations of a list of "good practices" that unite the essential elements of the support provided by IDRC for system development and research organisations.

The case studies of partner organisations constitute the fourth phase of the evaluation. This document presents a case study on the Economic and Social Research Consortium (CIES) in Peru.

The Consortium was created with IDRC and CIDA aid in 1989 during a difficult political and economic period in Peru. During the first stage of the relationship with the Peru Economic Research Consortium (PERC), from 1988 to 1998, IDRC and CIDA contributed a total of 8 million Canadian dollars. The second stage of the Consortium began in 1998. This stage proposed, among other things, an expansion of the Consortium in terms of membership and thematic coverage and a name change to the Social and Economic Research Consortium. In this second stage, CIDA and IDRC contribution was 10.2 million Canadian dollars. Throughout almost 20 years, IDRC's contribution totalled just over 3 million Canadian dollars. Since the beginning, IDRC's investment has been in terms of institutional support (*core support*) in the language of IDRC.

## 1.2 The Case Study

The CIES case study is one of six and the only case from Latin America.<sup>1</sup> The case studies sample was chosen to showcase the greatest possible contrast in the cases, which were selected based on several criteria that included: (i) the level of IDRC financing since 1995, (ii) a long-term relationship (more than five years) with IDRC, (iii) a geographic balance and (iv) being illustrative of the different types of organisations receiving IDRC support.

The purpose of the case studies is to investigate how, over time, IDRC support has contributed to the capacity development of individuals/groups, organisations and networks. The CIES case study seeks to describe the different capacity development processes and results that took place within the framework of collaboration between IDRC and CIES. The case study does not try to evaluate or measure the performance of CIES; it tries rather to analyse the focus of IDRC and the links that can be established between the development of CIES and the kind of support it received from IDRC. Consequently, the study does not conclude with recommendations about possible improvements in the Consortium's work, but rather presents thoughts on the main themes to be discussed within the framework of the IDRC/CIES relationship.

This sets the document apart from previous CIES evaluations.

Nevertheless, because of the important role that capacity development has played in the work of the Consortium, readers will see a certain similarity between its findings and those of previous CIES evaluations, especially the most recent one done by Intermedia in 2002. This case study tries to reflect new strategies and events in the context of the relationship between IDRC and CIES that have arisen in the last five years.

The Terms of Reference under which the study was conducted are included as Annex II.

### **Users and Proposed Usage**

Two users of the study have been identified: IDRC and CIES. In the case of IDRC, the primary user, the case study will be utilised to support the design, execution, follow-up and evaluation of capacity development initiatives. In addition, it will be useful to IDRC program management, providing a better understanding of their approach to the area of capacity development.

---

<sup>1</sup> The case studies selected were: (i) the Association for Progressive Communication, a global network of organisations in the field of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) for development; (ii) Makerere University in Kampala, Uganda; (iii) Cheikh Anta Diop University in Dakar, Senegal; (iv) the International Centre for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas in Syria, a member of the International Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR); (v) the Economic and Social Research Consortium in Peru (CIES) ; and (vi) the Environment Ministry in Cambodia.



It is hoped that this study will also be of use to CIES. Among the potential uses indicated by the Executive Office (EO) is the strengthening of the Consortium's identity and history, which is important given the continued expansion in its membership. In addition, by documenting the process of capacity strengthening, the study could contribute to the organisational learning and the resource management efforts of the Consortium.

### 1.3 Document Structure

The document is organised in eight sections. After this introduction, a summary of the methodology used follows, moving on to a description of the context and the evolution of the Consortium. The chapter after that tries to identify the motivations for capacity strengthening, while the final three sections describe the strategies employed in capacity development, the results, strengths and challenges arising from IDRC's focus. These sections, although they do not agree in name with the chapters of the Terms of Reference, do represent all the topics and questions included there.

## 2. Methodology

This case study has, as its objective, to describe the different processes and results of capacity development that took place as part of the collaboration between IDRC and CIES from approximately 1999 to 2006. The case study methodology took into account certain characteristics of CIES and of IDRC's support:

- Characteristics of a Network. In IDRC, the term "consortium" is in common usage and is equivalent to the concept of a "network", which is defined as "a social agreement of organisations and/or individuals linked around a common theme or goal, working together but allowing their members to maintain their independence as participants" (IDRC Annual Learning Forum (ALF), 2005, paraphrasing). As a consequence, the case study proposed exploring capacity development at the level of the network (the group, an umbrella organisation) and of their partners (the partner institutions). The group also includes the organisational structure of the General Assembly, the Board of Directors and the Executive Office.
- Consortium Leadership. During the time of the site visits that the evaluation team carried out, CIES was in a process of transition; its Executive Director (in charge since the first phase of CIES) had left the job and the Assistant Director was temporarily filling the post. The Board of Directors was in the process of selecting and naming a new director. The case study deals with this subject as part of the internal context and the institutional development of the Consortium. In October 2007, the Internal Director was ratified.

- Institutional Financing. IDRC's financing has been in the form of institutional support and has had the explicit aim of strengthening the Consortium institutionally. Since IDRC's support is institutional in nature, the case study does not analyse individual projects, instead it looks at the evolution of the Consortium as an institution, which is, in itself, a mechanism for building research capacity for development in Peru.
- Long-term Financing. The case study emphasises the last stage of the Consortium, when CIES was already constituted (2000 and up to the present). However, the accumulative effect of the relationship between both institutions and the long-term financing from IDRC is acknowledged. The grounds for collaboration are considered to have been established from the first phases of CIE in the 1990s as well as by IDRC's record in Peru.<sup>2</sup> Thoughts on the first phases (CIE) have been incorporated whenever possible and pertinent, given the available information.

## IDRC Projects

All IDRC projects and activities related to CIES were analysed with the aim of understanding the different shapes that IDRC interventions take in the area of capacity building. In the case of CIES, there were four projects between 1999 and 2006 (the period the case study places the most emphasis on). Of these, two major research projects (between \$1 million and \$4.6 million) were managed by the Social and Economic Policy Programme Area (SEP). Two other research assistance projects, involving lesser amounts, were financed under the direction of the Partnership and Business Development Division (PBDD).

**Table 2.1 IDRC Projects in support of CIES 1999 - 2006**

YEAR OF APPROVAL	PROJECT NUMBER	NAME	AMOUNT (IDRC)	TYPE OF PROJECT	SUB-TYPE OF PROJECT	IDRC AREA
1999	003868 (1998)	Social and Economic Research Consortium	CAD\$ 861,097	Research Project	Capacity Development	PPB CORP Under the management of the Social and Economic Policy Programme Area
2004	102321	Strengthening the Social and	CAD\$ 1,000,00	Research Project	Capacity Development	PPB CORP Under the

<sup>2</sup> For example, several researchers interviewed stressed the support offered by IDRC in the realisation of their postgraduate studies. In addition, several of the partner institutions have received or continue to receive support from the different programme areas of IDRC. Some have named IDRC as the agency that facilitated the establishment of their research area or the opportunity to carry out innovative research at the time.

YEAR OF APPROVAL	PROJECT NUMBER	NAME	AMOUNT (IDRC)	TYPE OF PROJECT	SUB-TYPE OF PROJECT	IDRC AREA
		Economic Research Consortium-Phase II	0			management of the Social and Economic Policy Programme Area
2005	102798	Peru 2006: Linking Research with Political Options in the Elections	CAD\$ \$50,000	Research Assistance Project	Project Development	PBDD (Challenge Fund Financing)
2006	103599	Social Development Network (Researchers and the non governmental organisations of the Andean Community of Nations - (CAN, by its Spanish acronym)	CAD\$ \$37,900	Research Assistance Project	Multipurpose	PBDD (Challenge Fund Financing)

Source: IDRC, Project Appraisal Documents

## 2.1 Sources and Data Collection

The sources for major data were documents, face-to-face or phone interviews, and a brief survey sent to CIES associates.

### Document Review

In the preparation of the case study, abundant documentation was available. Throughout its history, CIES has been evaluated some three times. There were also annual and semi-annual reports following CIDA guidelines. IDRC officers have also been careful in documenting their travel through trip reports they made available in an online file.

### Interviews

With the aim of conducting interviews, a trip to Peru was undertaken by Katrina Rojas and Mariane Arsenault, between September 17 and 28, 2007. The two visited Lima to collect qualitative and quantitative data on CIES by interviewing seven representatives from the Executive Office, seven from the Board of Directors, 45 from the Consortium's partner organisations and research associates. Two donor

representatives were interviewed and three from the Peruvian government participated as well. (A complete list of the persons interviewed is found in Annex III). Additionally, the team members met in Arequipa (September 24, 2007) with three research centres from this city. Other centres located outside of Lima were contacted by telephone with the aim of getting viewpoints that were not limited to the centres of the capital.

Interviews were likewise conducted with IDRC personnel in Ottawa and by telephone with staff in Montevideo. Several CIDA representatives, international advisors to CIES and other key actors were also interviewed.

## Survey

The aim of the survey was to offer an opportunity to all CIES partner organisations to express their opinions. The emphasis of the survey was on capacity development of CIES in general and not of the affiliated centres. The latter issue rather was broached in the interviews. With the support of the Executive Office, 38 associated organisations were sent a survey by email requesting their opinion. Of these 38 organisations, 25 responded (representing about 66% of the universe). Of these responses, 16 were from Lima (68% of the partners in the capital) and nine were from the provinces (56% of the affiliates in the rest of the country). The survey as well as its results can be found in Annexes IV and V respectively.

## 2.2 Case Study Framework

As set down in the terms of reference, this case study has been structured around five themes. The following table summarises these thematic groups as well as the questions that have guided the case study.

**Table 2.2 Case Study Framework**

TOPICS	MAIN QUESTIONS
1. Development Research Context	How has the legal, political, sociocultural and economic context influenced the ability of CIES to conduct development research?  What are the factors that have most helped or hindered the support for research?
2. Goals since the beginning of the relationship between IDRC/CIES	What were the goals/expectations of IDRC and CIES in terms of capacity development at the beginning? How have these goals/expectations developed and been implemented?  To what extent were these goals explicit, logical, consistent with, appropriate to and linked to the research context and issues?

TOPICS	MAIN QUESTIONS
3. Description of capacity development interventions	What capacity development strategies have been used? Why were these strategies chosen?  How relevant, strategic and effective have these capacity development strategies been?  To what extent have these strategies evolved over time? Why?
4. Performance and continuity of the relationship between IDRC/CIES	What are the results of IDRC's support in terms of individual and organisational abilities and research capacities?  What are the factors that have aided or limited achieving results?  How has IDRC been influenced by its relationship with CIES?  What is the current relationship between IDRC and CIES?
5. Recommendations	What are the strengths and weaknesses of IDRC's approach to capacity development?  How can IDRC improve its capacity development support to CIES in the future?

## 2.3 Methodology Limitations

We would like to point out some of the limitations in the results of the methodology we used. First, although the survey was sent to 38 partner organisations, the majority of those responding were from Lima. The response from the centres outside the capital was much lower than expected, which produced a distortion in the responses. In the analysis of the responses we tried to identify differences, if there were any, between these two groups. Second, another possible slant in the survey could arise from the fact that the responses were sent to the Executive Office, which did the follow-up with the partner organisations to increase the number of responses. Third, the interviews included some representatives of the users/clients of CIES (public sector and international cooperation). This was adequate given the focus proposed and the time available to prepare the case study. However, some sections of this document would have been enriched by a greater contribution from these players especially in the sections where the impact of CIES and its efforts to achieve sustainable financing are discussed.

## 3. Background to Capacity Strengthening

### 3.1 The Peruvian Research Development Environment

This section discusses some of the environmental elements relevant to research for development in Peru and its evolution over time - with

emphasis on the last five years - that, in some way, define the Consortium's development and the way in which this takes on and supports development research.

### **Changing Economic Realities: Greater emphasis on social realities?**

At the end of the 1980s, Peru suffered a political and economic crisis due to violence and terrorism and runaway inflation. This situation was caused by mismanagement of social and economic policies. This crisis had already begun to stabilise when the expansion of CIE was proposed with regard to research and membership. Once basic macroeconomic reforms had been consolidated, social issues began to gain more importance and the reassessment that created CIES reflected a reading of that context and of its implications for the agenda of applied research.

After several years of some stability in macroeconomic policies, today Peru has entered into an impressive economic growth stage. The economic boom has frequently been cited in interviews and is shown in some of the figures in Table 3.1. As a result of the economic expansion, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has risen by 4.1% between 2003 and 2006. Although government income has increased, totalling 19.6% of GDP in 2006, this has not been accompanied by a strong rise in public investment. As one of the interviewees mentioned, the Peruvian State is unaccustomed to working under conditions of surplus and does not have the programme design or implementation capacity that ought to match the current fiscal and economic situation.

**Table 3.1        Some figures on the Peruvian Economy**

	2003	2006
GDP (annual percentage difference)	3.9%	8%
Exports (annual percentage difference)	17.8	37.7
Current Account Balance (% GDP)	-1.5%	2.6%
Current Government Income (% of GDP)	17.4%	19.6%
External Public Debt (% of GDP)	48.1%	30.3%
Consumer Prices (close of the fiscal year)	2.5%	1.1%

Source: IMF (2007). "Peru: First Review of the Stand-by Agreement - IMF Staff Document. P.27.

With a stable and highly positive economic outlook, the Government and other players have turned their attention to Peru's social landscape. As the World Bank describes in its analysis for the incoming government of President Alan García:

"For the first time in the republican history of the country, the presidential transition takes place in democracy, social peace, rapid economic growth and favourable World markets. In other words, there has never been a better opportunity to build a different Peru -

richer, more equitable and more governable." (Giugale, Marco M., 2007; 1)

Unfortunately, high rates of poverty, inequities in the distribution of wealth and wide social gaps still persist in Peru. There remains, even now, much to do to overcome poverty and exclusion. One example of the importance given to such social themes emphasised by several of those interviewed is the fact that the Annual Executives Conference (the most important yearly gathering of businessmen) has highlighted this topic, beginning with the conference in 2006, which focussed on the issue of social exclusion, and continuing into 2007, when the slogan for the conference was: "All that we lack to be a just and prosperous country."

Today's context continues to favour a research agenda that incorporates the social, since it offers opportunities to the Consortium to contribute new knowledge and ideas that could guide the expected increase in public investment in social programmes and the reduction of poverty levels.

### **The Opportunities and Challenges of Decentralisation**

Peru is a country known for its centralist structures. As many have described, everything revolves around power in Lima. However, decentralisation has been an ongoing process that continues to stir up debate, and has affected the research for development context. During the government of Alejandro Toledo (2001-2006) various measures were approved including constitutional reform that, in 2002, led to the creation of regional governments.

Decentralisation efforts come, however, with questions pertaining to the ordering of planning and spending levels, definition of competition, auditing and consulting norms of the different entities, achieving unity in management and reconciliation of efficiency with democratisation and transparency in the decisions that are made. (Grompone, 2002; 12)

This goal of decentralising power comes against the backdrop of an economic situation that favours some regions. This is highlighted by regions that have grown more than Lima in recent years and in the rise in the mining royalty.<sup>3</sup> The growth in the State's collection of taxes, associated with the economic boom and good international prices in the mining industry, has allowed more resources to be transferred through the mining royalty and other mechanisms to decentralise resources. For example, the mining royalty disbursements have gone from

---

<sup>3</sup> The financial payment that regions in which extraction activities take place now receive (50% of income taxes paid by mining, petroleum and gas companies).

much less than 500 million new soles in 2002 to more than 1,500 million new soles in 2006<sup>4</sup>. (Mendoza, 2007; 15)

The regional situation is gaining importance, and several of the people interviewed said that this was a part of the context underscoring the value of CIES because of its efforts to incorporate regional research centres and establish links between entities operating in the regions and those in Lima. In addition, this was seen in the new initiatives promoting pre-electoral debates that CIES partners conducted for the regional elections in 2006. The environment also creates different types of demands for CIES as far as strengthening capacities is concerned.

On one hand the demand for training programmes, for example, from central bodies (such as the Economic and Finance Ministry, MEF, by its Spanish acronym), concerned precisely with the quality of public investment and uniformity in resource management. On the other hand, there are demands on CIES from its regional partner centres, which see new opportunities to influence regional debates and policies, but which perhaps require more mentoring.

### **Asymmetry in research and higher education**

Although this topic is part of the challenges of decentralisation, it deserves special mention, because of the importance it has for the context of development research and the role of CIES. From the first interview we conducted for this case study, the general framework of the differences between conditions and opportunities for higher education and research was stressed. These differences exist between private universities and public ones on one hand, and between research centres in Lima and in the regions, on the other.

... The level of university education in the provinces is usually of inferior quality to that of universities in Lima (with some notable exceptions) due to three main factors: inadequate infrastructure, insufficient academic training for professors and nonexistent access to library resources, even to books and professional articles. There is a need for the Consortium, or for any other similar organisation, to introduce programmes that improve the educational standards in the areas of economics of the provincial universities. (Hertzka and Hunt, 2000: 51. Paraphrasing)

Although these observations were made in 2000, the interviews for this study confirmed that this gap persists. This situation has affected decisions that have been made by Consortium Directors on affirmative action policies (limited competitions) and institutional allocations in competitions. As described by the most recent CIES evaluation:

---

<sup>4</sup> \$ 516 million Canadian dollars (February 2008 estimate).



"Since the creation of CIES, and in particular at the time it began announcements for competitions, there has been constant concern regarding strengthening the research conducted in public universities and in the interior of the country." (Interalia, 2002, p. 10)

This disparity has been and continues to be a fundamental characteristic of the context in which CIES operates that exceeds its ability to contribute. The gap creates a context that could potentially provide a very broad sphere of action for CIES and also the opportunity of internal debate on the equilibrium or possible agreements between improving research quality and capacity strengthening.

### **Scarce Resources Available for Research**

It is not easy to allocate for research in a public university budget because most of these funds are earmarked for salaries. As described by the interviewees from public universities, their institutions have a fund for research development that is traditionally distributed among the teaching staff according to a pre-established formula and depending on each staff member's position as a full, assistant or associate professor. However, the amount allocated for research is low. For example, one university allots a maximum of US\$1,200 annually for a full professor. (In comparison, a short-term limited CIES project offers financing of US\$5,000).

Public institutions and the business sector occupy a fairly marginal role in the financing of research in Peru, a situation that is quite different in countries such as Brazil or Mexico.<sup>5</sup> Existing financial sources, such as the National Council of Science and Technology (CONCYTEC, by its Spanish acronym) do not pay attention to social sciences and their budgets have been reduced. In 1980, the fiscal budget for research and development activities was US\$100 million, while in 2003 it amounted to just US\$35 million. According to available data, the amount for scientific and technological research in Peruvian universities was one of the lowest on the continent in 1999, amounting to just 0.08% of GDP.<sup>6</sup>

The current government will encourage technology development research. In 2007 it was announced that the President would allocate a sum of 200 million new soles<sup>7</sup> to finance the operation of the Competitiveness Research and Development Fund (FIDECOM, by its Spanish acronym), which

---

<sup>5</sup> Jesús Sebastián (2003). *Estrategias de cooperación universitaria para la formación de investigadores en Iberoamérica* (University cooperation strategies for researcher training in Iberoamerica). Madrid, OEI, p.18.

<sup>6</sup> José Raúl González de la Cuba (2004). *El financiamiento de la educación superior en el Perú* (Financing higher education in Peru). Lima.

<sup>7</sup> \$ 70 millon Canadian dollars (February 2008 estimate).

will underwrite research and development projects in Peruvian companies to improve their competitiveness.

Financing for social science research in Peru depends to a great degree on external funding. This includes Canadian financing channelled through CIES as the main source for economic and social research. There are also funds from the Latin American Social Sciences Council (CLASCO, by its Spanish acronym), which instituted a regional scholarship programme in 1998 and organises two competitions: research project competitions and essay writing competitions. Other donors active in Peru who emphasise research are the Ford Foundation and the Tinker Foundation, but each has its own subject priorities and requirements (such as complementary funding as in the case of the Tinker Foundation).

Due to limited resources available, researchers in public and private universities, like those in private research centres, supplement research with consultancy work, trying to align these kinds of activities with their medium- and long-term research work.

In this context, the annual CIES competitions offer an important source that many highlight as unique in fostering social and economic research in Peru, and does not have thematic restrictions.

### **Using Research to Formulate Public Policy**

Recent years have seen windows of opportunity for linking research with these processes. Even with this general change in the political context, the situation in Peru is perhaps not that different from that of other countries where the State does not have a record of demand for research applied to

the formulation or evaluation of its policies and programmes. On one hand there are differences in the "times"

required for research and the time available for evaluation of and decisions on policy. There are also questions of language, thematic relevance and different ways of relating and understanding each other.

Applied research does not only contribute to policy design and programmes, but also to evaluating the implementation of those public programmes. Peru faces a challenge in the creation of a culture of evaluation. In general, programme assessments have been conducted mainly because of external pressures (Benavides, 2005).

The uses to which research results are put are often affected by changes in direction and key personnel in some sectors of government (especially in the social areas such as education and health). It can be said that there has been more receptiveness in certain sectors and institutions that have kept independent professionals linked to

*"In general it is an environment in which nothing is demanded, not even transparency and this is bad for research; there is no demand for policy changes to be based as strongly as possible on evidence, and everything is very complicated."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

academia, such as the Central Reserve Bank (BCR, by its Spanish initials), the Ministry of Economics and Finance and the National Statistics Institute (INEI, by its Spanish acronym). The ties with research and analysis related to political proposals have been fluid as a result of the closeness among these institutions and are the result of a long history of CIES' work with these institutions. (CIES, 2003:5)

### **Challenges and Choices of Dialogue and Collaboration**

Another theme that stands out in the context of development research in Peru is the question of collaboration and dialogue.

The differences between individuals and organisations involved in research not only occur because of disparities in opportunities and conditions (as indicated previously), but also because of dissimilarities among disciplines, foci and ideologies. These divides have been great at different times, particularly at the beginning of CIE's operations. With the aim of bringing together researchers with different mindsets, a part of the funds received was allocated to financing joint research.

Today, these gaps continue as part of the context in which CIES operates. Some interviewees, however, indicated that CIES has helped build a space of plurality while others still see the presence of traditional ideological stamps, which introduces an additional challenge to the efforts to build an academic community.

### **3.2 IDRC Context**

Some of the features of IDRC's environment that have direct relevance for the case of CIES are outlined in this section. IDRC operates within the wider context of the

Canadian government, which means that it must face changes of government policy with relation to funds allocated to Official Development Assistance (ODA) and budgetary cuts, as well as respond to the growing emphasis on results-based management and the evaluation of public investments.

*"Here it is a rare thing that there is a plural organisation where it doesn't matter if you are on the left or on the right, as in the case of PERC. It is very difficult to find that in Peru."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

*"Peru remains a country where it is very important who speaks and this makes many things difficult. First, you are asked who has said this before being asked what has been said. We have not overcome that; we still have it. That is the greatest obstacle, in my opinion, to creating knowledge networks, and unfortunately we have not been able, neither in the era of PERC nor in that of the CIES, to put aside the subject of the ideological stamp that is implicit behind certain institutions or certain persons."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

### 3.2.1 Consortia and Networks in IDRC

The Peru Economic Research Consortium (CIE for its Spanish Acronym) was born at the end of the 1980s, when IDRC had joined with other donors to establish the African Research Consortium (AERC), seeking to strengthen local economic policy research capacity in Sub-Saharan Africa. The AERC experience, as well as that with the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA, by its French acronym), provided a certain backdrop to this national initiative in Peru.

The "consortium" was only one of the names used in IDRC to speak of the wider concept of "networks". For many years IDRC has recognised the importance of networks in development research support. Recently, IDRC has concluded a strategic assessment of networks. One of the documents prepared as part of that evaluation (Pyburn and Guijt, 2006) touches exactly on the topic of capacity development through networks. The findings indicate three reasons that justify investment in networks as a means and focus of capacity development: (i) the need for systemic change in the research environment; (ii) the need to develop a long-term perspective and, (iii) the critical contribution of communication and coordination made possible through networking.

### 3.2.2 IDRC Strategic Direction and Structure

In addition to the aforementioned points and IDRC's interest in networks, there are elements of strategic direction or structure that should be mentioned for their likely relationship with the evolution of IDRC aid to CIES.

IDRC conducts its planning by means of thematic programmes known as Programme Initiatives (PI), instead of a by country strategy. The PIs, which were introduced in the 2000-2005 strategic plan, promote a multi or transdisciplinary focus in the examination of research issues. PIs are framed within three large programme areas: Social and Economic Equality (SEP), Environment and Natural Resource Management (ENRM), and Information and Communication Technologies for Development (ICT4D).

Aid to CIES is under the SEP program area; for different reasons, since the beginning support for CIES has been channelled through a more corporative project than through a PI. Some of the reasons cited by IDRC staff for this occurrence include the absence of the PI structure at the time the project was designed and the thematic breadth/transverse nature of CIES that make it difficult to easily position it in only one PI. In practice, CIES did not fit perfectly in any of the programmes.

There have also been changes in SEP, and since 2005-06, SEP has been organised into four PIs that focus on different areas of public policy: Globalisation, Growth and Poverty (GGP), Governance, Equity and Health (GEH), Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) and Women's

Rights and Citizenship (WRC).<sup>8</sup> Within this structure, CIES has been included in the GGP.

### 3.2.3 Alliance with CIDA

IDRC has several initiatives with CIDA, including aid to the AERC. In the case of CIES, involvement with CIDA has been continuous and supported by top functionaries since interest was shown in the academic community of Peru by the Canadian Ambassador to that country at the end of the 1980s (Keith Bezanson). CIDA has contributed \$15,488,976<sup>9</sup> Canadian dollars throughout almost 20 years, a situation apparently exceptional in the history of CIDA.<sup>10</sup>

The CIDA cooperation had several characteristics. Firstly, as described in the brief history of CIES, during the life of PERC and in the first phase of CIES, CIDA channelled its funds through IDRC. A Contribution Agreement regulated the relationship between the two agencies. This involved IDRC playing the part of Executing Agency and at the same time that of donor, a double role that sometimes caused difficulties or tensions between the agencies, according to some of those interviewed. However, it has been a fruitful relationship over time, allowing resource support in greater quantities than IDRC could typically contribute on its own. At the beginning of this alliance with CIDA, it was also considered more strategic for the IDRC head office in Ottawa to manage the projects and relationship with CIES, rather than the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Office (LACRO) located in Montevideo.

## 4. Evolution of CIES

This section provides a brief account of the evolution of the Consortium, from its initial creation in 1989 up to today. The information has been taken mainly from Institutional History of CIES (2005) and supplemented by information provided by the interviews and other documents.

### **The Origins of CIE**

In the critical context of the 1980s, CIDA and IDRC offered their support to five research centres willing to unite under the framework

---

<sup>8</sup> The abbreviations are derived from the English names. Area restructuring is mentioned in: Brent Herbert-Copley (2007). Social and Economic Policy Programme Area, Report to the Board of Governors. P. 3.

<sup>9</sup> PAD - Strengthening the Peru Consortium for Economic and Social Research Phase II.

<sup>10</sup> According to one interviewee, currently there are only two such long living CIDA projects (one being CIES).

of a consortium.<sup>11</sup> The “project” of the Economic Research Consortium (CIE) was conceived as a mechanism to encourage economic study in research centres and to promote greater collaboration among them.<sup>12</sup> In addition, the project allowed for the creation of job security conditions in the academic centres that could counteract the flight of Peruvian researchers to northern countries. The consortium grouped together:

- The Pacific University (CIUP);
- The Development Studies and Promotion Centre (DESCO);
- The Development Analysis Group (GRADE);
- The Peruvian Studies Institute (IEP); and
- The Economics Department of the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru (PUCP).

In CIE the funds granted by CIDA and IDRC were divided among the five centres in Lima and an amount was allocated for joint activities. The quantity received by each organisation was established by means of a Memorandum of Understanding with IDRC.

In the first phase of CIE (1989-1993), partners identified the projects to be financed and presented them to IDRC for approval (the periods of the phases of CIES are presented in Table 4.1, as well as the amount of financing from CIDA and IDRC). These research projects had to respond to a series of questions (established by the Centres, IDRC and CIDA) on the causes of the economic crisis, the analysis of policy instruments and the institutional changes necessary to improve economic policy (among other questions).<sup>13</sup> A Steering Committee was formed with a representative from each centre. Administration of CIE was done from an executive secretariat run by one of the five partners. From 1989 to 1994, the secretariat in charge of fund administration was with the Development Analysis Group. From 1994 to 1999, that administration was done by The Development Studies and Promotion Centre.

The first phase assessment recommended certain changes, which were introduced in the second phase (1993-1999). As part of the efforts to improve research quality, peer review mechanisms for proposals, progress reports and final research products were established during this phase.

Many of these proposals were evaluated by an international advisory committee, a committee that represented an innovation in the second

---

<sup>11</sup> CIDA and IDRC had previously aided or collaborated with these centres.

<sup>12</sup> According to what we were told, the CIES pentagon form logo reflects its five-organisation origins.

<sup>13</sup> These questions are found in the PERC evaluation carried out by Hertza and Hunt (2000), p. 4

phase, and that in addition sought to broaden the links between Peruvian researchers and those in the Americas. Research was conducted in certain defined areas such as macroeconomic policy, structural adjustment, labour sector reform, public finances and sectoral analysis. In this phase, joint activities were expanded including debates, seminars, training sessions and conferences.

**Table 4.1 Phases of IDRC-CIDA Aid Projects to the Consortium**

Phase	Year	IDRC (CAD \$)	CIDA (CAD\$)	TOTAL (CAD\$)
CIE Phase 1	1989-1993	397,105.00	2,972,219.00	3,369,324.00
CIE Phase 2	1993-1999	755,200.00	4,148,330.00	4,903,530.00
CIES Phase 1	1999-2004	861,097.00	3,768,427.00	4,629,524.00
CIES Phase 2	2004-2009	1,000,000.00	4,600,000.00	5,600,000.00
TOTAL		3,013,402.00	15,488,976.00	18,502,378.00

Source: PAD - Strengthening the Peru Consortium for Economic and Social Research Phase II.

### **The Transition to CIES**

At the end of the 1990s, CIE had acquired a good reputation in Peru and there was acknowledgement among the parties involved that it had fulfilled its purpose. But the context had changed, and both IDRC and CIDA had begun to speak with the partners about the relevance of the existing Consortium model to a next phase. The concern of IDRC and CIDA centred on the fact that the model was unsustainable (it depended on external funding), was insufficiently competitive, lacked incentives to incorporate new members, and did not reflect the change in research priorities, which no longer were defined only in terms of economic matters as the macroeconomic reforms had begun to be consolidated. In addition, IDRC and CIDA insisted on greater ties to users of the results of the research. Therefore, CIDA and IDRC agreed to continue with CIE financing but under new conditions. These new conditions sought to establish a new way of encouraging collaboration and research. The change to the Social and Economic and Research Consortium (CIES) was done in consultation with the five founding partners, but the process was not easy because it implied a new consortium model. A great deal of discussion and negotiation among the partners, IDRC and CIDA and potential partners, was needed to arrive at a proposal for the new CIES.

The final proposal presented to the agencies explained that the "CIES here suggested, is an organisational endeavour by the most important research centres in Peru to respond effectively to the country's need for medium- and long-term socioeconomic research. It seeks to improve public policy debate, while supporting its member institutions in fulfilling their role of knowledge producers." (CIES, 1998:14)

The shift from CIE to CIES kept the same objective of “strengthening the Peruvian research community with the intention of producing and disseminating knowledge useful for the design and execution of public policies.”<sup>14</sup> However, important institutional changes were suggested. Broadly, these principal changes can be identified as:

- The introduction of a competition system to assign research funding;
- Opening up membership to academic and research institutions at the national level;
- The creation of an organisational structure that introduced the General Assembly, the Board of Directors and the Executive Office;
- Expanding research topics to include the social;
- The beginning of fundraising from other financial sources;
- Greater emphasis on communicating and disseminating results; and
- A greater focus on use of research and making efforts to have an impact on public policy.

These and the other changes introduced had great implications for the “organisational capacities” of the Consortium, as these are defined in Lusthaus, et. al (2002)<sup>15</sup>. Organisational capacity is the ability of an organisation to use its resources to carry out activities, and comprises all resources, systems and processes that the organisation employs to perform its work. Specifically, capacities such as strategic leadership, organisational structure, human resources, financial management, infrastructure, programme management, process management and inter-organisational ties are considered. In chapters 6 and 7 some of the strategies and results of the development of these organisational capacities are analysed. Many of these changes were made in a relatively short time; others are still in process.

---

<sup>14</sup> CIES (2005). *Memoria Institucional (Institutional History) 1999-2004*. Lima, CIES, p.12.

<sup>15</sup> These capacities are taken from the organisational evaluation model of IDRC, Universalia, and the IDB. See Charles Lusthaus, Marie-Hélène Adrien, Gary Anderson, Fred Carden & George Plinio Montalvan (2002). *Evaluación organizacional: Marco para mejorar el desempeño (Organisational Evaluation: Framework for Improved Performance)*. Washington, InterAmerican Development Bank (IDB) and the International Development Research Centre.



## **CIES Today**

CIES today has 40 partner organisations in Lima and outside the capital city. The diverse nature of the associations is one of CIES' strengths. These partner organisations include:

- Public and private universities
- Private research centres focussing on research as their main activity
- Private centres focussed on development projects as their main activity
- Private consulting firms
- Government agencies such as the National Statistics Institute (INEI)

From its beginnings CIES has invested more than 1.5 million dollars in more than 389 studies<sup>16</sup>. Its mission to "contribute to the development of Peru by raising the level of national debate on the major economic and social policy options" continues to be in line with that of the original CIE, but it is oriented now to a large degree towards dissemination and political impact. To reach this goal, CIES engages in different types of activities to develop the capacities of its researchers, partner organisations and networks; publish the results of its studies; promote applied research and its effect on public policy; and develop CIES institutionally.

## **5. Capacity Development Goals**

The terms of reference challenged us to describe the goals or motivations of the different parties involved in the process of capacity development, as well as to identify to what extent these were explicit and consistent given the context. Presented here is what we could gather concerning the motivations of IDRC and later we will reflect on those of the Peruvian research centres.

### **5.1 From IDRC's Viewpoint**

#### **Having an Effect on the System of Research in Peru**

For IDRC, capacity strengthening is part of the analysis of a problem in need of examination. The following quote defines the focus and strategy:

"Capacity development is building a research field and creating a critical mass of local capacity that can conduct

---

<sup>16</sup> CIES (2005). *Institutional History 1999-2004*. Lima, CIES, p.12.

studies in a defined area (e.g. eco-health, urban agricultural research) or use a particular focus to do research (e.g. multidisciplinary research, participatory research) " (Lusthaus and Nielsen, 2005: 23. Paraphrasing)

Therefore, in the current case study one would have to ask: What were the problems that were the target of IDRC's collaboration process?

At the initial stage, at the end of the 1980s, the problems or challenges for development could be understood as the potential deterioration of economic research capacity in Peru, against a backdrop of the economic and political crisis, which had reduced the viability of research in universities and non-governmental organisations, and many qualified researchers were thinking of leaving the country.

As time passed and the context changed, the set of problems shifted to the contribution of research to the formulation and evaluation of public policies. Another aspect that gained great importance was that of basing research on concrete evidence and on a wider and public discussion of the findings.

The increasing preoccupation with policy formulation based on evidence can be observed in the preparation of the general goals for the cooperation projects

*For us (IDRC) the problem is the formulation of better public policies; better in the sense of being based on empirical evidence and which analyse and reflect a wider societal debate. It has not been an attempt to identify specific policy topics, which are locally defined.*  
(Paraphrasing)

IDRC staff

with CIE and CIES (Table 5.2), according to project approval documents and other IDRC papers. One can say that from its inception, IDRC intended to have an influence more at the level of the research system in Peru (the individuals, organisations and institutions conducting and using research) rather than in only one sector.

**Table 5.1 Evolution of general goals in IDRC aid projects to the Consortium**

GENERAL GOAL	SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC GOALS OR SUGGESTED OUTCOMES:
PERC - Phase I (1989)	
To support a four-year research, publication and dissemination project on economic policy issues vital to Peru.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To support a series of individual economic policy studies in each of the participating institutions.</li> <li>• To allow effective dissemination of the findings of this research to the general public and to policymakers in the public sector.</li> <li>• To provide a forum for economic research capacity development in Peru.</li> </ul>
PERC - Phase II (1993)	
To strengthen Peru's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To maintain a pool of local human resources to respond to</li> </ul>

GENERAL GOAL	SUMMARY OF SPECIFIC GOALS OR SUGGESTED OUTCOMES:
ability to devise effective economic and social policy during its transition from stabilisation to adjustment and to long-term sustainable economic growth.	<p>public sector needs on economic and social policy themes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To strengthen institutional and research capacity in five main research centres in Peru.</li> <li>• To improve links and coordinate research agendas among the main investigators and study centres.</li> <li>• To increase knowledge of macroeconomic and social issues among researchers, policymakers, opinion leaders and the general public.</li> <li>• To improve the quality of economic research.</li> <li>• To expand informal ties between Peruvian and Canadian economists.</li> </ul>
CIES - Phase I (1998)	
The Consortium will seek better ways of organising and mobilising the community of research centres in Peru to contribute more effectively and sustainably to public debate on policy issues of economic and social importance to the country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To contribute more effectively and sustainably to public debate on economic and social issues.</li> <li>• To strengthen and expand policy design and analysis capacities.</li> <li>• To promote applied research on major economic and social topics.</li> <li>• To improve the quality and relevance of research for policy design and evaluation.</li> <li>• To publish study findings to encourage active public discussion.</li> <li>• To mobilise the research community by promoting greater recognition and support for social and economic research in Peru.</li> </ul>
CIES - Phase II (2004)	
To strengthen the academic community's production and spreading of useful knowledge among analysts, decision-makers, civil society, academia and international cooperation agencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To strengthen and consolidate CIES' institutional capacity.</li> <li>• To improve the research and dissemination capacities of CIES partners.</li> <li>• To improve the stock of useful knowledge for public policy design and implementation.</li> <li>• To publish useful knowledge and encourage active debate on public policies and programmes.</li> </ul>

Source: IDRC PAD, Paraphrasing.

### Capacity Development Using the Consortium Mechanism

IDRC's recent experience with the AERC and other African initiatives fed the design process for its contributions to CIES. The final evaluation of CIE, carried out by Hertza and Hunt (2000), also offers some perspectives on the conception of support projects to CIE. It

describes the flight of qualified researchers back then (at the end of the 1980s) and noted that:

*Against this backdrop it was hoped that support to a select group of organisations allowing them to offer researchers a relatively stable, long-term income would encourage holding on to a group of economic investigators. This would also bolster the organisations' capacity to conduct useful studies while fostering public policy discussion in the country. (Hertzka and Hunt, 2000: 3. Paraphrasing)*

Additionally, from IDRC's perspective, research capacity at the time was distributed among several centres; it was not just one centre that should receive aid. CIE was conceived, then, as a mechanism to boost the work of a group of research centres and also encourage a certain level of cooperation among them.

Some IDRC officers also believed that one of the institution's aims in financing a consortium had to do with the creation of a centralised mechanism to channel the distribution of funds in Peru.<sup>17</sup> From the point of view of programme officers involved at the start, there had been many requests from research centres in Peru during the 1980s and a part of the reason behind the Consortium was to centralise that demand as well as IDRC financing, and to develop a critical mass of researchers. However, IDRC's programme structure (by topic and not by country) did not facilitate this type of strategy, so in practice, IDRC cooperation was channelled through the Consortium and by means of projects with individual Consortium members.

---

<sup>17</sup> We did not find a reference to this reason in the documentation available.

**Expressing the *Explicit* Aim to Develop Capacities**

From the beginning, and in each one of the aid phases, strengthening capacities is evident as a specific objective or expected outcome of the Consortium (see Table 5.2 with goal summary). This is similar to what was found by a specific study on IDRC contributions to network capacity strengthening, which emphasises that the majority of the networks supported by the Centre have the explicit - to a greater or lesser degree - purpose of fortifying capacities. (Pyburn and Guijt, 2006)

*There has always been two levels at which the project has been interested in strengthening organisational capacities. On one level is the strengthening of members and research organisations. It is only in the last two phases that the objective of fortifying the Consortium itself, as an independent body, has come to the fore as a goal, and it is based on the idea that there are some actions valuable to the members that cannot be carried out by any of the individual members. (Paraphrasing)*

IDRC Staff Member

With CIE, the goal had been to strengthen capacities at the researcher level in research centres, but also, in some fashion, at the level of the Consortium by means of exchange among members. The proposal to change the organisational model to that of CIES arose out of the concerns of IDRC and CIDA about the sustainability of the existing mechanism, involving only five centres and dependent on CIDA and IDRC financing. At that time it was not necessarily the explicit aim to establish the Consortium as an institution in the Peruvian context.

**Giving Greater Emphasis to Institutional Strengthening and Sustainability**

In the change to CIES, what stands out in the project documents and what the players involved in the design described, is the goal of greater institutional strengthening of the Consortium. In the Project Appraisal Documents (PAD), for example, there are general goals such as those in the first phase of CIES (see Table 5.2) and in the second phase, a specific aim of strengthening and consolidating CIES' institutional capacity.

Sustainability has been an important IDRC goal in the second phase of CIES, which is confirmed by other capacity development efforts involving networks:

*Sustainability is a critical concern of capacity development efforts in network form. This translates into the development of a lasting capacity to do research and to inspire the partners of the initiatives to use the results or findings of the research (...). (Pyburn and Guijt, 2006:8. Paraphrasing)*

The assumption that networks facilitate this long-term perspective includes the expectation that they will have a greater potential for sustainability than other development research support mechanisms.

## 5.2 Through the Eyes of Peruvian Research Centres

It is very probable that we have not done justice to or we could not capture precisely the aims of the organisations associated with the Consortium because of the passage of time, changes in viewpoints, and the lack of documentation on the partners' perspectives. The evolution of the nature of CIES, and the even greater diversity of its membership, complicate the analysis.

The aims and hopes for capacity development of the members have diversified as the Consortium, its membership and the context have evolved. The final project reports (1999) point to some of the expectations of the first five organisations on joining the Consortium. Among the issues highlighted were: (i) a desire to improve the level of economic debate; (ii) to produce meticulous research; (iii) to construct an academic community; (iv) to create studies relevant to policy formulation; and (v) to strengthen research capacities at their own centres. This also indicated the importance and need to have supplementary and long-term economic resources to support the group of researchers in their institutions.

The transition to CIES propelled by IDRC and CIDA, forced a change in expectations that was not easy to assimilate at first and required long discussions among the parties. Today, in CIES, expectations regarding capacity development are diverse.

### **"Complete capacity" and CIES**

Through the (CSPF) 2005-2010 strategic plan, the concept of "complete capacity", referring to a more integrated project focus that includes support for complementary research activities such as communication and diffusion, or resource mobilisation, was introduced. In cooperation with the Consortium, IDRC has had the intention of bolstering capacities that go beyond that of conducting research. This is highlighted in the fact that resources and other support from IDRC have been aimed at tasks complementary to applied research such as dissemination (from the beginning) and later, a broad communications section, support for impact on public policy processes and resource management. In addition, the administration and financial management of CIES has been supported in different ways.

For some organizations, the fundamental contributions of CIES to capacity development are the resources that offer, through

competitions, the realisation of research. For others, the most significant aspect is access to training, information and opportunities for exchange with other study centres. The consultations done indicate that expectations in relation to CIES and its role in capacity development for applied research in Peru are summed up in the need for the Consortium:

- To successfully manage a permanent fund for annual research competitions, which constitutes a key element in the financial sustainability of the organisation;
- To strongly support the building of capacities at public universities;
- To strongly support the bolstering of capacity at research centres in the provinces;
- To better fulfil its role as an umbrella organisation that brings together different institutions and outlooks; and
- To play a greater role in creating a platform or academic community where there is exchange on research issues from different disciplines and points of view.

## 6. Capacity Development Strategies

As pointed out in Section 1, the previous phases of IDRC's study on capacity development supplied an operational definition of the term "capacities":

*Capacity is the ability of an individual, group, network, organisation or society to identify and analyse situations and be able to perform critical tasks that allows them to solve development challenges over time and in a sustainable manner. (Lusthaus and Nielson, 2008:3. Paraphrasing)*

It is this definition that is used in this case study. In the previous chapter some reasons behind IDRC's and CIES' capacity development were explored. This chapter analyses what has concretely been done to fortify CIES' capacities, those of their partner organisations and individual Peruvian researchers. For this purpose, actions undertaken by CIES have been distinguished from those of IDRC and a section has been included on the links between Peruvian and Canadian researchers, which both parties identified as a strategy.

### 6.1 CIES

CIES has developed a series of activities aimed at building the capacity of individual researchers and partner organisations.

### 6.1.1 Strengthening Capacities of Researchers and Partner Organisations

The task of CIES is centred on capacity strengthening of individual researchers and of partner organisations through:

- Providing financing for research through competitions;
- Mentoring researchers before and during the research process;
- Educating investigators through training and internships;
- Promoting cooperation among partner organisations;
- Implementation of projects by partner organisations; and
- Other types of services to the partner organisations.

In this section these strategies, their importance to capacity building and the strengths or weaknesses perceived by interviewers, are described.

#### Competition-awarded Financing for Research

The main pillar of CIES activities is an annual competition used to award funding to individual investigators from partner organizations for research projects. This competition has several kinds of projects. Winners are selected by a jury of their peers, which evaluates the technical quality and significance of the proposals for public policy formulation. The following table describes the types of projects, their potential beneficiaries and some of their characteristics.

**Table 6.1 CIES Competition: Project Type and Features**

TYPE OF PROJECT	AIMED AT	CHARACTERISTICS
Medium-sized projects	Experienced researchers	Generally lasts for 9 to 12 months and carries a budget of \$20,000.
Short-term open projects	Young investigators (younger than 35 years old)	Short-term project, between 6 and 9 months with a \$5,000 budget.
Short-term limited projects	Researchers from public universities or centres in the provinces	Lasting between 6 and 9 months and carrying a budget of \$5,000.
Research networks	A network of two or more partner centres	Lasting 12 to 18 months and carrying a \$100,000 budget.

Source: Institutional History, CIES (2005), p.22.

The importance of this activity for capacity development is considerable since it offers a form of “learning by doing”. This has been confirmed by several investigators interviewed who consider this activity fundamental to the process of capacity development. Financing that is not tied to specific themes allow researchers to propose projects based on their own plans and ideas. An assumption behind the



competitions is that over time these will contribute to improving research quality.

From the start of the competitions, policies were introduced that aimed to expand access to the contests for less developed research centres, so as to contribute more to their capacity development.

Some of these policies are:

- **Establishing institutional quotas:** Each centre has an institutional allocation. This means that although a centre might have a good proposal, there will be no financing for it, if the yearly project quota has been reached. This allocation is different in each partner organisation and is an effort to prevent the more developed centres with more research experience from hogging the funds.
- **Establishing Short-term Limited Projects:** This category was introduced in 2003 and seeks to create opportunities for less experienced researchers from partner organizations and for those who find it difficult to compete with more experienced investigators.
- **Advising on the Development of Short-term Projects:** With the goal of improving the quality of proposals, the Executive Office offers advice via electronic mail and face-to-face workshops organised by the associated researchers. This mentoring is offered both to young researchers from public universities in Lima and to research centres in the interior of the country.
- **Integrating Networks:** An effort has been made to incorporate less developed centres into leading edge ones in research networks with the goal of developing research of regional interest in the country.

*"The only case here, or practically the only case in Peru that allows you to do what you believe you should do, and in the area where you believe you can make a contribution. You decide the topic, you decide the focus based on what you have done, your experience, and your next project is being built on the basis of all the previous ones. This freedom allows you to specialise, and it increases your capacity to amass information. In this way, you begin to create specialists instead of generalists."*

Researcher, Partner Organisation in Lima

### Limited competitions as a strategy for capacity strengthening in the interior of the country

Although there are examples of CIES contributions to centres in Lima and in the provinces, several of those interviewed (associated researchers) said that the competition mechanism had undoubtedly strengthened the centres in Lima, while allowing only a small advance in levelling the playing field for centres in the rest of the country. Beginning in 2003, the Short-term Projects were divided into two blocks: (a) short-term open projects geared to young researchers and (b) short-term limited projects for researchers from public universities in Lima and the centres in the provinces.

The figures indicate that with the short-term limited projects the opportunities for the universities in the interior have expanded. In table 6.2, one can see the increase in projects earned by centres outside of Lima. In 1999, only two projects, or 7% of the studies financed in that year came from outside the capital city. In 2007, 10 projects presented by centres in the provinces were approved, which represented 33% of all proposals. Over the years, the centres located outside the capital have been winning more short-term open projects and medium projects, competing with all the centres in Lima.

**Table 6.2 Competitions Won by Centres in the Provinces 1999-2007**

YEAR	SP	SOP	SLP	MP	NETWORK	TOTAL
1999	1	-	-	0	1	2
2000	2	-	-	1	0	3
2001	3	-	-	0	0	3
2002	0	-	-	2	0	2
2003	-	0	4	0	0	4
2004	-	0	6	0	2	8
2005	-	0	8	0	2	10
2006	-	3	7	0	1	11
2007	-	2	6	2	0	10
Total	6	5	31	5	6	53

SP: Short-term Project; SOP: Short-term Open Project; SLP: Short-term Limited Project;  
MP: Medium-sized Project  
Source: CIES data

## Mentoring of individual investigators before and during the research

Throughout the research conducted by each researcher, CIES supports capacity development and at the same time it exerts quality control by means of the following mechanisms:

- Opening workshop in which the methodology, goals and expected impact on public policy are reviewed;
- Independent readers who review the document twice during investigation: once, halfway through and again at the end of the research; and
- Monitoring of the networks through follow-up workshops with the goal of evaluating progress and courses of action.

*"CIES has allowed us to take advantage of the opportunities to participate. The two studies that were conducted helped us to achieve more quality. In addition to the financial support, CIES has cooperated in technical matters with advisors who helped us to do a better quality job and also to have more clarity as to future directions for the research."*

Partner Organisation in the provinces

According to the researchers interviewed, the important aspect for capacity development is the existence of feedback processes. The comments and suggestions are useful to improve the final product and give greater clarity to the report destined for a broad audience. The chance to discuss the work and its progress is perceived as very positive for the researchers.

## Training of Researchers

Since 2002, CIES has developed educational activities including training and internship. Training is given in the different areas described in Table 6.3.

**Table 6.3 Training offered by CIES: Type and Characteristics**

THEMES	TARGET GROUP	EXAMPLES
Research techniques and methods	Researchers	Annual updating course in economics for national university professors. Collaboration with the Central Reserve Bank.  Course on how to use the National Household Survey (ENAH0, by its Spanish acronym) to conduct public policy research using the statistical package STATA.
Development of research proposals	Researchers	Workshop to guide less experienced researchers in the preparation of proposals for the research competition (nine workshops in 2006)

THEMES	TARGET GROUP	EXAMPLES
Public investment projects	Researchers	Three workshops on the national public investment system in 2006 (the first on road infrastructure and the other two on the formulation of health and research projects).

In 2006, five courses with 74 participants were organised. The participants have given the courses an average grade of 16.23 on a scale of 20. (CIES, 2006: 20)

In addition to training as such, CIES has organised seminars and exhibitions on the topics researchers considered important. For example, in 2006, a Seminar on the Challenges of Fiscal Policy and an

*"I took part in a network project and it was a bit difficult because it meant working with professors with a different ideology to mine and very rapidly we were going to be in a situation of confrontation because presidential elections were coming up and we were going to be on opposite sides of the coin. But it was a very nice experience; I have always wanted to use this example because it broke the ideological issue a little."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

informational workshop on the multi-annual macroeconomic framework were conducted. These timely seminars reinforced the ties between CIES and its partner organisations and offered the opportunity to important invitees to talk about the progress made in and/or the results of their research.

According to the contributions of the researchers and the Executive Office, the importance of these training activities for capacity development is, among others, to foster the research process and also to suggest new topics for investigation. In addition, it favours contacts between investigators from more developed centres with those from less developed ones. For example, in the case of the training to prepare proposals, in three of nine cases, the workshops were given by three more experienced researchers, which allowed younger researchers to learn from their more experienced peers and create ties. In many interviews with researchers and representatives of the partner organisations, the workshop on the INEI database was identified as important because it offered access to firsthand information to develop research.

CIES has supported national researchers with internships that offer them a chance to acquire research experience. These internships are in the amount of US\$1,500 for those conducted outside the intern's community and US\$1,000 for

*"CIES has suggested the use of homogeneous methodologies so that economics departments do not disperse along different paths and we can all speak the same language."*

Professor (CIES, 2005:58)

those within the intern's home base. These internships are normally for a short period of around 45 days.

The internships contribute fundamentally to the training of individual researchers and to creating connections between investigators. However, the self-evaluation shared by the members of IDRC and the Executive Office suggests that these links are not always durable. Although there are some cases of internships that led to long-term mentoring for a young researcher from the province by an experienced investigator in Lima, it seems that these are the exceptions.<sup>18</sup>

### **Encouraging Cooperation Among Centres**

Collaboration among researchers from centres with relatively greater development and investigators from relatively less developed centres has been promoted mainly through networking.

Since 1999, CIES has supported the development of projects in networks as a way of

strengthening

collaboration and

joint work

capacities. Since

2002, this method

has been used to

strengthen the

capacities of the

relatively lesser-

developed centres

with a network

policy that includes

centres of greater

and lesser

experience. There

have been some

successful experiences, among them those by CIPCA - Piura, GRADE and

the IEP, in relation to the "Rural Development: Alternatives for

Commercial Small Farming" Network. The most distinctive aspect of

this network is that it provided the opportunity to do work based on

pre-existing relationships of trust among researchers. In other cases,

these relationships did not exist previously and as some indicate, the

intention was to "force" cooperation among heterogeneous

organisations. However, the resources for these projects were

insufficient to cover the transaction costs, which were very high and

resulted in the network member centres splitting up the amount and

each one doing its part. For one of the interviewees, the experience

The macroeconomic network comprising the PUCP and the CIUP (1999) culminated in the adaptation, to the Peruvian situation, of the Central Bank of Canada's long- and short-term simulation models. CIES signed an agreement with the Central Reserve Bank to grant the use of the model to the Economic Ministry and the Bank and Securities Regulator. "The advantages of the new model are not only its greater sophistication but also its capacity to predict the effect of external shocks in the main internal macroeconomic variables." (Annual Report 2002-2003, p. 12). The results of this network are considered one of the most important concrete contributions of CIES to economic policy management in Peru. (CIES, 2003: 26)

---

<sup>18</sup> CIES has also granted internships to Canadian researchers. This strategy is mentioned in section 6.3 on links between Peruvian and Canadian public policy researchers.

with networks is yet another challenge that CIES faces in hopes of encouraging horizontal academic relationships among unequal organisations.

### **Implementation of Projects by the Partner Organisations**

CIES has also implemented projects with specific financing. Among the most visible is the presidential and regional elections project of 2006.

Thanks to financing from several sources<sup>19</sup> CIES was able to carry out initiatives to seek research influence in the design of public policies in the "Peruvian Elections 2006" and "Peruvian Regional Elections 2006" projects. This undertaking allowed CIES, through the Executive Office and the partner organisations, to play an important role as part of civil society in relation to the electoral process. In both projects debates between the candidates and a series of meetings and seminars with all political parties were organised.

Outside the capital, the elections initiative served to demonstrate the use of the project model to strengthen capacities. The project focussed on three regions of the country and was carried out by one of the partners in each region: In Arequipa (the Catholic University of Santa María), in Piura (CIPCA) and in Cuzco (the Bartholomew de las Casas Centre). As mentioned previously, the process of decentralisation of the country has improved regional government earnings as well as created a need to improve the efficiency of public spending. Additionally, the process of decentralisation has meant greater opportunities and needs for regional governments. It is for this reason that regional affiliates contributed three priority documents for regional development. Information was produced for journalists, officials, and political parties and for civil society in general.

According to those interviewed in the provinces who participated as well as those in the Executive Office, this capacity strengthening project has been important because it has offered opportunities to the regional partners to influence public policies and agendas in the context of regional governments that are still in the process of maturing (since they have only existed since 2002). Although there was a centre in charge of project management, efforts were made to create a support pattern involving the other partners in the same region, although we have not been able to establish to what extent this cooperation succeeded in all the three regions. It is worth mentioning that within the partner organizations, there are at least two from the regional projects that have continued through the project "Following Regional Governments".

---

<sup>19</sup> The "2006 Elections" project had support from the InterAmerican Development Bank (IDB), NED, CIDA-IDRC, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNFPA and MESAGEN.

### 6.1.2 Other Services Offered to Partner Organisations

The annual CIES general meeting that takes place in Peru allows for the distribution of research from the associated researchers and gathers together a wider public. Moreover, CIES, through the Executive Office, has developed other support services to partner organisations such as bibliographic searches, the dissemination of partner centre publications, and consulting on specific needs of the centres.

The Consortium establishes agreements that then allow it to offer new services to partners such as for example, access to the INEI database. Recently too, it has begun to offer information on research opportunities to the partners.

In 2006, partners with less experience received bibliographic aid of US\$558. (CIES, 2006: 21). Among the books delivered as part of the bibliographic support, are found publications from the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) as well as texts and publications from important research centres associated with the Consortium such as IEP and CIUP.

There was nothing like a grand strategy in which we had established beforehand the things that IDRC would do to strengthen the Consortium as an organisation. It [the focus] was more that when stumbled over a limitation we found a way to mobilise resources within and without IDRC to respond to it. (Paraphrasing)

IDRC Staff Member

## 6.2 IDRC

Although the aim of capacity strengthening was clear from the start of the relationship with the Consortium, a defined strategy on the part of IDRC could not be discerned, above all, at the stage in which the goal of strengthening CIES institutionally was declared. The course of the relationship between CIES and IDRC shows that the latter normally responded to the needs and requests of the Consortium as they arose, with the exception of a much more decisive and active role regarding certain turning points in the development of the Consortium (such as, for example, in the discussions of 1998-1999 relating to the new organisational model of CIES). From the point of view of the CIES actors (Executive Office and members of the Board of

I believe that there was a broad strategy, barely defined, and that it was to improve performance, the level of discipline and to expand projects to ensure that those supported got better and better. That was the objective. The basic position of IDRC was to listen to the Peruvians and to follow closely how things were going so that they could judge at what time to move on to a different way of operating. (Paraphrasing)

International advisor to CIES

Directors) this has been one of the positive features of IDRC support, because of the level of autonomy that it has allowed the Consortium. As is discussed again in Section 8, the strategy that in general seems to have worked for CIES, is more of "learning by doing" within a relationship of trust rather than of diagnosis and planning within a framework of results of capacity strengthening. This point is taken up further in the final chapter of this report.

IDRC has developed different types of activities during its support for CIES. The information in Table 6.4 has been compiled from interviews with CIES and with IDRC staff and shows the diversity of actions that have been implemented. The table explains the type of activity and its importance for capacity strengthening. These activities have been carried out with greater or lesser emphasis depending on the stage of the evolution of CIES and its relationship with IDRC.

**Table 6.3 Types of IDRC Activities in Support of Capacity Development in CIES**

SUPPORT ACTIVITY	IMPORTANCE FOR CAPACITY STRENGTHENING IN CIES
<b>Financing</b>	
To provide long-term institutional support, especially granting unrestricted funding for the research competition.	Because the funds were not tied to a particular topic, the partner (CIES) defined the research agenda, which eased local adaptation. This gave autonomy and flexibility in the use of resources.
To provide "catalytic" funds to drive certain processes of strengthening or strategic thinking (e.g. the "challenge" funds of the PBDD)	PBDD funds help to explore or experiment with different kinds of relationships, for example with new donors (IDB) or with new kinds of activities with regional players (CAN). The idea is to contribute to an additional project (in addition to the IDRC budget) and to help to manage funds from other donors.
<b>Interaction with CIES</b>	
To offer feedback on proposals and to facilitate discussion with multiple players.	Introduces a new organisational model of CIES: competition for access to funds and the expansion of the scope to other research centres.
To be in contact during institutional change through visits, calls and correspondence.	Support in difficult transitions such as the shift from CIE to CIES.
To offer support by organising tours to Ottawa to introduce CIES to donors and to the Canadian academic community.	Allows the reinforcement of relationships with IDRC and CIDA, their principal donors. <b>Also to open up opportunities build relationships with other players in the Canadian environment.</b>



SUPPORT ACTIVITY	IMPORTANCE FOR CAPACITY STRENGTHENING IN CIES
To introduce and support with the establishment of the International Advisory Committee.	Expands the network of contacts for exchange during the era of CIE, introduces new perspectives in the revision of proposals for research.
To support training for members of the Executive Office staff in general management (training on monitoring and evaluation, for example)	<b>Contributes to</b> the proper functioning of the Executive Office with the capacity to manage resources and account for those funds.
To address the administrative/financial situation by means of exercises such as Institutional Risk Assessment or audits.	Gives emphasis to the organisational aspect and unites administrative/financial staff and those of the programmes ( <b>both of CIES and IDRC</b> ) in this discussion.
To support by means of internships (i.e. spending some weeks in the IDRC head office in Ottawa), telephone calls or correspondence in the procedures of administration of donations and preparation of financial reports.	Provides mentoring to the Executive Office during processes geared at sharpening internal procedures, accounting systems and report-writing capacities.
To advise on new funding sources or resource management strategy.	Expands the opportunities for CIES with regard to its financial sustainability.
To participate in the Board of Directors of CIE (1998 -2004).	Contributes to institutional development during the period of transition to being an independent body.
To accompany on visits to/introduce other likely financing sources.	Stresses institutional aspects primarily financial sustainability; expands the range of possible contacts for the partner organisation.

It is possible to identify some key roles that IDRC has played in the evolution of CIES. They are:

- **Peer:** For years there have been individuals in IDRC who have had close personal ties to people in CIES, which has facilitated the development of a relationship among individuals that is personal, constructive, and recognises the value of each person. This is the interpretation of friendship used by Girgis (2007) in his article on the Capacity Development Paradox. This role that IDRC plays fosters the building of relationships between persons.
- **Advisor:** Because it has a relationship of friendship and trust with CIES, IDRC is the first choice when seeking to share and receive feedback on new ideas or strategies of institutional strengthening.
- **Donor:** IDRC has contributed directly to financing CIES and has acted as a channel for the substantial funds from CIDA. This arrangement has facilitated CIDA's long-term support of CIES.
- **Change agent:** This role required an important time investment on the part of programme officials to facilitate the planning of changes to the institutional design (expanding membership, etc.) that were introduced between 1998 and 2000 when CIES was created.<sup>20</sup>

**Did IDRC's Exit From the Board of Directors Have Any Effect?**

Some of those interviewed said that this reduced IDRC's potentialities, as well as those of whatever of the other players or potential users of CIES' work, to have a more direct channel to question or advise on the organisation's strategy. The majority of the members of the Executive Office and of the Board of Directors did not feel that IDRC's withdrawal from the Board affected the relationship in any way. Only one of the main players said that the relationship had much more force, was much closer when IDRC was part of the Board. There are still some within IDRC who question whether having a seat on the Board would give them greater knowledge on the internal operations of the organisation in which they are interested in trying to build organisational capacity.

*The CIE project planted the seed of a new way of organising research in Peru but also planted the seed of resistance. It required **external leadership** to propel the institution forward. [Emphasis added]*  
(Hertza and Hunt, 2000: 48. (Paraphrasing))

IDRC continued to offer support during the process of transition for some years after 2000.

---

<sup>20</sup> CIDA also played a role in this process; however, the emphasis here is on IDRC. In any case, those interviewed indicated that IDRC provided more input in CIES' institutional design.

- **Participant at decision-making level:** As one of the Consortium's members (representing the donors), IDRC participated in the Board of Directors until 2004 which allowed both a closer relationship with the partner organisation and the opportunity of contributing more in institutional terms. IDRC eventually withdrew for various reasons including the maturity of CIES and an internal agency discussion on a possible conflict of interests given its role as donor and at the same time Board of Director member with responsibilities for supervising and approving the actions of CIES. This also was a dilemma for CIDA and caused it to withdraw as a donor representative on the Board of CIES in 2001.

### 6.3 Links Between Public Policy Researchers in Peru and Canada

CIES, IDRC and CIDA have encouraged different ways of establishing links between Peruvian researchers and those from other countries and regions, particularly Canada. This section tries to identify the elements of that strategy.

During the first phase of CIE, the overseas relationships and those with Canadian researchers were informal. At that time, development of those ties was not a priority for the Consortium. The focus on the creation of links with Canadian researchers appeared for the first time as a recommendation in the evaluation report (Mid-Term Assessment of Phase II of CIE) by Young (1997).<sup>21</sup>

In the two phases of CIE (1989-1998), several mechanisms were used to develop these links:

- The participation of international experts in conferences and seminars;
- The interaction of researchers with members of the Advisory Committee - introduced in the second phase of PERC (1993-1999). The Advisory Committee included researchers from Argentina, Chile, Canada and two from the United States. The Advisory Committee has, as its mandate, to provide advice on themes such as research design, methodology or literature;
- The recruitment of Latin American and Canadian specialists involved in the Economic Policy Seminar for Latin America, or SPEAL by its Spanish acronym) financed by CIDA and in which PERC participated;
- *Ad hoc* contacts with members of Canada's economic community when they visited Peru or contacts established by the Canadian Embassy;

---

<sup>21</sup> Lavergne (2000), *End of Project Report: Economic Research Consortium, Peru (Phase II)* p.68.

- Cases of Canadian researchers visiting Peru on their own (not necessarily those who came on internships)<sup>22</sup>.

The proposal that the Peruvian centres presented for the formation of CIES explicitly included the development of relationships between academicians in Peru and Canada. One can read in CIES' mission statement that "it will actively promote the formation of thematic networks and the setting in motion of these networks with similar initiatives in research and formulation of public policy spheres as in other countries, especially in Canada."<sup>23</sup> The proposal puts forward a series of ways to encourage these links, including promoting exchanges with Canadian researchers, particularly those involved in networks that connect the public sector with academic institutions.

Internships for Canadian researchers to conduct studies in Peru and develop links with the community of Peruvian investigators are another strategy used for years. Each internship has a budget of approximately \$6,000. Normally, these assignments or scholarships that are granted to Canadian researchers are coordinated by IDRC. However, since 2003/04 CIES has directly managed this programme with support from IDRC for promoting the internships. There have been approximately 3-4 interns per year between 2003 and 2006 (the information was only available for those years).

Representatives of the Executive Office and researchers from CIES have paid annual visits to Ottawa for meetings with IDRC and CIDA and to give presentations of potential interest to the community in general and principally to other investigators or analysts interested in Peru. For two years, the presentations were organised with support of the Canadian Foundation for the Americas, (or FOCAL, by its Spanish acronym).

These strategies have been positive to the extent that they have generated ties between individual researchers, opportunities for some Peruvian researchers to participate in broader thematic networks and long-term relationships with Dr. Shane Hunt and Dr. Albert Barry (Advisory Committee members), and relationships that continue between some of the persons who were on internships and some of the partner centres.<sup>24</sup> However, in general, we did not find relationships with the public policies research networks, for example, with the *Canadian Policy Research Networks* or with universities or specific research centres in Canada.

---

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> CIES, 1998, p.15

<sup>24</sup> Our consultations with the Executive Office, with some of the officers at IDRC and with some of the research centres indicate that the Canadian internships are focussed more on the individual researcher. Although it is difficult to identify the contributions to organisational strengthening of the partner centres of CIES, we can find that in at least one of these cases, the tie between the research centre and a Canadian investigator continues to this day.

Why have there not been more links or more lasting ties? It is not possible to offer definitive responses based on the evidence that we have. On one hand, it appears to be that contact networks do exist, perhaps on a wide enough scale, but between individuals. This network has not been shared or converted into more institutional ties for the Consortium. The same could be true for information on opportunities for collaboration or for participation in thematic networks that arrive at some centres, but are not shared with the rest. On the other hand, one of the interviewees suggested that this could be due to the lack of topics of common interest among researchers of the two countries, with the possible exception of the subject of mining and natural resources.

## 7. Capacity Development Results

In this section, the results of the relationship between IDRC and CIES will be analysed in terms of capacity development.

In the case of CIES, support from IDRC has centred on the Consortium (a network-type organisation) and by this means, it has been possible to extend capacity strengthening on various levels –individual and organisational– as described by Lusthaus and Nielsen (2007). This section recounts the experience gained in these different fields. First, it analyses how the Consortium has been the mechanism that has made it possible –to varying degrees– to develop research capacities in individuals and organisations. Secondly, it examines the Consortium's contributions to the creation of a favourable research environment and explores ways in which the Consortium has strengthened its capacities for influencing public policies. The section ends with the results of organisational capacity development or institutional strengthening of the Consortium itself.

### 7.1 Research Capacity Strengthening

The comments on the capacities strengthened in individuals and organisations are related to individual and organisational abilities to perform all the steps in the investigation, understood as a vast process that goes from identifying the issue to using the results of this research. Clearly, not all individuals or people have gone through the same process.

#### 7.1.1 Individual Capacities

CIES has played a fundamental role in the capacity development of individual researchers, especially junior researchers.

## Lines of Research Work

Almost all the people interviewed stated that the projects financed by CIES have, over time, allowed researchers to study in depth, publish and to develop lines of research work. It is the sequence of projects that has allowed partner researchers to specialise.

*"For the past eleven years, most of my research has been funded by CIES and by IDRC, through CIES. This has been important for a group of people. There are no other sources. It might be different in other areas, but for some reason no one wants to discuss macroeconomics."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

## A Key Alternative for Young Researchers

The distinctive emphasis CIES has placed on supporting young researchers has had very positive repercussions on forming units and developing renowned researchers. In fact, we were told several young researchers have been professionally shaped or have grown with CIES mentoring, going from research project assistants to principal researchers, acquiring experience and credibility along the way. This has given them standing and recognition in their area of expertise.

This is substantiated by the survey that was done within the framework of this case study. In the open-ended question on the three most important factors that have most benefited CIES' capacity development, support for young people appears among the four most frequent responses. (See Table 7.1)

**Table 7.1 Important Factors in CIES' Capacity Development**

IMPORTANT FACTORS IN CIES' CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT
1. Incorporating new members outside of Lima
2. Disseminating research results
3. Strengthening capacities of young researchers
4. Annual research competitions

Source: CIES Partner Survey

Note: These are the first four responses in order of frequency of mention.

## Improving Research Skills

Of the training courses offered by CIES, researchers place importance on the course dealing with the use of the databases of the National Households Survey of the National Statistics Institute (INEI), which is a recent innovation. This course is in addition to the methodology workshops and sessions organised to support the preparation of proposals for CIES research grant competitions and training on project formulation.

Partner organisations have taken advantage of these opportunities by incorporating them into their own research capacity development and training young researchers.

### One Researcher's Story

She entered the research centre as a research assistant on a project funded by the Consortium under the IDRC framework. This project motivated her to get a postgraduate degree abroad. Upon her return to Peru, she has won several CIES-funded projects. She is now well recognised in her field of research and is a policy consultant. Her development as a researcher would not have been possible without CIES support, since it would have been more difficult and costlier.

Researcher from Lima, CIES Partner Organisation

*"The opportunity of discussing work and its progress with other colleagues was very constructive. The comments and suggestions from people reading the report that helped improve the end product and make it clearer for a wider public, were also important."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation (CIES, 2005:2)

## 7.1.2 Partner Organisation Capacities

CIES has influenced capacity strengthening in CIES' partner organisations.

Among the achievements during the first two phases of the Consortium (CIE), institutional strengthening at a time when research funds were being cut back is mentioned as having been very important. Offering a longer time frame compared to that of other projects made it possible to plan fields of work and recruit young professionals who were returning to the country after their graduate studies abroad. (CIES, 1998:5)

In this phase, between 1993 and 1998, organisations on average had between \$CAD 55,198 and \$CAD 146,289 (Herzka and Hunt, 2000: 2) to support their research efforts. This

*"I think CIES has been a pioneer in investment projects and development training when here (in the provinces) there were no government initiatives. I think the place given to training has been very good."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

undoubtedly represented an important part of their institutional budget. Nowadays, CIES funds are no longer that significant for those same members. In some cases, this has been viewed as positive since it means that organisations have diversified their funding sources, as stated by some of the people interviewed.

The following examples help illustrate the myriad of benefits CIES organisations have mentioned:

### **Access to Other Resources**

Winning CIES research grant competitions gives an organisation credibility, which in turn allows it to have access to other sources of funding to carry out research work (including consulting). There are also instances in which CIES funds have been used as complementary donations to obtain more funds from another donor.

*"Capacity strengthening has not been restricted to the individual or the university professor level. It has also taken place at an institutional level. Thanks to the research projects carried out at network levels with prestigious research centres in the country, the School of Economics has gained prestige and has consolidated its institutional image. This also involves institutional and individual benefits as professors get called in for consulting and to occupy high positions in central, regional or local government or in the private sector."*

Partner Institution in the Provinces

### **Established and Sustained Research Teams**

Organisations have been able to create and/or sustain research programmes because of CIES projects/competitions. This is highlighted in the case of NGO research centres. At one of these centres, having access to CIES funds, no matter how small the amount in terms of the organisation's general budget, makes it possible to have a full-time researcher there (in this case, it is an NGO that is not devoted to research 100%). Training sessions also provide

#### **The Story of a Private Local University**

When the university was founded, it did not have a clear idea of research support; the topic of research had not even been considered before. Forming part of CIES allowed them to show other professors that it was possible to do research linked to development, to decision-making, and that there were funds, guidance services and a network to learn and do research at the same time. Forming part of CIES put the topic of research high on the University agenda. CIES was the most important step the university has taken in terms of research.

With CIES, research groups established at the university have been able to compete for short- and medium-term projects. Before that, there were no research groups. They have won projects for three consecutive years and other professors have begun to show interest in it. Thanks to CIES, there are now 7-8 core research groups for economic policy issues, three of which are strong enough to contend [in the competitions].



opportunities to instruct researchers. As one organisation describes it, it allows the team to gain "knowledge of managing databases and information, and have a better understanding of the information generated at the level of government."

### **In-Depth Study along their Own Lines of Research**

Thematic flexibility is one feature of CIES that has allowed Partner Institutions to develop their own lines of research and not have to do "what a client asks for." Furthermore, especially in organisations dedicated to research, the competitions and this thematic freedom have resulted in internal processes being established to respond annually to the contests.

*"The research unit here at [...] exists because of CIES. In the 90s, the number of research related activities in the organisation decreased significantly and then we had to examine agency opinions, begin to publish articles of interest to academia and go back to the research circuit. This would not have been possible without collaboration like that of CIES, which is competitive. They gave us that chance."*

Partner Organisation in Lima

### **Developing Competitive Internal Mechanisms**

Although the context may be unusual, a public university, with recommendations from the Executive Office, has been able to transform the way it distributes available research funds (that before were added to each professor's salary) into an internal competition, following the guidelines established in CIES' own contests.

The responses to the survey given to CIES partners also show how different capacity strengthening strategies contributed to the group of partners. In Table 7.2, the various contributions to public and private universities, as well as to other members, can be observed. There is an average of four responses each, which can be interpreted favourably.

**Table 7.2 The Contribution of the Following Aspects to Strengthening the Group of Partners**

Questions	Public Universities	Private Universities	Other Members	Lima	The Provinces	Interviewees	Number of Abstentions/ No opinion
2.3.1. Incorporation of new Consortium members	4.25	4.00	4.44	4.38	4.11	4.27	3
2.3.2. Incorporation of affiliated institutions outside of Lima	4.33	4.40	4.67	4.36	4.67	4.48	2

2.3.3 Research Network Work	3.63	4.20	4.00	3.86	4.00	3.91	3
2.3.4 Cooperation among affiliated institutions	3.44	4.00	3.67	3.36	4.11	3.65	2
2.3.5 Training CIES affiliated institutions	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.88	4.44	4.08	0
2.3.6 The annual research competition	4.30	4.40	4.40	4.19	4.67	4.36	0
2.3.7 Research internships	4.00	4.20	4.00	3.91	4.25	4.05	6
2.3.8 Strengthening the capacities of young researchers	4.50	4.20	4.56	4.29	4.75	4.45	3
2.3.9 Disseminating research results	4.50	4.60	4.20	4.31	4.56	4.40	0
2.3.10 Participation of Affiliated Institutions in the Consortium's activities	3.78	4.00	3.88	3.57	4.38	3.86	3
2.3.11. Participation of national and partner universities from the provinces in the short closed competitions	4.33	4.40	4.57	4.15	4.88	4.43	4
2.3.12 Consulting services for researchers at national universities and partners from the provinces	3.88	4.20	4.00	3.69	4.50	4.00	4
2.3.13 Participation of young people in research projects	4.41	4.00	4.38	4.09	4.38	4.21	6
2.3.14	4.25	4.20	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.13	2

Executive Office support							
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: The numbers represent the average of responses obtained: 5 stands for very favourable; 4, favourable; 3, none; 2, unfavourable and 1, very unfavourable. The "no opinion" category was not given any points. The average was calculated based on the number of responses.

### 7.1.3 Contributing to a Favourable Environment

In the research process, certain results were also found to occur at a level that goes beyond the individual or the organisation, that is, in the research environment or system.

**Stock of Peruvian Knowledge.** One of the results, mentioned by several of the people interviewed, is the increase in the number of publications. For some, it was important first of all to focus on developing studies during CIES' initial phases to have a certain in-depth thematic range in order to have more impact and influence. Now, there are some 300 investigations and more than 200 printed publications.<sup>25</sup>

**Critical Mass of Researchers.** CIES and CIE assessment reports have stressed "having kept a community of high-quality researchers active in Peru, which is a great asset in terms of the country's development (particularly vulnerable to the exodus of its intellectual class)." (Interalia, 2002:2)

**Research Financing.** While its contribution is still limited, it can be pointed out that some public institutions have granted funds for specific research competitions, as in the case of the BCR. However, as stated in Section 4, stable sources of financing from the government for social sciences have yet to materialise. Some people interviewed expressed their optimism regarding a change on the part of the government in the near future. Others were more cautious, saying that if such an investment was made, it will not occur in the next few years.

## 7.2 Impact on Public Policy

The CIES mission speaks of generating "useful information for the Government, International Cooperation and development programmes." This focus and the need to interact with policymakers have been gradually incorporated into the Consortium's duties as of CIES' early phases.

*The Consortium was built to serve first its members and then the academic community. Interaction with non-academic users was not a priority although it has gradually become part of Consortium policy. (Hertzka and Hunt, 2000: 67. Paraphrasing)*

---

<sup>25</sup> CIES webpage <http://cies.org.pe/es/quienessomos>

With CIES, interaction with potential users outside academia and effect on public policy has special significance. While knowledge production was stressed more during CIES' first years, in the last four years a clear strategy aimed at external participants has been implemented.

Based on their experience, partner organisations assessed the way in which CIES has been able to strengthen capacities in terms of impact on public policy. In Table 7.3, one can see that most of the partner organisations have a good opinion of CIES' efforts to influence public policies. The opinion is even more favourable from partner organisations in the inland provinces.

**Table 7.3 Based on your experience, please evaluate CIES' strengthening in its capacity as a Consortium to:**

Questions	Public Universities	Private Universities	Other Members	Lima	The Provinces	Interviewees	Number of Abstentions/ No opinion
2.1.2 Increase the useful knowledge stock for the design and implementation of public policies	4.30	4.40	4.20	4.13	4.56	4.28	0
2.1.3 Dissemination of useful knowledge on public policies and programmes	4.50	4.60	4.10	4.25	4.56	4.36	0
2.1.4. Promote public debate on public policies and programmes	4.10	4.60	4.10	3.94	4.67	4.20	0

Note: The figures represent the average of responses, in which 5 stands for "very favourable," 4 "favourable," 3 "none," 2 "unfavourable" and 1 "very unfavourable." The "no opinion" category was not given any points.

As to public policy impact, our analysis shows that capacity development has taken place at every level of the Consortium, especially at the Executive Office (instead of with individual researchers or partner organisations). The strengthening of the impact and work with associates and individual researchers is confirmed as one of the areas needing reinforcement, as stated in the last CIES annual report (CIES, 2006:33).

### 7.2.1 Different Ways of Influencing

Although direct influence on public policy is hard to attribute to CIES' overall work, policy influence is evident in CIES' capacity to develop multi-faceted strategies for achieving this purpose. Some of the ways in which CIES has developed capacities are described below:

- **Communication:** As a result of CIES' strengthening in this area, both reports and interviews mention CIES' presence and visibility in the media in recent years. Most find this a positive change.
- **Discussions or Public Debates:** Through its Executive Office, CIES has participated and/or generated various kinds of discussion forums with the academic community, government officials, International Cooperation representatives and civil society organisations. Over the years, this has come to include presentations of several books, research findings, panels and other discussion forums.

Some of the efforts made during presidential and regional elections included a series of strategies. Among them, we can mention that of developing policy documents, meetings with political parties and rapport with the media. On a national level, this culminated in CIES' role in organising a debate among presidential candidates. Based on our interviews, the experience gained in the inland provinces is shown in the sidebar.

Through its ties with different agencies, as well as through agreements or more informal arrangements, CIES has been able to create more room for "closed workshop-type"

debates and others specifically focussed on certain groups or within the framework of certain current issues.

*"I think the crowning glory of all this work was the fact that the debate among the most important candidates in the elections was guided by the agenda that the universities drafted based on the work of their researchers. A very interesting and different space was carved out because the exercise was not only with journalists, but also with other professionals, through workshops with them and with guilds. In other words, dialogue was sought among all the sectors. The debate strove to introduce the need for institutional communication."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation (on the Regional Election Project)

- **Strategic Links and Ties with Public Institutions:** In recent years, important strategic alliances that facilitate the influencing process have been established. Among these alliances, there is an agreement signed with the Congress of the Republic. This agreement, signed in 2003, deals with rendering technical support and providing consulting services to the Parliamentary Research Centre (CIP) on current issues. More recently, in 2006, CIES held workshops with Congressional committees on draft laws

on the legislative agenda (funded by the United Nations Development Programme). The workshop activities included having a researcher/analyst and a lawyer/analyst share their perspectives on a bill and answer any relevant questions. This initiative was significant because it ties in research with the legislative process and it was an important step in bringing together researchers and legislative lawyers.

- **Strategic Links and Ties with Civil Society:** With civil society, CIES has offered support to organised groups like Health Forum (FOROSALUD), an organisation that aims to influence public health issues. The goal is to make it possible for this kind of body to make use of CIES' research and studies to develop strategies and supervisory methods. The Health Watch fulfils the role of providing this to civil society organisations for their work on influencing policy. This is an example of CIES' interaction with research users who "demand" support in public policy analysis.

The nature of the Consortium itself, which brings institutions and their researchers together, involves growth in its capacity for influencing by means of:

- **Advising High-Ranking Government Officials:** Many times, influencing is not done on the basis of a research project, but of a researcher's accumulated experience. Several of the researchers interviewed are called in to directly advise high-ranking officials or to participate in policy defining or assessment committees and/or social programmes.

- **Involvement in Public**

**Office:** Given the trajectory of a significant number of CIES associate researchers, there is often movement between academia and public service. This has also increased the capacity to influence public policies in two ways. On one hand, researchers enter public service with knowledge acquired from research projects. Some researchers have said that they apply their experience to policymaking. Their experience in public office later influences their research. As one person interviewed explained, "Now I do more applied studies and I pay more attention to the cost and benefits to public policies." A stint in Ministry positions later allows researchers to become more

*"The other thing I find noteworthy is that becoming more visible has been quite effective. Many opportunities have opened up with the media. Alliances or agreements have been made with key people. Perhaps what stands out most is the event towards the end of last year at Congress, the four workshops in which members of Congress sat and listened to at least one member of a CIES partner organisation give his opinion, give a talk. There were many people from several institutions. You have much wider political visibility. This part began with the project on electoral agendas."*

Researcher, CIES Partner Organisation

aware of the cultural, institutional and political limitations involved in accomplishing reforms. Moreover, sensitive to the importance of research, these officials/researchers tend to be more open to new studies generated by CIES.

#### 7.2.2 And the Effects on Policies?

CIES evaluations have gathered numerous testimonies corroborating the impact it has had on Peru's economic and social policies, even though it is difficult to establish a cause-effect relationship. The people interviewed commented on the difficulty in establishing connections between research and a policy change.

This situation illustrates the difficulties IDRC and its partner organisations face in their work, as observed in the Centre's Board of Director's report:

*The production of knowledge is accumulative; research activities are also built upon the work done in the past. Policy changes do not occur with a single piece of evidence, but through knowledge accumulated from a variety of perspectives and fields. (Herbert-Copley, 2007:13. Paraphrasing)*

In addition to this, there is the need to have the right conditions in order to make certain recommendations that arise from research. For CIES in Peru, these conditions come about more frequently in sectors and institutions in which independent professionals with ties to academia (like BCRP, MEF, INEI) have stayed on. In these institutions, the connection between research and discussion on proposed policies has been smoother and closer. In sectors like health and education, where officials are more susceptible to political shifts, research findings and independent proposals from academia are not as easily accepted. (CIES, 2003:5)

Therefore, examples of policy effects stemming from CIES-sponsored research mainly come from the field of economics, and they show both immediate results and delayed outcomes that did not occur until eight years after the research was finished. Two cases are presented as examples:

- Macro policies based on specific information on the workings of the economy. Short- and Long-term Models for the Peruvian Economy, based on Bank of Canada models. This example of "using" research was cited by researchers, as well as by the Executive Office and BCR officials. The partner organisations that participated in this were the CIUP and the CUCP.
- Research done by GRADE in 1994 within the CIES framework on "Trends for Measuring Inflation in Inflationary Contexts: The Case of Peru" highlights the more than 50% inflation rate that affected Peru's Consumer Price Index (CPI) between 1979 and 1993. When the results of the research were presented, they were not

well received but criticised by the INEI. In 2001, under the administration of President Toledo, an opportunity to analyse the methodology once again presented itself and in 2002, the INEI made changes to the index and published a new methodology manual. This example was included in the case studies published by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in its "Bridging Research and Policy" series (Escobal, 2002).

### 7.2.3 Influencing Challenges

CIES has faced both external and internal challenges to its process of capacity development for policy influence. Externally, as mentioned above, there is the unstable and, in certain sectors, negligible demand for applied research from "potential users" in the field of public policy.

Internally, the Consortium had to ensure that it encouraged research that was of use to policymakers. In this area, it has attempted to institute new ways of incorporating the needs and interests of policy users, but this task is still in progress. Moreover, one aspect mentioned in several documents (CIES assessments and reports) is the extent to which the value of influencing research on public policy has been internalised by researchers from partner organisations.

Influencing public policy is also difficult when dealing with a network like CIES, especially in terms of media relations. Heightened public visibility raises the issue of who will appear before the media -the Consortium, its Executive Office or the partner organisations- a dilemma that some feel more strongly about than others.

This predicament might be a partial result of the fact that it is a network with two "supra-functions," as described by Mendizábal (2007). CIES is a "support" network that offers services so that its members can come in contact with others and influence public policy. At the same time, it is also an "agency-type" network, in which it is the network/its secretariat, which is (directly or indirectly) charged with ensuring influence. This dual function is shown in Chart 7.4.



**Chart 7.4 Diagram of a Network with Two Supra-Functions**

QuickTime™ and a  
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor  
are needed to see this picture.

Source: Adapted from Mendizabal (2007).

It is important to consider the fact that many of the Consortium's Partner Institutions, especially those in Lima, already have their own experience, strategies, preferred foci and network of contacts for their work in influencing public policy. As CIES enters this field more solidly by means of efforts coordinated and/or headed by the Executive Office, some tension arises between partners and the Executive Office. More specifically, tension arises because of the visibility (described above) and consulting work - not only in the Executive Office's role or its responsibility to provide consulting services but also in internal debates on the function of core research versus "consulting" in the production of knowledge to influence public policy. The Executive Office's role or responsibility is discussed more fully in the section on CIES' Institutional Development.

### 7.3 CIES' Institutional Development

As indicated in the brief summary of CIES' evolution, the transition over the last decade (1998-2007) has had great implications for its institutional development over a relatively short period of time. The

following is not intended as a comprehensive analysis (based on an organisational diagnosis), but an effort to show the extent of the areas in which the Consortium has broadened its capacities in recent years, as well as the new challenges that have arisen as the Consortium has evolved.

### **Programme and Service Management**

After eight years, the research grant competitions coordinated by the Executive Office have built up an excellent reputation with partner organisations, public sector representatives and other participants interviewed. Most researchers say that winning a grant brings with it a certain prestige in Peru and, moreover, those interviewed perceive it as being run transparently. In addition to this, there is the management of various projects and programmatic activities CIES has been able to develop, such as training sessions, internship coordination and incorporating itself more firmly into influencing public policy. To extend this programmatic capacity, it has availed itself of the capacities of the partner organisations themselves (to take over certain tasks). The Executive Office's staff has grown larger and/or specialised personnel have been sought out.

### **Administrative/Financial Management**

With regard to the Executive Office's administrative/financial capacity, the secretariat has always had capable professionals in the field. CIES has acquired the capacity to not only report in due time and proper form to CIDA (according to its requisites), but also to report to the different agencies that finance projects in line with their own, distinct requirements. This task also entails the use of sophisticated systems. Previously, it dealt with CIDA and IDRC funds only, but CIES is now accountable to some 10 different sources (2006) which provide from less than US\$ 2,000 to more than US\$ 96,092, the largest amount from CARE Peru. (CIES, 2006:16)

### **Resource and Financial Sustainability Management**

CIES has developed capacities in managing financial resources as seen in the diversification of its sources of financing, but it has yet to obtain other contributions that will be instrumental in the institution's sustainability, particularly in terms of guaranteeing funds for research competitions.

CIES has been responsible for covering a growing portion of its administrative costs charged to other sources as of April 2000 (CIES, 2003:5). Over time, the proportion of income from IDRC and CIDA has diminished, but they are still the only sources of core support for the annual competitions and for a part of Executive Office operations.

In 2000, CIDA funds represented 76% of all the funding received. By the end of 2006, it represented 51% (see Graph 7.5). The total amount from different

*"There is not much interest on behalf of other governments in subsidising CIES' research work. It is used regularly, but they do not want to back institutional work."*

Cooperation Agency

resources seems to have increased, although it varies every year. For example, in 2005, CIDA funds still represented 71% of all the funds raised. The institutional quota varies between US\$ 22,000 and \$30,000 a year and is a small percentage of its total revenues.

**Graph 7.5 CIES Revenues between 2000 and July 2007**

**Error! Not a valid link.**

Source: CIES, Inflow and outflow by different sources, in US dollars

Since 2000, additional sources of financing have come mainly from international foundations, followed by international NGOs and multilateral organisations. The Consortium has had the support of the World Bank, the Labour Ministry, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the UNDP, the Ford Foundation, the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation (AECI) and the Economic and Finance Ministry, among others. IDRC's PBDD "challenge fund" was used to obtain financing from the IDB for the election project.

**Table 7.6 Additional Sources of Financing (not CIDA/IDRC) 1999-2007**

DONORS	AMOUNT IN US DOLLARS	%
International Foundations	1,111,000	44
International NGOs	371,000	15
Multilateral Organisations	338,000	14
Bilateral Agencies	317,000	13
US Universities	160,000	6
Public Sector	142,000	6
Others	56,000	2
Total	2,497,000	100

Source: CIES' Presentation to Members of the IDRC Board of Directors, February 2007

The results to date account for both CIES' reputation for credibility in the international community with regard to its capacity to formulate projects and for the agencies' interest in financing specific work that relates to their institutional agendas. However, to date, those donors have not contributed funds of an institutional nature. The results also show the challenges the Executive Office faces in terms of effectively raising funds that are important to the

different partner organisations. For some of them, financing the free competitions is crucial. For others, training and other services are fundamental. This creates a certain tension between the approach, results and expectations. The Executive Office has arranged for additional funds for competitions on specific topics, such as those for the BCR and the Health Watch.

Even though financing from Peru's public sector represents just 6%, it is an important step given its track record of financing the economic and social sciences and its willingness to back civil society organisations.

*"It is not likely that the Peruvian Government will take an interest in backing civil society organisations. Recently, the Government tried to pass a law to scrutinise NGOs. This law has not been enacted, but it shows how hard it would be for the Peruvian Government to allot funds to strengthening these organisations."*

Cooperation Agency

In 2007, CIES was working intensely with the help of a Programme Officer devoted to this effort (and who had previously worked in IDRC's PBDD), to develop a fundraising strategy that centred on creating an endowment that could provide the \$300,000 a year needed for the research grant competitions. This would be supplemented by a portfolio of financing projects for the other areas of communications and training.

## Human Resources

CIES began with a team of three people who came from distinct fields (anthropology, economics, and management). This group grew to include analysts, press managers, project officers and coordinators, people with fundraising experience and other administrative personnel. In 2007, the staff consisted of approximately 15 people. Furthermore, the Executive Office implemented a strategy to recruit analysts from those with the best performance in the annual BCR course for economists. Personnel in certain positions usually enter CIES' Executive Office early on in their professional careers; this leads to a high staff turnover as they leave to continue their studies. (From what the Executive Office tells us, this is also part of their role in backing the development of young researchers.) However, some key personnel positions of CIES have been relative stable, which has been favourable for the institutional memory and learning of the

### **The Transition to a Research Agenda that Includes Social Issues**

The transition strategy to establish an economic and social agenda does not seem to have involved significant changes in the nature, model or workings of CIES. The proposal declared the goal of beginning with research on issues to which economists could contribute and which complement other fields. The strategy was directed at broadening research so as to include social policy.

Parts of the strategy (perhaps inherent in it) could have included the decision, for example, to look for a professional from another field (not an economist) for the position of Executive Manager. Another part of the process consisted of the creation of a researching balance (Escobal and Iguñiz, 2000 and Barrantes and Iguñiz, 2004) in which material from several different topics was examined and new questions or research perspectives arose for each field. Topics of the latest balance included: macroeconomics and growth; international economic relationships; employment; poverty and the distribution of income; education; health; decentralisation; regulation, privatisation and concessions; the environment and natural resources. Another strategy CIES has used is that of establishing specific projects that give emphasis to social areas, such as the Health Watch.

Nowadays, the departments of economics are still the ones that represent many of the partner universities, but the expansion has incorporated other research centres that contribute from different fields. CIES has produced a large number of studies on issues of social policy in education and in health, for example. During this case study, we were unable to perform a review of the research to analyse the extent of transdisciplinary or multidisciplinary development.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider that there are two factors that operate in an inverse manner. On the one hand, all partner organizations relate to the economic or social investigation, which is a common denominator. On the other hand, there is a consensus between the partners about the general mission of CIES, which is a cohesive factor.

Fostering the Consortium's social cohesion is precisely one of the challenges identified to sustain the capacities developed to date. Part of that challenge is to influence the role of the more experienced centres and the empathy shown in providing consulting services to those who, in the future, will be their intellectual competitors.

organization

### **Communication/External Relations**

Beginning in 2002, the Executive Office has paid special attention to external communications. It is interesting to read, in an IDRC trip report, a comment on the Executive Office's team at that time (2001), which points out that one area in which they have least progressed has been in dissemination and outreach. This changed significantly between 2002 and 2007. During this period, one can see an increase in the array of communication tools the Executive Office uses to reach different audiences such as various bulletins of re-packaged research findings. Training journalists on development issues is also identified as an important strategy for establishing links between research and the media. Recently, the Executive Office has begun to strengthen its direct support and consulting work on dissemination and press relations with partner institutions.

### **Strategic Management**

This area takes into account building up a vision for the Consortium, its strategic planning and the overall delineation of its course given its mandate and its attributes as an umbrella organisation in Peru. Since it has gone from five to more than 30 partner organisations and has extended its field of action to the entire country, new challenges have arisen in terms of CIES' capacity to articulate the visions of the different partner organisations and define common visions and agendas. CIES has put in place different strategies like its annual assemblies, strategic planning sessions and consulting processes with partners. An active Executive Office has played an important role in leading the organisation. The first changeover in this position took place in 2007.

Strategic Management also changes as CIES' research agenda broadens to include social issues. However, as stated in the proposal presented to IDRC and to CIDA, the incorporation of social issues was aimed at making use of previous experience in economic research and would include important economic elements or would have "implications for decisions dealing with efficiency, equality and sustainability in the allocation of resources." Priority would be given to problems in which "economists' perspectives could productively complement the overview of the problem and the pragmatic analysis of possible solutions." (CIES, 1998:20)

### **Role as a Network**

More recently, the need to refine the profile of CIES as a network and define its influence at the sub-regional level are matters that present new challenges to the organisation's strategic management.

One of the advantages that a Consortium could offer is to enable the development of activities that each of the partners could not do

individually. As several of those interviewed noted, CIES has the challenge of being more than the sum of its parts. This ability to function as an umbrella institution or network has been affected by several factors, according to those interviewed.

On one hand, CIES has not defined institutional rules regarding what it means to be an umbrella institution that promotes applied research. This lack of definition has resulted in a trial and error process in terms of the areas in which the Executive Office (representing the Consortium) should take action and those in which partners should. Responsibilities in the process have gradually been defined, for example, in the area of "consulting" which created tension between the partners and the Executive Office stemming from real or perceived competition. An operations policy on this issue has been established so as not to provoke competition between the different parties.

In hopes of improving relationships, the Executive Office visited partner organisations in early 2007 to learn their expectations regarding CIES and to tackle the impression of distance from some its partners. Recently, a "portfolio" system has been implemented. Under this system each project officer is in charge of looking after relationships with a number of centres. Thus, the Executive Office becomes a focal point for the centres. This strategy is well regarded by the partners, who acknowledge closer relations in recent months. Furthermore, they have pointed to several services the Executive Office has begun offering partner organisations that do exemplify this role of an umbrella institution, such as: facilitating INEI, the key player in looking for other opportunities and regional and global research projects, and sharing another information that can benefit to the organizations partners. The portfolio system also allows CIES project officers to offer specific support to partner organisations when requested to do so.

## **Governance**

CIES established a new structural model for the Consortium's governance. A General Assembly and a Board of Directors made up of four representatives from the partner organisation Assembly, two from the public sector, two from civil society and two representatives from donor agencies, were created.

In recent years, the General Assembly has continued to grow, especially with the incorporation of more partners from public universities and from the provinces. This growth is reflected in the requests to allow these partner organisations to participate more actively in the organisation's leadership. This comes as partner organisations with more research experience tend to dominate the Consortium on an intellectual/academic level and make themselves heard more in the Assembly. However, "balancing" these different perspectives is no easy job.

During this same period, the Executive Office has had dynamic leadership, has evolved from a staff of three to some 15 people, and has acquired autonomy and a certain life of its own like any other organisation. The dynamism and drive of Executive Office personnel have undoubtedly contributed to several of CIES' achievements. However –and in this sense CIES is no different from other NGOs– a certain distance has arisen between the Executive Office and the Board, as well as between these two committees and the General Assembly.

Several people interviewed from CIES and IDRC agree that in recent years, more attention should have been paid to these governance issues and to accountability in the Consortium, which indicates that this matter still needs to be addressed.

It is important to stress that, as stated in Intermedia's assessment (Intermedia, 2002:24), CIES is a young institution that does not have much practice in its internal operations, and that from the onset, it was not born from the will of its current partner organisations. Throughout its evolution and growth towards new members, "a constant presence has fulfilled a deciding role since it has been able to mobilise a team towards common goals. Now, it needs to face the challenge of getting partner associations to take control of its organisation and take their places in the institution's operation." (Intermedia, 2002:24) What Intermedia stated in 2002 still applies in 2007.

### **Establishing Alliances**

Attention was drawn to this in the analysis on influencing public policy (CIES' strategic links), but these alliances have not just been established for influencing, but also in terms of the services CIES wants to offer its members and the efforts to diversify funds. One example that stands out is the agreement with the INEI that allows CIES to provide its partners with access to the National Households Survey (ENAH) databases and the agreement with the BCR that allowed CIES to carry out a specific competition on topics of monetary policy, dollarisation and tax decentralisation, for two consecutive years (2002-2003). CIES also is part of regional and global networks, such as Evidence-Based Policy in Development Network and Civil Society Partnership Programme (CSSP), in which CIES has played a promotional role.

Within this context of alliances, questions arise as to regional ties. IDRC approved a CAD\$ 37,900 project to explore ties with the Andean Community of Nations (CAN). Furthermore, at the recommendation of IDRC, the FARO group in Ecuador has requested support to arrange a process similar to the one organised in Peru for the 2006 national elections, in which research-based evidence was provided in support of the electoral process. This type of initiative brings to light the much broader issue of the ties CIES has with similar organisations in other countries. While these ties might assist in regional resource



management, they also lead to reservations in IDRC regarding the relevance regional work has on CIES' general strategy, promoted by its Board of Directors and after consultations with the partner organisations.

## 8. Final Considerations

This section begins with a few comments on the general overview of the case under study to analyse the strengths and challenges IDRC's approach presents as it seeks to strengthen the development of organisational capacities in partner organisations.

CIES reflects IDRC's effort to support capacity development for research and to influence policies by promoting relationships between organisations nationwide, using a consortium model. This mechanism supports the capacities of people, research groups and partner organisations. IDRC and CIES have used a wide variety of tools for developing the capacities described above (scholarship programmes, training and counselling, among others). Over time, this type of support has contributed to the creation of a more favourable environment for socio-economic research and the inclusion of research in policymaking processes in Peru.

Both IDRC and CIDA have contributed to creating and establishing the different phases of the Consortium's development. Given the substantial amount of financing (\$15,488,976 from CIDA and \$3,013,402 from IDRC) over the years, we understand that the CIES model may be unique and perhaps not entirely reproducible. Some feedback has mentioned that this model is difficult for IDRC to implement due to the level of investment, and it can only be done if other donors are attracted and contribute to it financially.

### 8.1 Strengths and Challenges of IDRC's Approach

In this section, we will present some thoughts on the strengths and potential challenges or limitations of IDRC's approach to capacity development as well as on certain issues to consider regarding the future relationship between IDRC and CIES.

#### 8.1.1 Good Practices that Contribute to Capacity Development

Generally, in the case of CIES, several good practices that contribute to Capacity Development adapted from the DAC (2003) and the IDRC *Corporate Assessment Framework* (2006) were observed and have been discussed in the previous phases of this strategic assessment (Lusthaus and Nielsen, 2007: 20).

## **Perseverance**

The CIES example is one in which continuity in personal relationships and in financing has been vital for capacity development. Those interviewed repeatedly pointed it out: IDRC's long-term commitment has been the element that has most favoured capacity development.

This strength is initially based on the fact that key IDRC people have known how to listen, have worked for years in Peru, and have gotten to know the environment very well.

Because of the broad scope of the relationship and financing, individuals and organisations have been able to commence or deepen their applied research on social and economic issues.

At the same time, IDRC, in this case, also showed perseverance (and firmness) at the main turning points in the Consortium's evolution. The CIES case shows that IDRC can perform the role of catalyser or facilitating agent in a difficult environment or during reform processes. At CIES, the changes needed during the transition from CIE to CIES took place at an organisational level. They were changes in structure (increasing the number of partners, setting up the board of directors), in operation (change to funds allocated through competitions) and in the Consortium's strategy (more emphasis on encouraging capacity development and on the policy-influencing process). IDRC closely followed these changes over the critical transitional years.

*"Capacity building is a very complicated concept. What does it mean? How is it measured? But let's say that one key point (under this concept) is having good human resources. To the extent to which you have a good relationship with a group of people, a stable relationship in a country that has leadership, the ability to shape public opinion, sooner or later, these people will be in important decision-making positions. It is your way of capacity building or helping to bolster institutionalism."*

A Member of the CIES Board

## **Flexibility**

The assistance provided to CIES was institutional and one of the fundamental elements in the capacity development process has been flexibility. In this sense, it has been possible to negotiate the use of funds, the schedules for executing projects and other features with IDRC and CIDA. This flexibility was also seen in the endowment of "special" funds for exploration, as well as the PBDD Challenge Fund, which was used to mobilise financing from other donors to conduct the election project and explore the regional relationship with the CAN.

## **Building Partnerships**

One of the strengths has been the opportunity to establish friendly relationships and trust between IDRC programme officers and CIES (its Executive Office, members of the Board and some of the researchers

representing partner organisations). IDRC also made it possible to establish relationships between CIES and other organisations or individuals outside of Peru (FOCAL, international consultants and indeed many others we do not know of). However, this point will be discussed below as an area that might be improved in the future.

### **A Locally Defined Agenda**

The people interviewed in Peru stressed the topic of the autonomy that IDRC has given CIES in many areas, including that of defining the research agenda. This autonomy has allowed CIES to work with a wide-ranging research agenda that responds to the needs of the environment. This is seen as one of CIES' positive features and has come up in several interviews with partners and their researchers.

#### **8.1.2 Other Strengths**

Furthermore, the CIES case shows other traits that could be considered strengths.

### **Teamwork at IDRC**

For the most part, those interviewed stated that teamwork among the different divisions of IDRC promoted continuity in the relationship with CIES. In the case of CIES, we see encouraging examples of interaction between Programmes, the PBDD, the Donation Administration and the Regional Controller.

The strength of the relationships between each of these groups and CIES has changed over time, and was notably intense during the phases in which IDRC was CIDA's Executing Agency as considerable collaboration was required with regard to accounting to CIDA. Moreover, key personnel have had certain permanence in the GADD and the people who worked with CIES on administrative and financial reports have always done so in Spanish, an advantage that is not always present in dealings between IDRC and its partners.

While teamwork has generally been a positive aspect of the relationship, it has also presented some limitations in capacity development due to IDRC's structure and its issue-based orientation. These issues will also be discussed in the section on challenges.

### **Partnerships with Other Donors**

As part of the IDRC-CIES experience, the partnership with CIDA is also worth mentioning. This has proven beneficial because CIDA gave continuous support, to a certain extent, to CIES during its strengthening process. The two agencies naturally had their moments of disagreements, but all in all, dealings between them took place in a friendly atmosphere, as those involved asserted.

On the other hand, the relationship with the Executing Agency, which involves accountability, also affected IDRC officers' workload and

approach at any given moment. In fact, the Interalia evaluation (2002) describes the perception at that time that IDRC and CIES' efforts were driven more by the imperatives of the project process (logical framework, parameters for measuring performance and others) than by institutional development as such.

### 8.1.3 Challenges Inherent in IDRC's Approach to Capacity Development

The first set of challenges refers not so much to how IDRC approaches capacity development, but to the limitations inherent in IDRC's own organisation and work style that represent challenges in the field of capacity building.

#### **IDRC's Structure and *Modus Operandi***

##### **Variable Budget Resource Allocation and Changes in Strategies**

One of the members of IDRC pointed out that, for instance, variability of budget allocations and changes in strategies have repercussions on initiative development. From his point of view, these aspects limit IDRC's opportunities when longer-term visions and commitments are required, especially in terms of

*"Yes, there is that pressure [to approve new projects]. How much mentoring can you give to projects that were approved 3 years ago? You cannot hold [people's] hands if you have a portfolio of projects. IDRC places a lot of importance on design so that less has to be done later on. This [CIES] is not a research project; it is an institution that deserves a different type of mentoring."*

IDRC Staff Member

what can be conveyed to the partners. In the case of the support IDRC has given to CIES, there is no evidence that these budget and planning fluctuations have affected commitment or the suggestions given in terms of future commitments in any way.

##### **Pressure to Spend the Budget and Approve Projects**

Other IDRC members interviewed stated that the pressure to spend the budget meant that the officers in charge of a project portfolio spend a considerable amount of time looking for new project ideas and providing proposal-drafting guidelines. This would leave them little time to assist in the projects that had already been approved. However, only one of

*"In this region, there are two big trade projects: the Latin American Trade Network and MERCOSUR. They are two networks that finance trade research and the Consortium has not been a part of them. They are like independent structures. That happens because at IDRC, people do not work for a country or for a region, but by issues. Thus, what often happens is that two Project officers travel to Lima at the same time, but they come to see different issues."*

IDRC Staff Member

CIES' members interviewed said that IDRC does not have the capacity to provide or direct technical assistance, but only to manage funds.

One of the distinctive features of the assistance given to CIES in the early phases, when CIDA was also collaborating, was that IDRC had project officers more exclusively assigned to the Consortium.

### **Relative Effects on Thematic Structure and Orientation**

CIES was perhaps an unusual initiative compared to IDRC's usual projects, in that it was not tied to a thematic programme.

Programme Initiatives, or PIs, finance different members of the Consortium to carry out specific research projects, as in the case of the Institute of Peruvian Studies, or IEP by its Spanish acronym, which serves as a node for executing one of the regional information and communication technologies (ICT) projects. Meanwhile, the GEH provides financing to the Development Analysis Group (GRADE). Opinions from IDRC staff members expressed concern about this approach, saying that it could weaken the Consortium. The participants in Peru interviewed on this issue had different points of view. Some said it had a neutral effect and that what was important was for the Executive Office to be informed and to share this information with other members. Others thought this practice undermines the role of the Consortium as a national financing mechanism. This could place the Consortium's development at risk to the extent to which competition occurs or is perceived to occur between the partners and the Consortium for the same source of financing. Although to date the effects of this practice do not seem to have been significant, as will be discussed in the following section, it is an issue that should be kept on the agenda for IDRC-CIES dialogue.

Most of IDRC people interviewed pointed out that the CIES experience has had very little effect on IDRC practices themselves, which is possibly due to a lack of sharing results and experiences. It was pointed out that since IDRC learning processes are generally structured around Programme Initiatives, some opportunities to learn more about the Consortium's experience were lost. In this regard, the fact that CIES was not placed (until very recently) within IDRC's programme structure has limited the number of opportunities to clearly identify who should be influenced. If there was cross-learning among individual IDRC programme officers, the lack of a structure that facilitates this process and the scarcity of time and resources limited those efforts.

Furthermore, since CIES' projects were managed from Ottawa, some of the people interviewed from both IDRC and CIES pointed out that the participation of the Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office (LACRO) was not as strong as it could have been, especially during the Consortium's initial phases. A more prominent role on LACRO's part in establishing South-South and regional links would have been welcomed by CIES. Those interviewed said that LACRO could have played a

stronger part in terms of providing CIES with “strategic intelligence” (ties with thematic and organisational networks), another good capacity development practice. In the PAD for the last phase of CIES, LACRO played a more active role in following up on CIES’ activities and we assume this role is understood not in terms of “monitoring”, but as providing “strategic intelligence” and ensuring that capacities are developed to support those already existing in the region. The interviews suggest that the relationship between CIES and LACRO has become closer in recent years.

### **Organisational Support Strategy**

As has been mentioned, IDRC has never had a “grand” strategy to support CIES, that is, a cooperation framework for CIES’ institutional development possibly based on an assessment of the way it is organised. However, there is evidence of favourable results in capacity development.

*With the resources at hand, we made a systematic effort to support CIES in their capacity development and we saw some progress in that regard. Sometimes, the approach has been a bit ad hoc because we did not always have the experts we needed here or in Lima, but in general, I believe we did a good job with the resources we had.*  
(Paraphrasing)

IDRC Staff Member

A legitimate question would be to ask whether there is anything else IDRC could do to support CIES’ institutional development. Specifically, when IDRC-CIES projects explicitly change to promote the organisation’s sustainability (as was the case in the last phase of CIES), should IDRC’s strategy also change? What is IDRC’s role in supporting a long-time partner’s sustainability?

In the absence of a strategy, IDRC has “been more reacting,” in the words of one of those interviewed on the support given to CIES. Retrospectively, a number of IDRC officers said that IDRC could have provided some kind of technical support or assistance in programme management processes, governance or other areas that would have strengthened the organisation even more.

*In the beginning, there might have been too much pressure on the Executive Office to raise funds. That explains why funds were so aggressively sought from every quarter. In Phase 1 of CIES, a schedule was designed. In it, IDRC’s and CIDA’s budget contribution for the salaries of the director and the executive director would gradually diminish. The pressure caused problems. We had to adjust the budget because insecurity is not beneficial to the good operations of an organisation. Since we had to amend this situation, I guess the design was not right from the beginning. Fundraising was understood as being very important at too early a stage.*  
(Paraphrasing)

IDRC Staff Member

Another observation

offered by IDRC staff members refers to the support IDRC itself has given the Consortium in their effort to “regionalise” or widen their scope of action to the Andean Region. Although the efforts to regionalise may seem appropriate for strategic reasons (to develop inter-organisational ties or increase the ability to raise funds for regional projects), the purpose of regionalisation in regard to CIES’ mandate is not clear. This kind of expansion deserves to be considered by the Board or the Consortium in terms of its overall effect on CIES’ future course and vision and the role that regionalisation, among other key issues, has within this vision.

### **The Focal Point of the Relationship**

IDRC communication was centred on the Executive Director and the Deputy Director. Thus, the Executive Office was the main liaison in the relationship. Although after a few years many opportunities to meet with a wider range of partner organisations arose, the relationship was generally centred on the small Executive Office team. This is probably not uncommon in the way IDRC works with other networks or consortia, and in truth, it may be the only feasible approach. However, when the partner organisation is undergoing leadership transitions, it reveals the potential risk of not having a wider array of relationships that can gauge and understand the organisation’s operations. Thus, at the time of the case study, several people interviewed from IDRC pointed out the need to focus more on the Board’s role and functions and on a broader consideration of governance issues.

### **Relationships and Networking**

One of the challenges identified in CIES was establishing ties with networks of researchers, institutions, research bodies and political agencies in Canada and other regions.

Both the Executive Office staff and CIES members expressed the desire to have more contact with agencies like Canada’s Social Science Research Council (SSRC), consortia from other regions (like the AERC) and other IDRC-backed networks. For instance, a long-time partner researcher had no knowledge of the PEP network until recently, when preparations began for its 2007 meeting in Lima.

*“In the case of the Consortium, they made use of the fact that they had already had experiences like the AERC and SISERA. I do believe there was synergy with all that was learned and an experiment in a single country was attempted to see how it worked. That was very positive. I also see a negative side to this. I feel that IDRC could have gone a step further in linking this institution with similar ones in other regions. I do believe that this Consortium should have spoken with the AERC a long time ago. And I do not think there was any formal contact between them.”*

IDRC Staff Member

Efforts were made to improve the relationship with researchers in Canada and we tried to describe some of these in Section 6.3. However, with the exception of two of CIES' main long-term consultants, Doctor Albert Barry and Doctor Shane Hunt, relationships did not materialise between institutions (we suppose that many individuals have their own individual contacts).

This means that IDRC needs to play a more active role in facilitating exchanges among the consortia and provide a better flow of network information. IDRC's renewed effort would have to be joined by an undertaking to report on opportunities and share contacts between the Executive Office and CIES' partner organisations, and among the organisations themselves.

## 8.2 Areas to be Considered for IDRC-CIES Relationship in the Future

The case study indicates that in general, the relationship between IDRC and CIES has made capacity development possible. In other words, it has been a positive relationship that has contributed to the evolution of one institution in the Peruvian context. This section presents some issues which IDRC could consider as it seeks to strengthen CIES' capacities, given the organisation's current internal context and conditions. We consider them areas that require attention from CIES and IDRC in the near future in order to give continuity to the favourable results of the last 20 years.

### **Consortium Governance**

We think IDRC could sponsor a discussion on the consortium's governance. This is an issue that IDRC and CIES have placed on the discussion table. We believe it is a good time to discuss the issue since there has been a change in the organisation's Board and the Consortium has initiated explicit strategies to improve relations and to reduce distance between partner organisations, the Board of Directors and the Executive Office.

The CIES model proposes having a General Assembly and a Board of Directors. The designation process was done based on the principle that the perspectives of the research users or the Consortium's clients should be taken into account. Thus, a group of four partner representatives and six representatives from other participants (the public sector, civil society and donors) was decided upon.<sup>26</sup> If the principles behind this structure are still valid, there will be no need to consider any significant adjustments to the model. However, it should be asked if this model allows for sufficient representation and

---

<sup>26</sup> In practice, there is obviously constant movement between partner organisations and other public sector and civil society groups, which means that, at any given moment, an associate researcher could be on the Board representing the public sector.



participation to define the course of an organisation with more and more partners.

The issue of donor representation has been difficult regarding the configuration of the Board of Directors. The Canadian Embassy has had a certain presence, but it has not been constant. IDRC has not had any presence on the Board of Directors for the aforementioned reasons. We believe it is important for donors, who are considered key participants, to have the opportunity of being included on the Board. It might be fitting for IDRC and CIES to study the advantages and disadvantages of this kind of participation on behalf of IDRC. In private-company and non-profit organisation governance structures, it is not uncommon for the agency financing the organisation to have a representative on the board. According to the way "partnership" was defined, a closer relationship can arise by participating on the Board. However, there is also the justifiable concern of a potential conflict of interests -real or perceived- if a donor is on the Board. This could happen when the person representing the donor is both responsible for making decisions on the organisation's future financing and, as a member of the Board, for looking after its financial security. It is important to establish clearly, any possible conflict of interests and the mechanisms to avoid them. The potential advantages of having IDRC on the Board are the opportunities for greater cooperation and assistance on institutional issues. The potential disadvantages are that geographical distances can still limit IDRC participation, and its presence can be perceived as tied to possible financing.<sup>27</sup>

Another way to improve governance would be along the lines of governance processes/systems. In this case study, we did not examine the decision-making processes or the flow of information/communication among the different agencies involved in CIES' governance -the General Assembly, the Board of Directors and the Executive Director's Office. However, it would be helpful for the Consortium, as well as many other organisations, to have clearly defined roles and responsibilities for each agency, in addition to a more systematic consolidation of the communication and decision-making processes. It must be ensured that the Board receives the information it needs to make decisions and that the Assembly is well informed of the organisation's key issues.

### **CIES' Strategic Management**

Regarding a topic associated with governance, IDRC could assist CIES to analyse the Board's and the Assembly's contributions to CIES' strategic management. Here it would be necessary to validate CIES' mandate, strengthening its role as a network-type umbrella

---

<sup>27</sup> It would be useful to examine the option of not having the IDRC representative be responsible for making financing decisions in the future in order to avoid any potential conflict of interests as mentioned above.

organisation. This also means expanding those value-added services that make being a member of the Consortium worthwhile. All this would form part of the "social cohesion" strengthening process that is now encouraged at CIES. IDRC could make suggestions based on its experience with other consortia or set up exchanges with them.

This discussion should also include the issue of CIES' regional projection and how it relates to the mandate. It is important to have a clear idea of the reason for working outside Peru, whether it is to establish inter-organisational ties that would help CIES accomplish its mission in Peru or to extend its scope and in that way have access to regional opportunities and resources.

### **The Consortium's Financial Sustainability**

The Consortium has outlined a strategy that includes the creation of an endowment as a vital element of its financial sustainability. From what we understand, the endowment would provide the mechanism to hold annual research competitions. Once these competitions are assured, CIES could begin proceedings on specific projects for other programme areas, such as capacity development and impact, among others. CIES has already shown its ability to deal with these kinds of specific projects. However, it has yet to be able to obtain institutional support resources (other than resources from IDRC and CIDA) that allow it to continue the competitions. We feel that financial sustainability is an important factor for CIES' future and that IDRC could assist in the deliberations regarding the feasibility of the sustainability strategy based on its experience with other consortia, networks or partner organisations and its efforts to establish these endowment funds. What mechanisms have made it possible to establish endowments in these cases? For instance, there are donors that match funds or provide complementary donations to help in this process. The context of government and cooperation resources in Peru (and in Latin America) is another factor to consider in the feasibility study for the endowment creation strategy. If this is not feasible for this specific strategy, what are the alternatives to give continuity to all or some of the initiatives that CIES has launched?

### **Analysis of the Capacity Development Strategy**

One of the issues that will continue to be important for the Consortium is that of defining its role in research capacity development among partner associations in the country and public universities. This case indicates that several formats have been tried, but there is still no in-depth knowledge as to whether one strategy is more effective than the other. This will continue to be an issue from which both IDRC and CIES can benefit beginning with a series of discussions on how CIES could assume this role in the future. IDRC might have experiences from working on this issue with other partner associations that it could share.

## **Other Possible Areas to Consider**

In general, the characteristics of IDRC support and the way its staff works are greatly valued. These aspects have been described in Section 6.3 and the previous section deals with the strengths of IDRC's approach. Our queries have gathered some general recommendations for improving IDRC support and we have added some comments that IDRC can discuss with the Executive Office and the Consortium's partner organisations in terms of their expectations of IDRC's roles and the contributions of its current staff.

- As mentioned above, there is no clear evidence on the effect that the practices of the PIs have on the development of the consortium in terms of the support given to CIES' partner organisations. The consortium mechanism could be weakened if the only reason for joining up is to obtain resources to carry out research. As CIES expands its value-added services, fulfilling its role as an umbrella organisation to its partners, we believe this risk is lowered. At the moment, we would like to point out that it is an issue that should still be discussed between both organisations.
- Some partners and Executive Office staff members expressed an interest in having IDRC encourage more dialogue/exchanges between CIES as a bloc and other networks (like the PEP, LATN, MERCOUR or AERC) that also receive IDRC support. These international networks provide associated institutions with other kinds of opportunities and would add to the appeal of belonging to CIES. It is true that the networks mentioned in the interviews were thematic networks that are normally associated with economic topics (which is not surprising since many of those interviewed are economists). We believe it would be good for IDRC to also facilitate contacts and exchanges with multi-disciplinary or trans-disciplinary networks.
- Another issue to take a closer look at is that of ties between Peruvian and Canadian researchers to explore the ways this relationship could be strengthened in the future and the role it could play in internships for Canadian researchers.
- We also perceived a request for CIES to be provided with "strategic intelligence" within the framework of the region and of the experiences of other consortium-type organisations in other regions. On another note, it would be possible to provide or give Consortium members access to tools that IDRC has developed or promotes, like Outcome Mapping.

## Annex I List of Abbreviations Used

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
AECI	Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional
AERC	Consortio Africano de Investigación
ALF	Annual Learning Forum
BCR	Banco Central de Reserva
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
CAN	Andean Community
CD	Consejo Directivo
ECLAC	Economic Comisión for Latin America and the Caribbean
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIE	Consortio de Investigación Económica
CIES	Consortio de Investigación Económica y Social
CIP	Centro de Investigación Parlamentaria
CIPCA	Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado
CIUP	Universidad del Pacífico
CLASCO	Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales
CONCITEC	Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología
CSPF	Corporate Strategy and Programme Framework
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DESCO	Centro de Estudios y de Promoción del Desarrollo
ENAH0	Encuesta Nacional de Hogares
FIDECOM	Fondo de Investigación y Desarrollo para la Competitividad
GADD	Grant Administration Division
GEH	Governance, Equity and Health
GGP	Globalization, Growth, and Poverty
GRADE	Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo
ICT4D	Information and Communication Technologies for Development
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IEP	Instituto de Estudios Peruanos
INEI	Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas e Informática

## Annex I List of Abbreviations Used

IPC	Índice de Precios al Consumidor
LACRO	Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
MEF	Ministry of the Economy and Finance
MESAGEN	Mesa de Género de la Cooperación Internacional
NED	National Endowment for Democracy
ODA	Official Development Assistance
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
EO	Executive Office
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PAD	Project Appraisal Documents
PB	Proyecto Breve
PBA	Proyecto Breve Abierto
PBC	Proyecto Breve Cerrado
PBDD	Partnership and Business Development Division
PCD	Peace, Conflict and Development
PEP	Poverty and Economic Policy
PI	Programme Initiative
PIB	Producto Interno Bruto
PM	Proyecto Mediano
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
PPB	Programme Partnership Branch
PUCP	Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú
SEP	Social and Economic Policy Programme Area
SEPIA	Seminario Permanente de Investigación Agrícola
SISERA	Secretaria de Apoyo institucional a la investigación económica en África
SSRC	Social Science Research Council
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WRC	Women's Rights and Citizenship

## Annex II Terms of Reference

### **Strategic Evaluation on Capacity Development: Terms of Reference for Organisational Case Studies**

#### **1. Background**

Over the past several decades, IDRC in line with many development agencies, organisations and donors, has grappled with the issue of how to assess capacity building initiatives. Many of these agencies have struggled with how to articulate and document the complex array of results of their capacity building activities. Part of this difficulty lies in the fact that there are few systematic reviews of how development agencies construct the concept of capacity building in order that they may systematically look at how this construction leads to results. While there is a great deal of information regarding development projects that have attempted to build capacity, there is a dearth of information regarding how development agencies approach the concept of capacity building.

In response to the above considerations, IDRC's Evaluation Unit (EU) is conducting a strategic evaluation to investigate the Centre's contributions to the development of capacities of those with whom the Centre works. The evaluation aims to provide IDRC's own staff and managers with an intellectual framework and a useful common language to help harness the concept and document the experiences and results that the Centre has accumulated in this domain. Specifically, the strategic evaluation focuses on the processes and results of IDRC support for the development of capacities<sup>28</sup> of its southern partners - what capacities have been enhanced, whose, how, and how effectively.

Assisted by the consultant firm Universal Management Group, during the first three phases of this strategic evaluation, significant progress has been made in (1) defining what IDRC means by 'building' or 'developing capacities and in sharpening understanding of *how* IDRC supports capacities and with *whom*; (2) developing an initial set of typologies that will assist IDRC staff and partners in conceptualizing, planning, monitoring and evaluating capacity development and (3) elaborating a list of 'good practices' that

---

<sup>28</sup> The international development community tends to use the term "capacity development" rather than "capacity-building". The latter is often seen to mean that capacities are assumed to be absent, or that the process is one of moving from one level of capacity to the next, whereas "capacity development" acknowledges existing capacities, and the political dynamics of change. In this document, both terms are used somewhat interchangeably as "capacity-building" is the term most frequently used in IDRC parlance.

capture some of the elements of IDRC's support that staff and partners view as being critical to building research organisations and systems.

Initial conceptual work developed in the first phases of the strategic evaluation indicates that "for IDRC staff, capacity building is an essential variable in their approach to development. With a focus on process and on learning-by-doing, and especially on sustaining long-term personal relationships, IDRC is fixed on the value of the individual partner (the researcher or group of researchers) as the key component in capacity building."

IDRC's approach to capacity building was found to be normally instrumental or functional in nature, and focussed on tangibles, such as professional competencies, capabilities, and the tools needed to conduct research. These skills included the ability to identify research problems, to design and implement projects, to monitor and evaluate, to achieve good financial management, to link with other researchers and with donors, to publicize results, and so on. For IDRC therefore, capacity building means working with partners to conduct better research in a specific field and that any change that occurs as a result of this capacity building is at the problem or research area level rather than at the institutional or systems level. And yet, analysis undertaken during the first three phases of the strategic evaluation also indicates that IDRC partners are always connected to others within the research problématique or system. As such, at IDRC, capacity development often takes a *systems approach*. In other words, it not only addresses the individual(s) directly involved in the project(s) or programme, but also looks at how these individuals are connected to others: other individuals, organisations, and/or networks.

It is clear that it is only through examining the dynamics and evolution of how all the involved parties and communities work together to solve the development challenge that we will better understand how IDRC supports *the capacity to do research-related activities*. In light of these findings, IDRC has a growing interest in understanding how its capacity support (through projects or other activities) at the individual level - individuals and/or teams/groups is able (or not able) to influence change within their organisation or network. IDRC would also like to have a deeper understanding of how individuals have the capacity to build or establish relationships and partnerships to influence change through research, and how these partnerships and relationships interact within the various settings (organisations, networks).

With a view to increasing the Centre's ability to capture and track capacity changes in terms of the dynamics and interactions between individuals, organisations and networks and to understanding if and how IDRC contributes to capacity changes, phase 4 of the strategic evaluation will focus on the development of six (6) organisational

case studies. Case studies will better ground the findings of phases 1 to 3 of in specific, in-depth experiences.

## **2. Case study scope and methodology**

The case study work consists of a purposeful sample of six (6) organisational case studies, chosen on the basis of maximum variation. Maximum variation sampling aims to capture and describe the central themes that cut across a great deal of variation. For small samples, it turns the apparent weakness of heterogeneity into a strength by applying the logic that "any common patterns that emerge from great variation are of particular interest and value in capturing the core experiences and central, shared dimensions of a setting or phenomenon" (Patton, 2002, 234-235). In this strategic evaluation, it is expected that this approach will bring to the fore important learning on IDRC's experiences and abilities for supporting research capacity in different types of organisations and research environments.

Organisational case studies have been chosen in order to capture how, over time, IDRC's sustained support contributes to capacity development at the individual/group, organisational and network levels in the field. The organisational case studies will examine different types of organisations in different geographic regions and with diverse sectoral concentration, which have received significant IDRC support over the last ten years.

All of the case studies selected for this strategic evaluation have been chosen on the basis of being within the top fifty (50) southern-based recipient organisations of IDRC financial support since 1996. Being longitudinal in nature, the case studies will examine the cumulative results of IDRC's significant investment (more than \$ 2 million in each case) extended through a number of projects or capacity support interventions, by different IDRC programmes over a significant period of time. The organisational case studies will examine both the *processes* and the *results* of capacity development with Southern partner organisations.

The case studies will present rich narratives of different capacity development processes.

In IDRC's view of *complete capacity*, there is a need to pay attention to and fund multiple functions to enhance the capacity to do research-related activities, including how to conduct, manage, and communicate research. For IDRC, communicating research goes beyond simple presentation of results; it involves dissemination strategies that include effective approaches so that research can be taken up and used by policymakers, communities, private sector, NGOs, governments, other researchers, etc. to find solutions to their development problems. Analyzing *complete capacity* will bring the evaluator into contact with the multiple IDRC areas that provide capacity development support including Programmes Branch, the Evaluation Unit, the Partnership and



Business Development Division, Research Information Management Services and the Grants Administration Division

These narratives will be developed through (1) A review of documents including organisational assessments (Institutional Risk Profile), project design documents, monitoring documents (*inter alia*, technical reports, trip reports, correspondence) and project reports; and where they can be located; (2) Interviews with project leaders, project participants and other key informants in the organisations being evaluated; (3) Interviews with relevant IDRC staff from programmes, grant administration and financial management (GAD, regional comptrollers) and units involved in capacity development work with the organisations being evaluated (e.g. responsible programme staff, senior IDRC managers, Evaluation Unit, Library, PBDD, etc.) Additional research components (e.g. internet or academic literature reviews, focus groups, surveys, etc.) can be added as needed by the case study author to answer the evaluation questions.

The case studies will need to explore what collaborative efforts were established and achieved throughout the projects/interventions being examined and determine whether these collaborations were established to achieve particular development tasks: to do research, to manage research or to communicate/disseminate research to others to use and/or apply in policy and/or practice. Since our understanding of capacity is that it changes and shifts over time, the case studies will also need to illustrate how these collaborative efforts evolved and shifted over time, and if and how the research problem also evolved or shifted over time.

Each of the case studies will cover a range of projects and activities in the same organisation in order to demonstrate the rich diversity of capacity support interventions that are employed by different IDRC programmes and units. This diversity will assist IDRC to look back at its collective work with the organisation in question and to evaluate - in its own terms - the Centre's ability to apply what has come to be seen as its own tacit list of "good practices" for capacity development. (See Annex 1)

By collecting data at the lowest level of analysis (the project or capacity development intervention), the case study authors will need to layer or 'nest' these units in order to aggregate their data analysis upwards to come up with findings at the organisational level. The end goal is not to measure the partners' performance *per se*; rather, it is to explore what links can be made between partners' performance and the level/type of capacity development support received from IDRC. In framing the case studies around the five data clusters mentioned below (environment, intention, description, performance and findings), findings will test key corporate assumptions and should provide information and insights into *what and how* we are doing under *different working conditions*, *how we understand* the concept of capacity development, *how we can do better*. In all

cases, the focus of the analysis should be centred on capacities related to research for development as this is IDRC's mandate.

### **3. Use of organisational case studies**

As a central piece of this strategic evaluation, the case studies will be used by IDRC staff to support the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of capacity development projects and activities. The case studies will also be used by IDRC Senior managers to better understand IDRC's particular approach to capacity development, as a key corporate result area.

### **4. Case study data collection areas:**

#### **(i) Examination of the research for development context**

Lead questions:

- How has/does the overall legal, political, social/cultural and economic environment influence the partner organisation's ability to engage in research for development?
- What have been the factors that have most inhibited or enabled the uptake of capacity support for research?

Sub-questions:

- How has/is the organisation affected by the administrative/legal environment?(Does it have a clearly defined legal framework? Is it affected by bureaucracy?)
- Has/is the organisation considered influential by others in its external environment?
- How is the organisation affected by the political environment? (stability, corruption, links to government, links to civil society)
- Does the organisation take into account the effect of culture on possibilities for access to and participation in capacity development initiatives? (e.g. religious/ethnic/gender/class customs and biases; nepotism; violence and crime)
- Does the organisation have access to a predictable pool of capable human resources?
- Does economic policy support the organisation's ability to acquire technologies and financial resources for research capacity building?
- Are there other partnerships have been formed with other donors, researchers and civil society stakeholders? For what purpose?
- Is there adequate physical and technological infrastructure to enable the partner organisation to make the best use of capacity development support?

**(ii) Intention at the outset of the IDRC-partner organisation relationship:**

Lead questions:

- What were the intentions/expectations of IDRC and the partner organisation in terms of capacity development at the outset? How were these intentions/ expectations developed and to be accomplished?
- To what extent were the intentions explicit, logical (i.e., based on a theory of change), coherent, appropriate, and connected to the research context and problematique?

Sub-questions:

- What lead IDRC and the partner organisation to become involved with each other through the project/activity?
- What did each one hope to achieve?
- If appropriate, did these intentions/how did these intentions change over time?
- If there was an explicit objective to build capacity, how was this determined and formulated? If there was no explicit or implicit objective, why not?
- Who is/was involved in the building of capacities - individuals, organisations, networks?
- What is/was the overall understanding of how capacity changes?
- How was the approach to capacity designed? Was there a set approach or was it a `mixed bag` of approaches?
- Did it fit with any conception of "complete capacity" - or was *conducting the research* considered good enough?

**(iii) Description of the capacity development intervention(s)**

Lead questions:

- What capacity development strategies were employed and how were they implemented? Why were they chosen?
- How relevant, strategic and effective were the capacity development strategies?
- How did the strategies evolve over time? Why?

Sub-questions:

- What actually happened ? Why did it happen this way?
- What kinds of capacity were addressed? (e.g. to do research, to manage research, to communicate/disseminate research?) Using what type(s) of interventions?

- How relevant, appropriate and effective were these interventions to the capacity problem or research problem being addressed?
- Did/how did the approach to capacity in the project/intervention evolve over time? What results were achieved?
- What outputs were produced by the project/intervention? At what level? (individual, organisational, network?)
- What (if any) collaborations (partnerships, relationships) were achieved by the partner through the project /activity? What roles did people involved play? How did these change over time? Did the relationship with IDRC lead to other/new collaborations with others?

**(iv) Performance and continuity of the IDRC-partner organisation relationship**

Lead questions:

- What are the outcomes of the IDRC support in terms of individual and organisational capacities and the conduct and uptake of the research?
- What factors helped/hindered the achievement of the outcomes? (related to IDRC and beyond)?
- How has IDRC been influenced by the relationship with the partner organisation?
- What is the ongoing nature of IDRC's relationship with the partner organisation?

Sub-questions:

- What capacity changes/outcomes have occurred in the partner organisation? (improving/expanding research capacities, generating new knowledge, affecting policy and/or practice? Other?)
- What changes (if any) have occurred in IDRC as a result of the capacity support relationship between the two?
- Did/how did the partner organisation's perception of a research or development problem shift or change over time? To what extent was/were the IDRC intervention(s) a factor in this change of perception?
- Are there any significant cases in which the building of capacities at the researcher level has led to macro change at the organisational level? Are there any significant cases in which the opposite has been true?
- Has IDRC capacity development support allowed researchers to take on a leadership role in their organisation?

- How has/has the building of capacities (individual, organisational, network) contributed to the ability of an IDRC partner organisation to fulfill its mandate?
- How has/has the partner's definition of capacity changed over time?
- Did/how did IDRC staff collaborate and consult with one another in their dealings with this organisation?
- What other factors affected the capacity development results with this organisation? (internal context of IDRC, IDRC programme objectives, other initiatives in place, including those of IDRC as well as other donors).
- Has IDRC capacity building support contributed to effecting systemic change within the research environment? Has it played a role in "influencing established (and often firmly held) paradigms, practices, attitudes and behaviours?" (Adamo) How??

#### **(v) Findings**

Lead questions:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of IDRC's approach to capacity development?
- How can IDRC improve its capacity support in the future to this organisation?

Sub-questions:

- How can IDRC best support organisations to respond to challenges and shifts in the external research environment?
- How can/can IDRC target the capacity needs of organisations - while continuing to support individual researchers and research groups?
- What changes (if any) should IDRC consider incorporating into its plans for capacity development support to the partner organisation?

### **5. Responsibilities and Tasks**

The case study authors will complete the following tasks:

#### **Case Study Design and Management:**

- 1) Review of documents including organisational assessments (Institutional Risk Profile), project design documents (Project Approval Documents, correspondence between IDRC and partners), monitoring documents (*inter alia*, technical reports, trip reports, correspondence) and project reports (technical reports and Project Completion Reports); any other documentation relevant to evolution and status of IDRC's organisational

relationship on issues of capacity development with the case study organisation.

- 2) Travel to Ottawa and participate in **a two day methodology workshop being organized by IDRC's Evaluation Unit on 3, 4 and 5 July 2007**. The objective of the methodology workshop is two-fold: First, to brief case study authors on IDRC's objectives and rationale for this strategic evaluation and ground the authors' understanding and development of the case studies on the knowledge base of progress (in both conceptual and in practical terms) achieved under the first phases of the evaluation. Second, by addressing any unanswered questions or doubts that the authors might have, the methodology workshop will provide a space for collective author feedback to IDRC on the direction of the case studies and generate a common understanding of IDRC expectations around case study objectives, questions, content and analysis.
- 3) Based on the Terms of Reference (TORs) including the lead questions noted under the data clusters outlined above, the reading of the organisational case study file, and discussions at the methodology workshop, the consultant will develop a case study **work plan (one for each case study)** for submission and approval by IDRC, prior to beginning data collection in the field. The workplan should include a description of the proposed case study methodology and data collection instruments, a work timeline and should flag any outstanding questions requiring attention of clarification from IDRC's Evaluation Unit.

#### **Collection of Data:**

- 4) Compile a list of key case study informants including, but not limited to: project leaders, project participants and other key informants in the organisations being evaluated; relevant IDRC staff from programmes branch, grant administration and financial management (in Ottawa and regional comptrollers) and units involved in capacity development work with the organisations being evaluated (e.g. senior IDRC managers, Evaluation Unit, Library, PBDD, etc.); external players including other donors and stakeholders who have interacted with the case study organisation in a capacity development capacity.
- 5) Using the qualitative and/or quantitative collection methods of preference, collect any additional data (either insider or outside of IDRC), that the case study author deems appropriate and necessary for answering the evaluation questions being posed by IDRC.
- 6) Travel to the field in order to interview key informants (varies according to case study). Interviews should normally move out from those most directly affiliated with the project to those

purported to have been affected by or to have used the results in some way. Because there is inherent bias in interviewees to present findings in the best possible light, triangulation of data sources is crucial. Every effort should be made to ensure that interviews are conducted with representatives of at least three of the main groups involved: project implementers in the organisation, beneficiaries, IDRC and where applicable related project participants (other funded or departmental studies which have been linked to the project). The consultant will normally have an opportunity for follow-up visits for data verification or further data collection where warranted;

- 7) Participate in a validation workshop in a location to be determined (most likely Ottawa), the consultant will make a brief presentation, describing the case and indicating preliminary findings. The consultant may be asked to facilitate the data analysis or may be asked to be an active participant in the process. Following the workshop, the team may determine that it is advantageous to follow up the findings with further data collection in the field, either for the introduction of new respondents or to gather data in areas not yet addressed in the case; and
- 8) Finalize the case report based on inputs and any further verification carried out, and submit final satisfactory reports in hard copy and electronic format by in accordance with the schedules outlined for each case study. Upon completion of all the case studies, the Evaluation Unit may invite the consultant to participate in a cross comparative case study analysis of the data.

## **6. Timeline**

Timeline varies for different case studies due to variations in authors' abilities to travel to the field and/or IDRC regional office abilities to accommodate author visits. Overall, first drafts of the case studies are expected in November 2007. The Evaluation Unit plans to hold a validation workshop with case study authors, IDRC staff, select partners and other interested stakeholders in the first months of 2008. Final drafts are expected by the end of first quarter in 2008.

**ANNEX 1:**

Good Practices that Contribute to IDRC's Capacity Development (adapted from DAC, 2003 and IDRC's Corporate Assessment Framework, 2006).

GOOD PRACTICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	MANIFESTED IN IDRC THROUGH:
<b>IDRC characteristics</b>	
Persistence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained mentoring</li> <li>• Continuity, prolonged engagement</li> <li>• Iterative learning process</li> <li>• Aim to build legitimacy, credibility and trust</li> </ul>
Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding arrangements</li> <li>• Location within Canadian government system</li> <li>• Agility to respond to developing country needs</li> </ul>
Resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stay engaged under difficult circumstances</li> <li>• Provide legitimacy, credibility and trust</li> </ul>
<b>Building Partnerships</b>	
Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networks of individuals and organisations/institutions</li> <li>• Inter-organisational linkages</li> <li>• Face-to-face interactions between/among IDRC staff and researchers</li> <li>• Providing legitimacy and credibility to partners and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
GOOD PRACTICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	MANIFESTED IN IDRC THROUGH:
<b>Harnessing Existing Capacities</b>	
Strategic Intelligence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scan locally and globally, reinvent locally - regional presence to determine existing capacities</li> <li>• Staff knowledge of regions</li> </ul>
Build on existing capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained mentoring - provide long-term support beyond "one-off training" sessions</li> <li>• Regional presence - to determine existing capacities</li> <li>• Use local, existing capacities rather than creating parallel systems</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance of the Problem</b>	
Locally-driven agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local ownership</li> <li>• Local and global participation in determining the agenda</li> </ul>



GOOD PRACTICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	MANIFESTED IN IDRC THROUGH:
<b>IDRC characteristics</b>	
Persistence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained mentoring</li> <li>• Continuity, prolonged engagement</li> <li>• Iterative learning process</li> <li>• Aim to build legitimacy, credibility and trust</li> </ul>
Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding arrangements</li> <li>• Location within Canadian government system</li> <li>• Agility to respond to developing country needs</li> </ul>
Resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stay engaged under difficult circumstances</li> <li>• Provide legitimacy, credibility and trust</li> </ul>
<b>Building Partnerships</b>	
Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networks of individuals and organisations/institutions</li> <li>• Inter-organisational linkages</li> <li>• Face-to-face interactions between/among IDRC staff and researchers</li> <li>• Providing legitimacy and credibility to partners and beneficiaries</li> </ul>
GOOD PRACTICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	MANIFESTED IN IDRC THROUGH:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmes continually evolving to meet developing country demands</li> <li>• Bring southern perspectives and voices to the analysis of development challenges</li> <li>• Support devolvment of major research initiatives when appropriate</li> </ul>

## Annex III Persons Interviewed

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	METHOD	CONTACT INFORMATION
Brent Herbert-Copley	Director, Social and economic policy	IDRC	In-person interview	115, Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario Tel. 613-236-6163 bherbert-copley@idrc.ca
Edgard Rodriguez	Senior Program Specialist, Programme and Partnership Branch	IDRC	In-person interview	115, Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario Tel. 613-236-6163 erodriguez@idrc.ca
Mónica Dankers	Administrator, Programs	IDRC	In-person interview	115, Kent Street, Ottawa, Ontario Tel. 613-236-6163 mdankers@idrc.ca
Eloisa Martinez	Administrator, Programs	IDRC	In-person interview	115, Kent Street Ottawa, Ontario Tel. 613-236-6163 emartinez@idrc.ca
Gerett Rusnak	Research Officer, GGP	IDRC	In-person interview	115, Kent Street Ottawa, Ontario Tel. 613-236-6163 grusnak@idrc.ca
Gioconda Ortega-Alarie	Research Officer, Project Officer (2003-2005)	IDRC	In-person interview	
Shaun Bona	Regional Controller	IDRC - Montevideo Office	Telephone interview	Avenida Brasil 2655 11.300 Montevideo, Uruguay Tel. (+598-2) 7090042
Real Lavergne	Program Officer, IDRC previo  Senior Research Analyst	CIDA	In-person interview	
Ivan Roberts	Director	CIDA	In-person interview	
Anne-Sophie Belzil	Project Officer	CIDA	Telephone interview	
Gary McMahon	Project Officer, IDRC (1989-1996)		Telephone interview	
Bob Anderson	Representative of Canada	Board of Directors, CIES	In-person interview	
Albert Berry	Advisor to CIES	University of Toronto	Telephone interview	

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	METHOD	CONTACT INFORMATION
Javier Portocarrero Maish	Executive Director	CIES	In-person interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082 javier@CIEs.org.pe
Carmen Roca	Program Officer	CIES	In-person interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082
Maria Amelia Trigos	Project Officer	CIES	In-person interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082
Eduardo Jiménez	Analyst	CIES	In-person interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082
Norma Belén Correa Aste	Project Officer	CIES	Group interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082
Mónica Neiro	Administrator	CIES	In-person interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082
Margarita Petrera Pavone	Coordinator - Ford Foundation project	Observatorio de salud	In-person interview	Antero Aspillada 584, El Olivar, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. 511-421-8082 mpetrera@CIEs.org.pe
Carlos Eduardo Aramburu	Senior Professor	PUCP	In-person interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000 anexo 5372 caramburu@pucp.edu.pe
Hilda Nugent	Program Coordinator, Cooperation Section	Canadian Embassy	In-person interview	Livertad 130, Miraflores Lima 18, tel. 511-444-4015 ext. 3809 hilda.nugent@international.gc.ca
Rosario del Bosque	Planning and Evaluation Section	AECI	Telephone interview	Miguel Dasso 117, 2ndo piso, San Isidro, Lima-Perú Tel. (511) 211-4080
Waldo Mendoza	Senior Teacher	PUCP	Group interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000
Óscar Dancourt	Senior Teacher	PUCP	Group interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000
José Rodríguez	Senior Teacher	PUCP	Group interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000
Janina León	Senior Teacher	PUCP	Group interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000
Roxana Barrantes	Researcher	IEP	Group interview	Horacio Arteaga 694 - Lima 11 Peru tel. 511-332-6194

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	METHOD	CONTACT INFORMATION
Carolina Trivelli	Senior Researcher	IEP	Group interview	Horacio Arteaga 694 - Lima 11 Peru tel. 511-332-6194 trivelli@iep.org.pe
Eduardo Morón Pastor	Director, Research Centre and member of the Board of Directors	Universidad del Pacifico	In-person interview	Av. Salaverry 2020, Lima 11, Peru Tel. 511-219-0100 moron_ea@up.edu.pe
Gustavo Yamada	Researcher, Research Centre	Universidad del Pacifico	Group interview	Av. Salaverry 2020, Lima 11, Peru Tel. 511-219-0100 anexo 2400 yamada_ga@up.edu.pe
Juan Francisco Castro	Researcher, Research Centre	Universidad del Pacifico	Group interview	Av. Salaverry 2020, Lima 11, Peru Tel. 511-219-0100 castro_jf@up.edu.pe
Janice Seinfeld	Research, Research Centre	Universidad del Pacifico	Group interview	Av. Salaverry 2020, Lima 11, Peru Tel. 511-219-0100 seinfeld_JN@up.edu.pe
Elmer Cuba Bustinza	Socio gerente	Macroconsult	In-person interview	Gral. Brogoño 1156, Miraflores Lima 18 Peru Tel. 511-702-2580 ecuba@macrocon.com.pe
Raúl Delgado Sayán	Civil Society Representative for CIES' Board of Directors	CESEL	In-person interview	
Juan Nunura	Faculty of Economics	Universidad del Callao	Group interview	
David Davila	Dean, Faculty of Economics	Universidad del Callao	Group interview	
Raul Mores	School Director	Universidad del Callao	Group interview	
Benjamín Bayona	Executive Director	Universidad Nacional de Piura	Telephone interview	
Jorge Zegarra	Profesor	Universidad Nacional de Trujillo	Telephone interview	
Bruno Revesz	Regional Project Director	CIPCA, Piura	Telephone interview	
Fernando Villarán	President	SASE	In-person interview	Pasaje Sucre 189 Ofic. 102 Lima - 18 Tel. 511-241-6756 fvillaran@speedy.com.pe
Alberto Pascó -Font	Public Sector Representative	Consejo directivo	In-person interview	
Molvina Zeballos M.	President	DESCO	In-person interview	Leon de la Fuente 110, Lima 17 Peru 511-613-8300 molvina@desco.org.pe

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	METHOD	CONTACT INFORMATION
Eduardo Toche M.	Researcher	DESCO	In-person interview	Leon de la Fuente 110, Lima 17 Peru 511-613-8300 etoche@desco.org.pe
Raúl Mauro M.	Senior Researcher	DESCO	In-person interview	Leon de la Fuente 110, Lima 17 Peru 511-613-8300 remm@desco.org.pe
Alberto Andrianzén	Representative of Civil Society, Board of Directors of CIES	Andian Community	In-person interview	
Iván Montes Iturrizaga	Senior Reseracher	Universidad San Pablo, Arequipa	In-person interview	Salaberry 301, Cercado, Arequipa Peru Tel. 054-605600, anexo 211 imontesi@ucsp.edu.pe
Oscar Odóñez	Director	CEDER, Arequipa	Group interview	
Juan Catacora	Rural Development Area	CEDER, Arequipa	Group interview	
Alipio Montes	Coordinator of the Rural Administration and Development Section	CEDER, Arequipa	Group interview	
Gonzalo Neyra Araoz	Researcher	Universidad Católica Santa Maria, Arequipa	Group interview	
Federico Rosado	Researcher	Universidad Católica Santa Maria, Arequipa	Group interview	
Pamela Cabala	Researcher	Universidad Católica Santa Maria, Arequipa	Group interview	
Raúl Jáuregui	Researcher	Universidad Católica Santa Maria, Arequipa	Group interview	
Nadia Gomero	Researcher	Universidad Católica Santa Maria, Arequipa	Group interview	
Iliana Monti	Researcher	Universidad Católica Santa Maria, Arequipa	Group interview	

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	METHOD	CONTACT INFORMATION
Javier Iguíñiz Echeverría	Cheif, Economics Department	PUCP	Group interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000 anexo 4950 jiguini@pucp.edu.pe
José Távara Martín	Director, Economics Department	PUCP	Group interview	Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel Lima 32 Peru tel. 511-626-2000 anexo 2110 jtavara@pucp.edu.pe
Felix Wong Carpio	President of the Board of Directors	CEDEP	In-person interview	J.F. Sanchez Carrion 790, Lima 17, Peru Tel. 511-461-5593 fewong@cedepperu.org
Juan Chacaltana J.	Researcher	CEDEP	In-person interview	J.F. Sanchez Carrion 790, Lima 17, Peru Tel. 511-461-5598 jchacaltana@gmail.com
Juan G. Díaz Huaco	Manager	IPAE, Centro de Estudios Estratégicos	In-person interview	Av. La Marina Cuadra 16 s/n Lima 21 Tel. 511-566-2290 jdiaz@ipae.edu.pe
Manuel Mendoza	Consultant	IPAE, Centro de Estudios Estratégicos	In-person interview	Av. La Marina Cuadra 16 s/n Lima 21 Tel. 511-566-2290 mmendoza@ipae.edu.pe
Enrique Palacios Lozada	Director of the Institute for economic research	Universidad San Marcos	In-person interview	Francisco de Zela no. 1541 - Lince Tel: 421-7132 eepl@terra.com.pe
Carlos Casas	Jefe del Gabinete de Asesores	Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas	In-person interview	
Darío Navarro Carrasco	Decano de la facultad de Ingeniería económica y Ciencias sociales	Universidad nacional de Ingeniería	Group interview	
Javier E Sicchar Valdez	Director, Institute of Economic and Social Research	Universidad nacional de Ingeniería	Group interview	
Martín Valvidia	Research Director	GRADE	Group interview	Av. Del Ejercito 1870, Lima 27, Peru. Tel. 511-264-1780 jvaldivi@grade.org.pe
Miguel Jaramillo	Senior Researcher	GRADE	Group interview	Av. Del Ejercito 1870, Lima 27, Peru. Tel. 511-264-1780 mjaramillo@grade.org.pe
Santiago Cueto	Executive Director	GRADE	Group interview	Av. Del Ejercito 1870, Lima 27, Peru. Tel. 511-264-1780 scueto@grade.org.pe
Javier Escobal	Senior Researcher	GRADE	Group interview	Av. Del Ejercito 1870, Lima 27, Peru. Tel. 511-264-1780 jescobal@grade.org.pe

NAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION	METHOD	CONTACT INFORMATION
Vicente Tuesta R.	Assistant Director of Economic Studies	Banco Central de Reserva del Perú	Group interview	Jr. Antonio Miro Quesada 441, Lima 1 Tel. 51-1-613-2779 vicente.tuesta@bcrp.gob.pe
Adrian Armas Rivas	Director of Economic Studies	Banco Central de Reserva del Perú	Group interview	Jr. Antonio Miro Quesada 441, Lima 1 Tel. 51-1-613-2779 adrian.armas@bcrp.gob.pe
Fernando Eguren	President	CEPES	Group interview	
Marcos Cueto	Researcher	Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia	In-person interview	
Luis Alberto Jiménez	Researcher	Departamento de Economía, UNALM	In-person interview	

## Annex IV Survey

### **ENCUESTA SOBRE EL FORTALECIMIENTO DE CAPACIDADES DEL CONSORCIO DE INVESTIGACIÓN ECONÓMICA Y SOCIAL (CIES)**

El Centro de Internacional de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo (IDRC por sus iniciales en inglés) está realizando una evaluación estratégica para investigar su contribución al fortalecimiento de capacidades de grupos y organizaciones con quienes trabaja. Uno de sus socios, el Consorcio de Investigación Económica y Social (CIES) ha sido elegido como estudio de caso en esta investigación. El propósito del estudio es investigar cómo, a lo largo del tiempo, el apoyo del IDRC ha contribuido al fortalecimiento de capacidades del CIES.

La presente encuesta se realiza con la finalidad de identificar, desde la perspectiva de los miembros, los elementos del fortalecimiento institucional del CIES en los últimos años, los factores que han contribuido a ese fortalecimiento y, los aportes del IDRC en el proceso. La encuesta se dirige a los directivos de las instituciones asociadas.

Le agradeceremos mucho llenar y devolver la encuesta antes del 4 de octubre del 2007. Esta se puede devolver a la Oficina Ejecutiva del CIES, atención Srta. Rocío García (Fax (51 1) 421-7968 / 421-8082) o al correo electrónico rgarcia@CIEs.org.pe Las Sras. Katrina Rojas y Mariane Arsenault de Universalia, una firma con sede en Montreal, Canadá, están a cargo del estudio de caso del CIES.

#### **1. Información del encuestado**

1.1 Tipo de organización donde trabaja:

Sector público	Sector privado empresarial	Universidad	ONG
----------------	-------------------------------	-------------	-----

Otro (especifique): \_\_\_\_\_

1.2 Lugar:

Lima	Provincia
------	-----------

1.3 Edad

Menos de 30 años	30-39	40-49	50 - más
------------------	-------	-------	----------

1.4 Tiempo de participación en el Consorcio:

Menos de 1 año	1-3 años	3-5 años	Más de 5 años
----------------	----------	----------	---------------



**2. Fortalecimiento del CIES**

2.1 En base a su experiencia, por favor evaluar el fortalecimiento del CIES en su capacidad como Consorcio para:

	MUY FAVO- RABLE	FAVO- RABLE	NULA	DESFAVO- RABLE	MUY DESFAVO- RABLE	NO OPINA
Fortalecer capacidades de investigación de las Instituciones asociadas	5	4	3	2	1	0
Aumentar el stock de conocimiento útil para el diseño y ejecución de políticas públicas	5	4	3	2	1	0
Difundir conocimiento útil sobre políticas y programmas públicos	5	4	3	2	1	0
Promover el debate público sobre políticas y programmas públicos	5	4	3	2	1	0

2.2 Por favor, señalar las tres áreas en las que usted considera que el CIES se ha fortalecido más significativamente en los últimos años (de las ya señaladas arriba u otras que no hemos identificado):

(1)

---

(2)

---

(3)

---

2.3 Por favor, evaluar la contribución de los siguientes aspectos al fortalecimiento del conjunto de asociados del CIES:

	MUY FAVO- RABLE	FAVO- RABLE	NULA	DESFAVO- RABLE	MUY DESFAVO- RABLE	NO OPINA
La integration de nuevos miembros al Consorcio	5	4	3	2	1	0
La integración de instituciones asociadas localizadas fuera de Lima	5	4	3	2	1	0
El trabajo en redes de investigación	5	4	3	2	1	0
La articulación entre las instituciones asociadas	5	4	3	2	1	0
La capacitación de las instituciones asociadas al CIES	5	4	3	2	1	0

	MUY FAVO- RABLE	FAVO- RABLE	NULA	DESFAVO- RABLE	MUY DESFAVO- RABLE	NO OPINA
El concurso anual de investigación	5	4	3	2	1	0
Las pasantías de investigación	5	4	3	2	1	0
El fortalecimiento de capacidades de investigadores jóvenes	5	4	3	2	1	0
La divulgación de resultados de investigación	5	4	3	2	1	0
La participación de las Instituciones Asociadas en las actividades del Consorcio	5	4	3	2	1	0
La participación de la Universidades Nacionales y de los socios de provincia en los concursos breves cerrados	5	4	3	2	1	0
Las asesorías a investigadores de Universidades Nacionales y de los socios de provincia	5	4	3	2	1	0
La participación de jóvenes en los proyectos de investigación	5	4	3	2	1	0
El apoyo de la Oficina Ejecutiva	5	4	3	2	1	0

2.4 Por favor identificar los tres factores más importantes (de las ya señaladas arriba u otros que no hemos mencionado) que han favorecido el desarrollo de capacidades del CIES?

(1)

---

(2)

---

(3)

---

### 3. Conclusión

3.1 ¿Cómo podría el IDRC mejorar su apoyo al fortalecimiento de capacidades del Consorcio?

---



---



---



---

3.2 ¿Alguna otra observación o comentario?

---

---

---

---

***Gracias por su cooperación***

## Annex V Survey Results

### Pregunta 1.1 - Tipo de organización donde trabaja

OPCIONES	RESPUESTA
Sector público	2
Sector privado empresarial	1
Universidad	13
ONG	9
Otro (especifique):	0

### Pregunta 1.2 - Lugar

OPCIONES	RESPUESTAS
Lima	16
Provincia	9

### Pregunta 1.3 - Edad

OPCIONES	RESPUESTAS
Menos de 30 años	2
30-39	2
40-49	5
50 - más	16

### Pregunta 1.4 - Tiempo de participación en el Consorcio:

OPCIONES	RESPUESTAS
Menos de 1 año	2
1-3 años	1
3-5 años	3
Más de 5 años	18
Abstención	1

**Pregunta 2.1** - En base a su experiencia, por favor evaluar el fortalecimiento de CIES en su capacidad como Consorcio para:

Preguntas	Universidades públicas	Universidades privadas	Otros miembros	Lima	Provincias	Conjunto de entrevistados	Número de abstenciones / No opina
2.1.1 Fortalecer capacidades de investigación de las Instituciones asociadas	4.00	4.20	4.10	4.00	4.22	4.08	0
2.1.2 Aumentar el stock de conocimiento útil para el diseño y ejecución de políticas públicas	4.30	4.40	4.20	4.13	4.56	4.28	0
2.1.3 Difundir conocimiento útil sobre políticas y programas públicos	4.50	4.60	4.10	4.25	4.56	4.36	0
2.1.4 Promover el debate público sobre políticas y programas públicos	4.10	4.60	4.10	3.94	4.67	4.20	0

\* Nota: Los números representan un promedio de las respuestas recogidas en el cual 5 representa muy favorable, 4 favorable, 3 nula, 2 desfavorable, 1 muy desfavorable. A la categoría "no opina" no se le ha asignando puntaje. El promedio se calculó en base al número de respuestas.

**Pregunta 2.2** - Por favor, señalar las tres áreas en las que usted considera que el CIES se ha fortalecido más significativamente en los últimos años (de las ya señaladas arriba u otras que no hemos identificado):

RESPUESTAS	NUMERO DE RESPUESTAS
Divulgación de conocimientos	10
Fortalecimiento capacidad de investigación	9
Aumento del stock de conocimiento útil sobre políticas públicas	9
Promover el debate público	6
Concurso	4
Actor válido para evaluar programmas y proyectos públicos	2
Publicaciones que pueden ser usados en la educación universitaria / o para el público en general	2
Creación de un espacio de dialogo	1
Incremento de la competitividad en materia de investigación de sus socios	1
Asociarse a entidades publicas, privadas, académica y ONG como parte de una cultura de dialogo	1
Consultarías	1
Canal de filtro de información de multilaterales	1
Articular a las más prestigiosas entidades de investigación e investigadores	1
Sus propuestas han sido las propuestas de consenso de la sociedad civil en su conjunto	1
Capacitación en la investigación	1
Apoyo a la investigación social	1

RESPUESTAS	NUMERO DE RESPUESTAS
Apoyo en la revisión del currículo de estudios	1
Promover el desarrollo de alianzas estratégicas	1

\*Nota: Se reportan un total de 53 respuestas en 24 encuestas.

**Pregunta 2.3** - Por favor, evaluar la contribución de los siguientes aspectos al fortalecimiento del conjunto de asociados del CIES:

Preguntas	Universidades públicas	Universidades privadas	Otros miembros	Lima	Provincias	Conjunto de entrevistados	Número de abstenciones / No opina
2.3.1 La integración de nuevos miembros al Consorcio	4.25	4.00	4.44	4.38	4.11	4.27	3
2.3.2 La integración de instituciones asociadas localizadas fuera de Lima	4.33	4.40	4.67	4.36	4.67	4.48	2
2.3.3 El trabajo en redes de investigación	3.63	4.20	4.00	3.86	4.00	3.91	3
2.3.4 La articulación entre las instituciones asociadas	3.44	4.00	3.67	3.36	4.11	3.65	2
2.3.5 La capacitación de las instituciones asociadas al CIES	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.88	4.44	4.08	0
2.3.6 El concurso anual de investigación	4.30	4.40	4.40	4.19	4.67	4.36	0
2.3.7 Las pasantías de investigación	4.00	4.20	4.00	3.91	4.25	4.05	6
2.3.8 El fortalecimiento de capacidades de investigadores jóvenes	4.50	4.20	4.56	4.29	4.75	4.45	3
2.3.9 La divulgación de resultados de investigación	4.50	4.60	4.20	4.31	4.56	4.40	0
2.3.10 La participación de las Instituciones Asociadas en las actividades del Consorcio	3.78	4.00	3.88	3.57	4.38	3.86	3
2.3.11 La participación de la Universidades Nacionales y de los socios de provincia en los concursos breves cerrados	4.33	4.40	4.57	4.15	4.88	4.43	4
2.3.12 Las asesorías a investigadores de Universidades Nacionales y de los socios de provincia	3.88	4.20	4.00	3.69	4.50	4.00	4
2.3.13 La participación de jóvenes en los proyectos de investigación	4.41	4.00	4.38	4.09	4.38	4.21	6
2.3.14 El apoyo de la Oficina Ejecutiva	4.25	4.20	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.13	2

\* Nota: Los números representan un promedio de las respuestas recogidas en el cual 5 representa muy favorable, 4 favorable, 3 nula, 2 desfavorable, 1 muy desfavorable. A la categoría "no opina" no se le ha asignando puntaje. El promedio se calculó en base al número de respuestas.

**Pregunta 2.4** - Por favor identificar los tres factores más importantes (de las ya señaladas arriba u otros que no hemos mencionado) que han favorecido el desarrollo de capacidades del CIES?

RESPUESTAS	NUMERO DE RESPUESTAS
Nuevos miembros fuera de Lima	13
Divulgación de los resultados	11
El concurso anual	11
Fortalecimiento de capacidades de investigadores jóvenes	10
Capacitación des los socios	6
Trabajo en redes de investigación	3
El personal de la oficina ejecutiva	2
Espíritu de sana competencia	1
Esfuerzos para la participación en espacios de discusión	1
Apoyo a la investigación	1

RESPUESTAS	NUMERO DE RESPUESTAS
Articulación entre universidades asociadas	1

\*Nota: Se reportan 60 respuestas en 23 encuestas.

**Pregunta 3.1** - ¿Cómo podría el IDRC mejorar su apoyo al fortalecimiento de capacidades del Consorcio?

RESPUESTAS
Manteniendo su apoyo a los concursos de investigación y fortaleciendo el programme de publicaciones y difusión del CIES.
Fortaleciendo la línea de incentiva mejorando la diseminación del conocimiento, fomento más sostenido de la investigación.
Validando aproximaciones metodológicas alternativas a las puramente cuantitativas al estudio de problemas concretos de la realidad peruana.
Asesorando a la universidades miembros en el diseño de sus cursos del área de metodología de la investigación
Realizando seminarios de discusión de la problemática coyuntural de manera periódica.
Aunque no tengo sugerencias específicas de cómo hacerlo, sería muy útil que el IDRC apoye la vinculación del CIES con instituciones de investigación en otros países, sobre temas afines, que amplíe la red de vinculaciones / referencias / bibliografías de los investigadores asociados (al CIES).
Apoyando eventos especializados para debate académico de investigaciones en temas prioritarios, pero no solo de los financiados por el CIES.
Apoyo al acceso a fuentes bibliográficas internacionales de alto costo.
Seguir apoyando con financiamiento para desarrollar investigaciones Científicas y contribuir en la búsqueda de soluciones a los problemas sociales, económicos y ambientales del país.
Mantener el apoyo al CIES con fondos concursables.
Promover un trabajo más estrecho con universidades públicas y de provincia.
Propiciando que las actividades del Consorcio se orienten a generar complementariedad con otros esfuerzos cuyo objetivo es generar conocimiento útil para el diseño de políticas y la toma de decisiones, a fin de trascender a la labor académica y que el conocimiento generado en las investigaciones se articule en esfuerzos mayores de generación de propuestas.
Fortaleciendo todos aquellos factores con calificación de nula a no opina.
Proponiendo elemento más operacionales en las investigaciones del Consorcio.
Buscando que los resultados de las investigaciones constituyan insumos orientados hacia la opinión pública y el discurso político. Promoviendo el debate público desde una aproximación ideológicamente más variada y alejándose, en la medida de lo posible, de la perspectiva académica.
Encontrando acciones comunes tanto de investigación como de trabajo con la comunidad, de modo que todas puedan intervenir en un aspecto particular.
Promover también investigaciones asociadas, vale decir un a institución (fondo UNI) asociada a otra institución (fondo CIES) para promover investigadores UNI.
Capacitaciones programmeadas al año.
Debería darse una adecuada capacitación en investigación en las instituciones



RESPUESTAS
asociadas.
Con programmeas de asistencia técnica para uno de sus socios: la universidad pública, en las áreas de capacitación en investigación y mayor difusión de las experiencias de los mejores investigadores.
Mayor apoyo económico para que el CIES continúe con su trabajo a favor de la investigación en el Perú.
Brindar más apoyo para investigaciones en el interior del país.
Priorizar investigaciones aplicadas para resolver problemas reales del país.
Dejando de ser una institución centrada en el estudio de las políticas macroeconómicas y fortaleciendo su capacidad de estudio e intervención en temas sociales como la educación y la salud pública. Asimismo enfatizando más su apoyo a estudio de género. Dándole más oportunidades a los investigadores jóvenes. No poniendo una fecha límite por los proyectos sino que sean más flexibles.
Desarrollar programmeas de formación especializados en provincias con socios regionales.
Apoyando redes de investigación entre universidades nacionales y extranjeras.
Con mayor participación dentro de las instituciones socias.
Financiando proyectos de desarrollo.
Propiciar investigaciones interdisciplinarias en redes entre instituciones de diversos países.
Usar alguna definición operativa de desarrollo para monitorear avances de ese concepto en los diversos países como producto de la calidad de las investigaciones.
Apoyando con el asesoramiento a los investigadores de las instituciones que somos miembros del Consorcio; facilitando procesos de intercambio de experiencias y pasantías; promoviendo la actualización permanente de los docentes e investigadores mediante convenios a nivel de postgrado, etc.
Con un mayor presupuesto orientado a la capacitación especializados y permanente a los investigadores de provincia.
Considero que manteniendo el apoyo al concurso anual del Consorcio y propiciando el desarrollo de nuevas investigaciones dirigidas a mejorar las decisiones políticas del gobierno nacional y de los gobiernos subnacionales.
Propiciar que el Consorcio, a través de sus asociados, pueda mantener y mejorar su presencia en los gobiernos regionales, con la presentación de investigaciones en ejes estratégicos relacionados con el desarrollo regional.
Tal vez, enfatizando un poco más el desarrollo de capacidades en investigación en asociados al Consorcio fuera de Lima.
Incrementando los fondos para más concursos de investigación, financiando iniciativas de capacitación de los centros asociados hacia sus zonas de influencia.

\*Nota: Se reportan respuestas 24 encuestas.

### Pregunta 3.2 - ¿Alguna otra observación o comentario?

RESPUESTAS
La visita y el dialogo de los representantes de IDRC con algunas instituciones asociadas de Lima y de provincias sería muy pertinente.
Realizar publicaciones sobre metodología de la investigación.
Los balances de temas a investigar tengan una mayor participación de las

RESPUESTAS
instituciones que forman parte del Consorcio.
Si bien el IDRC ha fomentado la investigación y respetado la autonomía del CIES, esta institución no ha logrado afianzar mecanismos que regulen su rol de segundo piso. Tal vez IDRC pueda apoyar de esta forma el fortalecimiento institucional del CIES.
Una mayor coordinación CIES-UNI.
Una mayor coordinación CIES-UNI.
El IDRC debe seguir con las evaluaciones periódicas. El CIES debe reforzar su política de vincular las investigaciones como insumo de políticas económicas o sociales.
El CIES es una excelente idea, tiene algunas fallas en su implementación y en su conducción reciente, pero todo indica que esta mejorando. Debe mantenerse porque hace una contribución fundamental al país.
Seguimos percibiendo un sesgo ideológico en el CIES, favorable a enfoques más bien intervencionistas. Esa es la principal limitación que seguimos observando a su valiosa labor de promoción de la investigación económica y social.
Favorecer investigaciones sobre el concepto de desarrollo más justo, sobre el tipo de globalización que favorezca la estabilidad y equidad entre naciones, sobre las alternativas de reducción de violencia nacional, cultural, ambiental y global. Los temas y políticas puntuales pueden enmarcarse dentro de concepciones amplias, que le den sentido y dirección.
Que se promueva una mayor participación de las investigaciones e investigadores de provincia y regiones para explicar con mayor profundidad los problemas económicos, sociales, ambientales y los conflictos que se generan en estos niveles de gobierno, diversificando los temas, así como propendiendo a proponer políticas públicas acorde con la realidad particular de cada zona.
Creo que el Consorcio se constituye en la mejor opción (tal vez la única) a nivel nacional, para fortalecer la investigación social y económica, de manera desconcentrada en el ámbito nacional. El Consorcio es un espacio de generación de conocimiento útil para lograr el bien común, al brindar mejores herramientas a los hacedores de política nacional, regional y local para la toma de decisiones. En este sentido, va nuestro profundo agradecimiento al IDRC, por permitir que el Consorcio sea un instrumento para el fortalecimiento de la investigación económica y social a nivel nacional.

\*Nota: Se reportan respuestas en 12 encuestas.

## Annex VI Bibliography

### **IDRC Documents**

- Adamo, Abra (2003). "Influencing Public Policy through IDRC-Supported Research: Synthesis of Document Reviews". Final Report. Ottawa, IDRC Evaluation Unit.
- Bernard, Anne (February 2005). "Mapping Capacity Development in IDRC".
- Gillespie, Bryon (2005). "Theories of Change: Exploring IDRC Understandings about Capacity Development".
- Herbert-Copley, Brent (2007). Social and Economic Policy Programme Area: Report to the Board of Governors. Ottawa, IDRC.
- IDRC (2005). *Annual Learning Forum*. Ottawa, IDRC.
- IDRC (2004). *Corporate Strategy and Programme Framework 2005-2010*. Ottawa, IDRC.
- Lusthaus, Charles, Marie-Hélène Adrien, Gary Anderson, Fred Carden & George Plinio Montalvan (2002). *Evaluación organizacional: Marco para mejorar el desempeño*. Washington, Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo y Centro Internacional de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo.
- Lusthaus, Charles y Stephanie Nielson (Abril 2005). "Capacity Building at IDRC: Some Preliminary Thoughts".
- Lusthaus, Charles, y Stephanie Nielson (Febrero 2007). "IDRC-supported Capacity Building: Developing a Framework for Capturing Capacity Changes".
- Lusthaus, Charles, y Stephanie Nielson (Marzo 2007). "Capacity Building at IDRC. Results and factors supporting results".
- Wuyts, Marc (2004). *An Evaluation of the AERC Research Programme: 1997-2003*. The Hague, Institute of Social Studies.

### **CIES Documents**

- Anderson, Janine y Janina León (2006). *El enfoque de género en la investigación del CIES*. Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2007). *Informe anual: Periodo enero 2006 - Diciembre 2006 (Versión al 13 de marzo de 2007)*. Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2007a). *CIES, 1989 to 2007: the path from project to institution*. (Presentation for the visit of the Honourable Barbara J. McDougall IDRC Governor April 18, 2007.) Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2007b). *Revista Economía y Sociedad*, no. 64, Julio. Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2007c). *Revista Economía y Sociedad*, no.63, Abril. Lima, CIES.

- CIES (2006). Informe anual: Periodo enero 2005 - Diciembre 2005 (Versión al 31 de enero de 2006). Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2006a). Revista Economía y Sociedad, no.61, Octubre. Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2006b). Informe semestral enero - junio 2006. Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2005). Memoria institucional 1999-2004. Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2004). Informe anual: Periodo abril 2003 - Marzo 2004 (Versión al 21 de junio de 2004). Lima, CIES.
- CIES (2003). Informe anual: Periodo Abril 2002 - Marzo 2003 (Versión al 25 de abril de 2003). Lima, CIES.
- Iguíñiz, Javier M. y Roxana Barrantes (2004). *La investigación económica y social en el Perú: Balance 1999-2003 y prioridades para el futuro*. Lima, CIES.

#### **IDRC - CIDA Documents**

- (2002). "Economic and Social Research Consortium: Audit Services". Ottawa, IDRC.
- IDRC (2005). Amendment no. 1 to the Memorando of Grant Conditions. Ottawa, IDRC.
- Interalia (2002). "Revista operativa del proyecto Consorcio de investigación económica y social - CIES". Dirección de la Américas, ACDI.

#### **Partner Documents**

- DESCO (2005). *Memoria 40 años 1965-2005*. Lima, DESCO.
- Grompone, Romeo (2002). *Los dilemas no resueltos de la descentralización*. Colección descentralización, Lima, IEP.
- Mendoza, Waldo (2007). "Tiempos de bonanza económica: el primer año del presidente García" en *Economía y Sociedad*, no. 64, pp. 12-19.
- Monge, Carlos (2007). "La descentralización: lo que nos dejó Toledo, lo que nos espera con García" en *Economía y Sociedad*, no.63, pp. 7-12.
- Rodriguez Sosa, Jorge y Molvina Zeballos Manzur (2007). *Evaluación de proyectos de desarrollo local: Enfoques, métodos y procedimientos*. Lima, DESCO.

#### **Websites**

- Benavides, Livia (2005). "M&E of Public Expenditures in Peru." Discussant during a World Bank Conference : Towards the Institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Latin America and the Caribbean. Washington (June 6-7, 2005).

[http://iris37.worldbank.org/domdoc/PRD/Other/PRDDContainer.nsf/D  
OC\\_VIEWER?ReadForm&I4\\_KEY=B7E8619D92C09B1B85256BCE006154D7766BEF  
38520666DE8525709800562929&I4\\_DOCID=6FBC7D6CB5F1358785257155004B  
4C3A&](http://iris37.worldbank.org/domdoc/PRD/Other/PRDDContainer.nsf/D<br/>OC_VIEWER?ReadForm&I4_KEY=B7E8619D92C09B1B85256BCE006154D7766BEF<br/>38520666DE8525709800562929&I4_DOCID=6FBC7D6CB5F1358785257155004B<br/>4C3A&)

Consortio de Investigación Económica y Social.

<http://cies.org.pe/es/portada>

Escobal, Javier (2002). "Measuring Inflation and Hyperinflation: the Impact of Research on Improving the Way Peruvian Statistics Office Calculates CPI Indexes" en

[http://www.gdnet.org/pdf/global\\_research\\_projects/br&p/Peru.pdf](http://www.gdnet.org/pdf/global_research_projects/br&p/Peru.pdf)

### Other documents

(2006). "Capacity Development under Programme Based Approaches: Synthesis Report". Washington, Lenpa Spring Forum 2005.

Aramburu, Carlos . (2007). "Vinculando la investigación en TICS para el desarrollo a las políticas públicas". (Documento por publicar)

Consortio de Universidades (). *Informe: La educación superior en Iberoamérica 2006 Perú*. Lima.

FMI (2007). "Peru: Primera Revision del Acuerdo Stand-by - Documento del Personal del FMI." Washington, FMI.

Girgis, Mona (2007). "The Capacity-building Paradox: using friendship to build capacity in the South." *Development in Practice*, Vol. 16, No.3. pp.353-366.

Giugale, Marcelo M., Vicente Fretes-Cibils y John L. Newman. (2006). "Perú: La oportunidad de un país diferente. Prospero, equitativo y gobernable". Washington, Banco Mundial.

González de la Cuba, José Raúl (2004). *El financiamiento de la educación superior en el Perú*. Lima.

Holvand, Ingie (2007). "Making a Difference: M&E of Policy Research". Workingpaper 281. Londres, ODI.

Hurni, Hans, Jon-Andri Lys y Daniel Maselli (2001). "The role of Research for Development" En *The Challenges of Enhancing Research Capacity in Developing and Transition Countries*. Bern, KFPE, pp. 15-55.

Kuramoto, Juana y Máximo Torero (2004). *La participación pública y privada en la investigación y desarrollo e innovación tecnológica en el Perú: Una apreciación global relativa a otros países latinoamericanos*. Lima, GRADE.

Liebler, Claudia y Marisa Ferri (2004). "NGO Networks: Building Capacity in a Changing World."

- Lusthaus, Charles y Christine Milton (2006). "The Evaluation of Inter-Organisational Relationships in the Non-for-Profit Sector: Some Observations". Montréal, Universalia.
- Maselli, Daniel, Jon Andri Lys y Jacqueline Schmid (2006). «Improving Impacts of Research Partnerships.» Berne, Swiss Commission For Research Partnerships with Developing Countries, KFPE.
- Mendizabal, Enrique (2007). "Influencing Policy Processes in Peru: the Role of Networks". Borrador. Londres, ODI.
- Mendizabal, Enrique (2006). "Building Effective Research Policy Networks: Linking Function and Form". Working paper 276. Londres, ODI.
- Mendizabal, Enrique (2006a). "Understanding Networks: The Functions of Research Policy Networks." Working paper 217. Londres, ODI.
- Provan, Keith G. y H. Brinton Milward (2001). "Do Networks Really Work? A Framework for Evaluating Public-Sector Organisational Networks". *Public Administration Review*, no. 61, vol. 4, pp. 414-423.
- Pyburn, Rhiannon y Irene Guijt (2006). "Capacity Building in Networks: An Analysis of the Findings from an IDRC Strategic Evaluation".
- SEPIA (2005). *SEPIA 20 años: Evaluación y Reflexiones / Seminario Permanente de Investigación Agraria*. Lima, SEPIA.
- Schenk, Ingrid (2005). *Structured Flexibility: The Governance, Coordination, and Outcomes of IDRC Supported Networks*.
- Sebastián, Jesús (2003). *Estrategias de cooperación universitaria para la formación de investigadores en Iberoamérica*. Madrid, OEI.
- Weiss, Carol H, Svetlana Karushkina-Drivdale y Shahram Paksima. IDRC-Supported Research & its Influence on Public Policy: Final Report. Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Willard, Terri y Heather Creech (2006). "The Sustainability of Networks: An Analysis of the Findings from IDRC Strategic Evaluation".
- Whyte, Anne (2004). "Human and Institutional Capacity Building: Landscape Analysis of Donor Trends in International Development". Report to the Rockefeller Foundation.
- Zinke, Julia (2005). "Networks as a Form of Capacity: Workshop Report." The Hague, ECDPM.

**Project List**

PROJECT NUMBER AND TITLE	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
--------------------------	--------------------

PROJECT NUMBER AND TITLE	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
003868 Peru Consortium for Economic and social Research	<p>Herzka, Claudio y Shane Hunt (2000). <i>End of Project Review: Peruvian Economic Research Consortium (Final Report)</i>.</p> <p>Hunt, Shane (2000). <i>Report on Research Quality in Phase II Peru Economic Research Consortium (CIE)</i>.</p> <p>Lavergne, Réal (1997). Trip Report - Abril 17 - Mayo 3, 1997.</p> <p>Lavergne, Réal (1997a). Trip Report - Septiembre 7-13, 1997.</p> <p>Lavergne, Réal (2000). <i>End of Project Report: Economic Research Consortium, Peru (Phase II)</i>.</p> <p>Morales, Juan Antonio (1993). <i>Report on the Economic Research Consortium, Peru</i>.</p> <p>Project Appraisal Document</p>
102321 Strengthening the Peru Consortium for Economic and Social Research - Phase II	<p>CIES (1998). <i>Propuesta para una nueva iniciativa 1998-2002</i>. Lima, CIES.</p> <p>CIES. Presupuesto ACIDI-IDRC proyecto CIES II (abril 2004-marzo 2009).</p> <p>Herbert-Copley, Brent (2005). Trip Report - Octubre 20, 2002.</p> <p>Herbert-Copley, Brent (2000). Trip Report - Abril 4-7, 2002.</p> <p>Herbert-Copley, Brent (2002). Trip Report - Febrero 4-15, 2002.</p> <p>Herbert-Copley, Brent (2001). Trip Report - Abril 29-Mayo 8, 2001.</p> <p>Herzka, Claudio (1999). <i>Issues for CIES: the Challenges for the Peruvian Social and Economic Research Consortium(Final Version)</i>. Ottawa.</p> <p>Lavergne, Réal (1999). Trip Report - Agosto 22 - Septiembre 4, 1999.</p> <p>Lavergne, Réal (2000a). Trip Report - Marzo 26 - Abril 7, 2000.</p> <p>Ortega-Alarie, Gioconda (2004). Trip Report - Marzo 12-19, 2004.</p> <p>Ortega-Alarie, Gioconda (2004a). Trip Report - Mayo 31 - Junio 4, 2004.</p> <p>Rodriguez, Edgard (2007). Trip Report - Diciembre 10-15, 2006.</p> <p>Rodriguez, Edgard y André Rius (2007). Trip Report - Mayo 11-18, 2007.</p> <p>Project Appraisal Document</p>
102798 Peru 2006: Linking Research with Policy Options in the General Elections	Project Appraisal Document

PROJECT NUMBER AND TITLE	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
103599 Social Development Network (Researchers and NGOs) of the Community of Andean Nations (CAN)	Project Appraisal - Draft Project Appraisal Document Budget Notes



## Annex VII CIES Partners

UNIVERSITIES	
LIMA	REGIONS
Escuela de Administración de Negocios para Graduados-ESAN	Universidad Nacional de Piura, Facultad de Economía
Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Departamento de Economía	Universidad Nacional del Altiplano, Facultad de Ingeniería Económica
Universidad del Pacífico, Centro de Investigación	Nacional San Antonio Abad del Cusco, Facultad de Economía
Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina, Facultad de Economía y Planificación	Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Facultad de Economía
Universidad Nacional de Ingeniería, Facultad de Ingeniería Económica y Ciencias Sociales	Universidad Católica San Pablo
Universidad Nacional del Callao, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas	Universidad Católica de Santa María, Arequipa, Centro de Investigaciones
Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos	Universidad de Piura, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales, CISE
Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia	Universidad Nacional de la Amazonía Peruana, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Negocios
Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas	Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas
	Universidad Católica Santo Toribio de Mogrovejo, Departamento de Ciencias Empresariales
	Universidad Nacional Santiago Antunez de Mayolo, Escuela Académico Profesional de Economía
CENTRES	
LIMA	REGIONS
Asociación Benéfica Prisma	Centro Bartolomé de las Casas
Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo y la Participación - CEDEP	Centro de Investigación y Promoción al Campesinado- CIPCA
Centro de Estudios y Promoción del Desarrollo - DESCO	Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo Regional - CEDER
Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales - CEPES	Instituto de Investigaciones de la Amazonía Peruana
Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo - GRADE	Centro Guamán Poma de Ayala
Instituto Apoyo	
Instituto Cuánto	
Instituto de Estudios Peruanos - IEP	
Instituto Nacional de Estadística e	

Informática - INEI	
Instituto Peruano de Administración de Empresas - IPAE,	
Macroconsult S.A.	
Seguimiento, Análisis y Evaluación para el Desarrollo-SASE	
Servicios Educativos Rurales- SER	

## Annex VIII Biographies of the Authors

### **Katrina M. Rojas**

Ms. Rojas is a Senior Project Manager and Partner at Universalía Management Group. She has worked in planning, monitoring, evaluation, governance and other areas of organisational development for the last twelve years. Since joining Universalía in 2001, she has carried out assignments in performance management, monitoring, evaluation, and organisational assessment for the World Bank, UNIFEM, International Development Research Centre, UNCDF, Caribbean Development Bank, International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, Foreign Affairs Canada, Television Trust for the Environment, and the Government of Nicaragua's Programme to Support Implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy. Between 1994 and 2001, she lived in Costa Rica and consulted on organisational development issues with civil society organisations involved in children's rights, human rights, women's rights and gender equality, health and environmental issues, popular education, and community development in Central America. She coordinated planning and nonprofit governance programmes at Fundación Acceso, an NGO that provides training and technical assistance to civil society organisations in Central America. Ms. Rojas holds a Master's in Public and International Affairs from Princeton University.

### **Mariane Arsenault**

Mariane Arsenault joined Universalía in February 2006 and she has completed her Masters degree in International Studies from Montreal University. She has international working experience in Latin America and in Asia. Since joining Universalía, she has been working in evaluation, specifically with multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and UNIFEM, and bilateral donors like the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Recently, she has participated in a number of evaluation assignments in M&E which required data collection, data analysis, development of evaluation tools and report writing. All of these assignments required interviews with key stakeholders and, in some cases, the facilitation of information sessions and focus groups. Ms. Arsenault is Canadian and is fluent in English, French and Spanish.